Governments of nations commit themselves to a declaration of principles and intentions which they call a constitution. Major portions of these manifestos are as a rule devoted to the welfare of the general population. Religious denominations, charitable societies, and all so-called humanitarian enterprises, in a similar way, expend the greatest part of their energies and wherewithal, towards helping people. Whilst all of these organisations need money to achieve their ends, the accumulation of large resources is not for private profit, it is for the benefit of the general public. It may not always work out that way, but that is what we expect of them.

It is different with business concerns, as they exist for the purpose of making money, and they are not censured because they distribute their profits to their shareholders and employees. Minimal amounts may be given to charity, but the average business man would think you were out of your mind if you suggested to him, that he should assign most of his profits to humanitarian purposes. However, this is what L.O. Bailey did, and he was one of the sanest of men. Moreover, he was far from being a really wealthy man at the time, as surplus cash, then, and for many years, was in short supply. His gift of love did not wait to be given until such time as it was fully convenient for him. He saw the need and fulfilled it by giving not only of his worldly goods, but by giving freely of himself.

Jack Dun Trop, A Gift of Love

They didn't care, they weren't interested in us. They really and truly didn't care about the kids enough. They took on the responsibility and how dare they blame somebody else for their failure. They took on the responsibility, therefore it was their responsibility. Now that man didn't know anything about children. He didn't care about children's individuality. We were a means to an end. He didn't know me from Shirley or Robyn or Carmel. He didn't know anything about me or the others.

Hopwood child

In the years immediately following the end of the Second World War in Australia, a Sydney businessman, Lesley Owen Bailey (1890-1964), embarked on a social experiment which is unique in Australian, and possibly world, history. Bailey took into his care 86 'war babies', 43 boys and 43 girls, the eldest born in 1942, the youngest in 1949. He provided for them from his own personal fortune until they came of age, and made provision for many well into adulthood. The children were
brought up together in establishments owned by Bailey throughout NSW, principally Hopewood House, located at Bowral. They have come to think of themselves as a form of family, and describe each other to this day as ‘brothers and sisters’. The family motif was strengthened by the distinct appellations given to Bailey and his principal partner in the project, Madge Cockburn, of ‘Daddy Bailey’, and ‘Aunty Madge’. The children were brought up on a diet based on natural health principles, and were used by Bailey as exemplars of the efficacy of such a diet in producing healthy children who would be able to make a useful contribution to society. Bailey died in 1964. However the ‘Hopewood family’ has remained a remarkably cohesive group for the over 35 years following his death. He left a legacy, sometimes positive, sometimes negative, often a disconcerting mixture of both, for all those who came under his care, as well as establishing a business based on the results of his experiment which endures to this day.

For purposes of clarification, it must be noted at this time that while I refer to them throughout this work as the ‘Hopewood children’, those who came under Bailey’s care during the 1940s are of course now men and women in their fifties. This work is an attempt to understand, in its widest terms, what I have called the ‘Hopewood Experiment’. My principal intention at the outset of this project was to understand the social impact which life in Hopewood had on the children, both at the time and in their later, adult lives. In seeking to understand these effects it was necessary to define and understand the practices of Hopewood itself. These practices in turn could not be grasped without an understanding of both the private motivations of Bailey and the public concerns which may have constrained, facilitated, directed or
influenced Bailey in his project. This study therefore represents a continuum in which social, economic, and intellectual currents interact with private history and specialised concerns. These interactions generated a series of problems both personal and social, which required solution. This solution was formulated in institutional terms, generating a set of practices, which were enacted on the children under Bailey’s control. The institutional practices, both those defined by Bailey, and those which arose within the institution itself, had outcomes, some of which were within the schema which Bailey had developed for his projects, others which were either incidental, or in some instances contradictory to, this schema. The interactions between these agencies of mutual influence, both within and beyond the social milieu which Bailey created at Hopewood are the principal focus for examination in this work. My intent has been to understand how that peculiar combination of individual biography, historical events, and social structure played themselves out within the framework of Hopewood.

L.O. BAILEY AND HOPEWOOD – A BIOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

This is not a work of history. The focus of this work is sociological: to reconstruct, and deconstruct, the particular social milieu that was Hopewood, and the social entity which has endured, as the ‘Hopewood Family’, to this day. Nevertheless, there are historical issues to be faced, not the least of which is the ‘story of Hopewood’, the interlocking narrative of personal, public and institutional events which form the framework in which this unique social experiment took place.
Versions of the life of Bailey, and the development of the Hopewood institution, have already been provided by Trop (1971), and Raymond (1987). Both of these works are primarily celebrations in praise of Bailey: Trop's work was commissioned by the YWAA as a tribute to his life's work; Raymond's work draws heavily on Trop's, and was primarily intended for promotional purposes for the Hopewood Health Centre at Wallacia, NSW, which carries on Bailey's natural health principles as a commercial entity. Whilst they both provide a detailed and essentially accurate chronological account, neither of these works takes the objective, critical stance in assessing Bailey's life and work which it is the intention of the current work to provide. The following biographical details of Bailey's life combines an historical account of the development of the Youth Welfare Association of Australia (YWAA) and the Hopewood homes themselves. It is largely based on the accounts of Trop and Raymond, supplemented with material from the Annual Reports of the YWAA and other contemporary material, including press and other media reports.

Bailey was born on November 14, 1890, in the Sydney suburb of Petersham. Bailey's father died when Bailey was just twelve years of age, and to supplement the family finances Bailey took part-time work after school, and eventually left school entirely at the age of fourteen. He moved to the country at the age of sixteen, working at a number of different occupations, before finally gaining some success as a cane grower. He married at the age of twenty one. He and his wife were to have 4 children.

Bailey enlisted for World War I in 1917, selling the cane farm and moving to Sydney prior to his departure for England in December 1917. He was fortunate
enough not to see active service whilst abroad, being stationed in England from February 1918 to January 1919, followed by a brief period in France before returning to England in May 1919. He returned home to demobilisation in Australia in February 1920. Whilst being spared the experience of the front line of battle, Bailey’s experiences in wartime and post war England were to form the basis of his future work at Hopewood. In particular, he became aware of the plight of ‘war babies’, illegitimate children born in the chaos of war, who, with their mothers, had no place in society, no support from a society and government which for the most part stood in moral judgement upon them, and who lacked many of the most basic amenities to care for the health of either the mother or the child. This experience was to stay with Bailey for the rest of his life, and when he embarked on his own project, it was from this same group, a quarter of a century later and on the other side of the world, that he drew the recruits to his vision of natural living. Whilst in London Bailey also met with, and was exposed to the child care methods of, Maria Montessori.¹

On his return Bailey worked briefly as a sales representative for an office supplies company. After leaving this job, he used his deferred army pay to move into the real estate business, seeing the potential as returned soldiers came back from the war, looking to settle back down into civilian life again. He initially bought property in the Sydney suburbs of Dee Why and Ryde, and rented office space in Elizabeth Street, Sydney city, the ground floor of which was used as a gift shop. To assist in the administration of the business, Bailey engaged the services of a young woman, Alice Mary Taylor, or ‘Girlie’ as she was to become known. Girlie had a hobby of

¹ Maria Montessori (1870-1952) developed a method of early childhood education, still practised today, based on allowing the child to creatively learn in and experience its environment, rather than based on formally structured lessons.
needlework, and one day she made a fuji silk nightdress which Bailey suggested she display in the shop window. This sold quickly, as did others which Girlie subsequently made. Sensing another business opportunity in a post war environment where there was little available in the way of fancy lingerie, Bailey set up a lingerie shop in Pitt Street, Sydney, with facilities for the manufacture of more of Girlie’s designs. This was the beginning of the Chic Salon chain of stores which was to provide the financial foundation for Bailey’s later work. At its peak, the Chic Salon chain had 91 shops throughout the country, before the business was sold by Bailey in 1962.

Girlie became a partner in the business, but made an impression on Bailey not just as a seamstress. They began an affair a short time after, living together from 1928 till 1943, when she moved to Melbourne with their two sons, to manage the Melbourne end of the Chic Salons business. Bailey subsequently reunited with his wife, whilst two of his daughters were to play active parts in the Youth Welfare Association of Australia which he was to later found.

In 1925, Bailey hired a 13 year old shop girl, Florence Madge Cousins (later Cockburn). Bailey recognised her potential early, and by the age of 18 she was a manageress of a Chic Salon store. By 21 she was the supervisor of eight stores, and superintendent of all retail staff. Cockburn was to remain Bailey’s right hand woman in business, as well as his mistress, for nearly the next forty years, until Bailey’s death in 1964.
Despite the ravages of the Depression, the Chic Salon business continued to grow during the late 1920s and early 1930s. The pressures of work, together with chronic respiratory, digestive and allergic disorders, and regular surgery, were all taking their toll on Bailey's health. He often appeared to be in pain and would faint if required to stand for too long. His own doctor expressed his doubts that Bailey would last another ten years. Bailey had subjected himself to conventional medical treatments over this period, without any noticeable improvement in his poor state of health:

As I grew older, I was chronically ill with respiratory and digestive disorders. By the time I was forty years old, I could not stand for long without fainting, I was doubled up with sciatica and arthritis and I had completely lost the use of my right shoulder... I had always been a great believer in medical procedures. Whenever I did not feel well, and that was most of the time, I went to a physician, and I faithfully followed his advice, taking my full share of drugs, both by mouth and through inoculations. I was what might be termed a 'good patient', and as I have already related, I offered no resistance to any medical treatment, no matter how drastic. The operations to which I allowed myself to be subjected bear witness to that (Trop 1971:26-8).

The turning point in this state of affairs came about in 1932. On the recommendation of a friend, Bailey purchased a book by Frank McCoy M.D., *The Fast Way to Health*. The first step in McCoy's program for improved health was a twenty day juice and water fast. After completing the twenty sometimes difficult days, Bailey proclaimed himself a changed man. He reported an abundance of energy, no more pain, no more respiratory problems, no more allergies. Bailey's renewed vigour was maintained by a strict diet of fresh fruit and vegetables and wholemeal bread.

Despite the scepticism of the medical profession at the time, including that of his own physician, Bailey embarked on an intense study of the literature of nutrition and natural living. He read the work of the Australian Alan Carroll, who had formed the Child Study and Adult Health Association of Australia in 1904. Carroll had worked with children, pregnant women and nursing mothers, utilising natural health
principles for the nutrition and healing of both mothers and children. From the American William Hay, he delved deeper into the proper 'combining' of foods, as well as coming to the conclusion that, in contravention of the principles laid down by McCoy, human beings were not naturally carnivores and that meat was not an essential part of a healthy diet. Natural health and natural hygiene as a way of life came to Bailey through the work of Alexis Carrel, who linked the decline of Western civilisation to its failure to maintain a naturally healthy way of life. The work of Robert McCarrison with the Hunza people of the Himalayas further convinced Bailey of the virtues of the 'naturally healthy' diet: according to McCarrison, the Hunzas lived regularly past the age of one hundred years, on a diet consisting of whole grain, fruit, fresh vegetables, raw goat's milk, and yoghurt.

From this time on, Bailey became something of a prophet for the natural health message in Australia, spreading the word through public lectures, radio talks, and the written word. He synthesised his influences into a dietary regime based the whole grain, fruit, and fresh vegetables of the Hunzas, with no meat, supplemented by a bodily health regime of sun baths, fresh air and regular exercise. Following a health scare of her own in 1940, Madge Cockburn also became a disciple of the gospel of natural living. Despite his own enthusiasm for and promotion of the virtues of the natural health lifestyle, Bailey was unable to effectively influence public opinion and practices to the extent he wished. Too often he was dismissed as a crank or a quack, and marginalised by the conventional medical establishment.

World War II brought with it a renewal of the ideas which Bailey had taken away with him from post-war London. Business was poor due to the wartime
restrictions, but aside from this Bailey became aware of the same social issue that had made such an impression on him twenty five years earlier: during wartime the existing moral codes collapsed, resulting again in a large number of babies being born out of wedlock. As early as 1925 Bailey had intimated to Cockburn his desire to fund some form of orphanage or children's home from the profits of the Chic Salons, and in 1941 he went public with this intention. In a bulletin distributed to staff in all of his stores, he announced his intention that

I had in mind a plan to build up the earning capacity of the business to a level which would enable it to sponsor and support an ideal home for orphans and other babies in need of protection...I am confident that it can be demonstrated that when children are nourished by an adequate supply of natural foods, eaten in correct order, and properly masticated, that they will escape most of the ailments suffered by the majority. If in addition they have the benefits to be derived from exercise, physical culture, fresh air, sunshine, recreation, suitable companionship and guardianship, hygiene, suitable housing, clothes and instruction, plus the affectionate attention of the people who will be carefully selected for that purpose, will it not be strange, if they do not emerge from such a home with qualifications much above average? (Chic Salon Bulletin, September 2 1941, cited in Trop 1971:9-10)

The desire to provide a home for orphaned war babies was combined with Bailey's new found passion for natural health. His proposed home was, right from the start, intended as a vehicle to demonstrate the effectiveness of the regime which had changed his life. Armed with the evidence of this demonstration, he would no longer be a mere quack or fanatic, his message would be heard.

The Youth Welfare Association of Australia (YWAA) was formed by Bailey to be the vehicle for putting his plan into action. The YWAA was officially registered on July 10 1942, with Bailey as Managing Director and Chairman (although for the rest of his life he took the title of President). It was later successfully registered as a charitable organisation, guaranteeing it tax exempt status. The aims of the YWAA were set out in the 30 Articles of the Memorandum of Association. In brief, the aims
of the YWAA were to establish a permanent Home for the care of children whose mothers were otherwise unable to do so, either for economic reasons, or based on such considerations as the desire to avoid the ‘taint’ of illegitimate motherhood. The Home was to be an ideal Home, in which the best of diet, health, education and opportunity were to be available to the children. It was envisaged from its inception that such a Home would have the responsibility for the care of its children until such time as they were old enough to make their way in the world independently.

The YWAA’s first acquisition to support its aims was Belhaven, a large mansion in Sydney’s exclusive Bellevue Hill. Belhaven was intended to provide pre- and post-natal care to mothers and babies in need. The births would still take place in hospital, either at the Women’s Hospital or the Royal Hospital, the mothers would be placed on a natural diet, and would be encouraged to remain with the babies long enough to give the children the advantages of breast feeding (although in the end no mother ever did). After overcoming significant oppositions and official barriers, Bailey finally took possession of Belhaven. Having established the location for the beginning of his great project, Bailey now set about attracting mothers to Belhaven. His first contact was through doctors, with letters being sent to the Australian Medical Association, and direct to doctors in prestigious Macquarie Street, asking if they had any suitable cases for Belhaven. Suitable cases were defined as pregnant women “without support”. The benefits of “congenial companionship, a liberal diet, recreation, pre-natal exercises” were stressed, as were the qualifications and dedication of the Belhaven staff. Mothers were invited to remain after the birth, and it was stressed that as a charitable institution, there would be no charge for Belhaven’s services. Finally, mothers who were “not in a position to provide for their children”
would be able to leave them in the care of the YWAA “for fixed periods” (Trop 1971:18-19). Belhaven was eventually to care for more than 200 expectant mothers and their babies. Following the birth, a number of options were available to them: leaving with the babies to care for them themselves; allowing the YWAA to arrange adoption by private families; having them placed in state institution; or, as intimated in Bailey’s initial approach to the medical profession, placing them in the care of the YWAA.

It was not legally possible for Bailey or the YWAA to adopt the children left in the care of the YWAA, and Bailey did not favour the solution of making them state wards. Instead, a form of agreement or ‘contract’ was entered into with each mother who elected to leave their child in the care of the YWAA. Under these agreements, the YWAA undertook to take full responsibility for the care of the children until they had completed their education, in accordance with the Articles of Association. It was made clear that the children would be brought up on a natural health diet. The children would also be brought up as Catholics or Protestants dependent on the mother’s wishes. Both Trop (1971:20) and Raymond (1987:14) state that the mothers had full visitation rights to the children. However, the extent to which the mothers were made fully aware of this provision is not clear, and in any case, very few mothers actually visited their children whilst growing up under Bailey’s care. In addition, the agreements contained provision that in the event that the mothers subsequently chose to remove their children from the care of the YWAA, then should they later change their minds, the children would not be readmitted.
The first baby came to Belhaven on October 22 1942. By Christmas of 1943 there were 29 babies at Belhaven under the care of the YWAA. Whilst Belhaven provided a perfect location for the pre- and post-natal care of the mothers, being close to the city, doctors and the major Sydney maternity hospitals, it left a lot to be desired as a long term home for a growing group of young children, in terms of size and amenities. In February 1943 Bailey acquired Hopewood House at Bowral, a large mansion set on 320 acres of farm land, equipped with a piggery, dairy, orchards, and extensive grounds. This provided the ideal solution for Bailey’s long term accommodation problems: Hopewood had room for the children to play, and its rural setting made it perfect for the growing of the fresh fruit and vegetables which were to form the basis of the children’s diet. After renovations were complete, the children, now totaling 61, were moved to Hopewood in August 1944. Hopewood was officially opened by the Acting Prime Minister F.M. Forde on 25 November 1944.

Figure 1-1: Hopewood House, c.1944
The population at Hopewood House continued to grow regularly over the next few years, reaching its final total of 86, comprising 46 boys and 46 girls, in late 1949, as the following diagram indicates.

![Growth of the Hopewood Family 1943-50](image)

The children continued to be brought up on the natural health diet, although for a time in the late 1940s, on the insistence of an official from the New South Wales Child Welfare Department, a small amount of meat was added to their diet. Preschool teaching was based on Bailey's application of the principles of Maria Montessori, whom Bailey had met whilst in London at the end of World War I. Bailey had intended to construct a school on the grounds of Hopewood, however this was not approved by the Department of Education. The children were therefore educated locally, either in the government school system for Protestant children, or in the Catholic system, depending on the wishes of the mothers.
From 1947 to 1958 the Hopewood children were subject to regular dental inspection and measurement by Dr N.E. Goldsworthy, Director of Dental Research in NSW, who was later joined in his research by Dr F.W. Clements, at the time in charge of child nutrition research at the University of Sydney. The findings of the research were published, from 1953 to 1960, in both the *Medical Journal of Australia* and the *Australian Dental Journal* (Lilienthal, Goldsworthy, Sullivan and Cameron, 1952; Sullivan and Goldsworthy, 1954; Goldsworthy, 1958; Goldsworthy and Spies, 1958; Sullivan and Harris, 1958). The research showed a significantly higher quality of dental health among the Hopewood children, in particular a much lower incidence of dental caries, which was attributed to their particular diet. This was for Bailey the culmination of proof of the virtues of the natural health way of life.

Bailey continued to use Belhaven as his prime source for children until its sale in 1948. An annex to the Hopewood estate at Bowral, similarly named Belhaven Cottage, was also used for the care of expectant mothers. However, by the end of the 1940s the work of assisting expectant mothers and newborn babies was over, with the main work now focusing on caring for 86 children. Bailey was now officially “Daddy Bailey”, and Cockburn was “Aunty Madge” to the growing and healthy brood.

From this time, the Hopewood property empire began to expand. After an initial successful holiday excursion to the New South Wales country town of Moree in 1949, Bailey purchased a cottage in Moree township and a 120 hectare property outside of the town, which he set up as an experimental farm. Bailey’s land purchases were quickly followed by the establishment of a Chic Salon in Moree. Further purchases followed: a cottage at Narabeen Lakes near Sydney, a major land purchase
in Canberra which incorporated a shopping arcade, offices, and a hostel for the Hopewood children; and a residence in Cook Road, Centennial Park, Sydney. These were followed over the next few years by either the purchase or building of units or houses at Manly, Mosman, Canberra, and Maroubra, as well as the purchase of a 300 hectare property with two cottages near the NSW country town of Forbes. Many of these constructions or purchases of residences for the Hopewood children were made concurrently with the purchase of retail space for the Chic Salons. The Hopewood children were distributed over these residences, with the aim both of giving them a more intimate, family-like atmosphere than could be achieved with 86 children living together at Hopewood, and to provide the house parents with greater scope for supervision of the children as they came into adolescence. Most of these smaller units were segregated on gender lines: Narabeen, Manly and Cook Road for the girls, Forbes and Hopewood House for the boys. Some of the children were to spend almost their entire lives under Hopewood at the one residence, whilst others were moved regularly.

Fig 1-3: Hopewood Family Picnic, Hawrel, 1950
Hopewood House remained the formal centre of their universe however, with all returning regularly to Bowral for communal celebrations such as Christmas.

With the expansion of the Hopewood Homes throughout NSW, came the expansion of Chic Salons. Whilst Bailey was successful in obtaining substantial public donations to the YWAA, he was nevertheless forced to finance a large amount of the Hopewood operations either from his own personal fortune, or from the corporate funds of Chic Salon Pty Ltd, and L.O. Bailey and Co Ltd, which provided the manufacturing, storage and transport services for the clothing to be sold in the Chic Salons. Both of these companies were solely owned by Bailey. Madge Cockburn stood beside him in the expansion of the business: by 1945 she was Vice-President of the YWAA, and a director both of Chic Salon and L.O. Bailey and Co, and in 1958 was appointed Assistant Managing Director of all Chic Salon and L.O. Bailey Enterprises. Bailey opened his 67th Chic Salon on his 67th birthday, however the financial pressure of supporting Hopewood operations did not end until 1959, when he sold the land in Canberra to developers at a significant profit.

These profits made the YWAA financially secure. They also allowed Bailey to implement the next part of his plan for spreading the natural health gospel in Australia. In 1960, under the auspices of his newly founded Natural Health Society of NSW, Bailey purchased a large guest house on 10.4 hectares at Wallacia, adjacent to the Nepean River at the foot of the Blue Mountains, NSW, naming it the Hopewood Health Centre. Here Bailey offered, to paying clients, a health clinic in the style of the Kellogg clinics in the United States, or the Bircher-Benner clinics in Switzerland. The natural health diet was of course the centrepiece of the therapeutic experience.
offered at the new Hopewood, as well as relaxation techniques, yoga and sunbathing. Ever the astute businessman, Bailey took the proven results of his work with the children's diet, and turned it into a commercial enterprise which is viable to this day.

Bailey sold his remaining interests in Chic Salon and L.O. Bailey and Co to the Woolworths department store chain in 1961, with Madge Cockburn to continue as managing director for two years. Again, the funds from this sale were passed to the YWAA. Bailey officially resigned his business positions on September 27, 1962. He still retained his positions with the YWAA, and the Natural Health Society of NSW, and in 1963 established the Hopewood Youth Development Association (HYDA) with the aim of combining the youth welfare activities of the YWAA with the promotion of natural health initiatives.

By this time the Hopewood children themselves had grown up, and were making their own way in the world. Some had their further education assisted, for some the Chic Salons had proved a useful point of entry into the workforce, whilst for others the years of farm labour at the Hopewood farms at Bowral, Moree and Forbes had directed their aspirations towards life on the land. Some of the older ones had already married (none among each other, however, despite Bailey's fervent wishes), and a new generation of Hopewood grandchildren was being born. The traditional Christmas reunion still took place every year at Hopewood House, a re-affirmation of the bond between this group who had grown up together under such unusual circumstances.
Bailey died on September 16, 1964, from complications arising from a bowel operation, attributed to the earlier debilitations of his pre-natural health lifestyle. His funeral was reported as ‘one of the biggest family funerals in Sydney’s history’. Following his death, Madge Cockburn took over as President of the YWAA until 1981, although she still remained an active behind-the-scenes influence on its affairs. The YWAA was renamed the Australian Youth and Health Foundation in 1985, reflecting the fact that it was no longer directly engaged in youth welfare activities. The HYDA, in which a number of former Hopewood children had been active, merged with the Australian Natural Health Society in 1981, and continued to be supported by the AYHF. Hopewood House was gifted to the Catholic Brothers of St Majella in 1967, and has had a number of other owners since then.
The Hopewood Family continued the tradition of the Christmas reunion, at Hopewood when it was acceptable to the current owners, or at other locations such as Sydney's Centennial Park. Madge Cockburn took on the role of matriarch and figurehead of the family, however for those who remained close to this emotional centre of the family, Bailey was, and still is today, revered as the man who took 86 orphan children and gave them opportunities they would not otherwise have had. This is not to say that the reverence for Bailey, and the connections with the Hopewood Family, are shared equally by all. Some have drifted away from the family, and are rarely, if ever, heard from. Others, particularly in recent years, have been increasingly vocal and critical of the treatment they received under Bailey's regime, with allegations of physical and sexual abuse being made against fellow Hopewood children, Hopewood staff members, and even against Bailey himself. To date, there has been no satisfactory resolution of these issues, but what remains is a legacy of bitterness between those who are fervent supporters of the memory of Bailey and Cockburn, and those who are calling for a re-evaluation of Hopewood and the effect it has had on their lives.

The last links with the origins of Hopewood have now been broken. Madge Cockburn died in 1999, having carried to her death the flame of Bailey's memory, the ideal of the natural health way of life, and the devotion of many of the Hopewood children. The last surviving former Director of the YWAA, Eric Storm, died in March 2000, aged 102. He had maintained Bailey's diet until his death, and credited Bailey's inspiration with his own continued long life and vigour. What remains are the lives and memories of the 78 surviving children.
UNDERSTANDING HOPEWOOD

The core of the argument of this thesis is that Bailey's project was an eugenically motivated scientific experiment, aimed at proving scientifically the efficacy of natural health methods to physically improve the condition of the children under his control. Having proved this, he intended to use these children as the initial stock by which an Australian super race could be bred, which would be capable of defending Australia against what appeared at the time to be a potentially hostile outside world. In order to achieve his intention, Bailey founded the institution of Hopewood. The establishment of the institution gave him the necessary control over his subjects, particularly in terms of their diet and daily routine, and he was thus able to create most of the conditions for an acceptable scientific experiment. The practices which Bailey instituted at Hopewood can be seen as methods of social control, aimed at both controlling the environment of his scientific experiments, and of socialising his charges in a way that was appropriate to the founders of a new Australian 'super race'. I have situated this empirical aim within a framework which seeks to understand the interaction of personal biography, history and social organisation. While the history and sociology of eugenics defines the wider environment in which Bailey's project was enacted, individual lives were influenced by, and individuals did influence, the project. An equal concern in developing my thesis has been to hear individual voices, separate from the wider historical and social chorus.

I have used several routes in to understanding this version of Hopewood. Bailey was a prolific writer, as well as a public speaker. Unfortunately, most of his private papers were passed to Trop during the writing of A Gift of Love. According to the testimony of Madge Cockburn, Trop took these papers with him to the United
States and they were never returned. What remains, in addition to those portions of Bailey's private papers which were incorporated in *A Gift of Love*, are the Annual Reports of the YWAA. Bailey used these as the opportunity to expound his vision, to the faithful and to the public at large. They remain the single most comprehensive source for Bailey's thoughts and vision for the Hopewood children. These were the primary source for my honours thesis and subsequent publications, and they still make a significant contribution to this thesis. Bailey was a public figure for much of his life, and the Hopewood Experiment attracted much curiosity and publicity during his lifetime. Contemporary newspaper, magazine and film accounts have provided an additional perspective on Bailey as he was viewed in his own time. There is also a wealth of photographic evidence of Hopewood, provided from my own private collection passed down from my mother, the collections of other Hopewood children who have been kind enough to pass material to me, as well as material published in Annual Reports and by Trop (1971). I have used this material for two purposes. Initially, these photographs are illustrative of the many of the physical arrangements of Hopewood. I have also attempted to decode the social meanings implicit in many of these representations of social scenes, as additional keys to understanding Hopewood. I have also been fortunate enough to interview a number of the major players in Bailey's life, including both Madge Cockburn and Eric Storm prior to their recent deaths. I have also interviewed a number of the surviving Hopewood children themselves, and it is their stories of the Hopewood Experience which form the core of this work.
This is not to say that such representational artifacts of the Hopewood experiment can necessarily be viewed uncritically. Bailey the successful businessman was adept in the arts of what Goffman (1959) calls acts of social performance, in which social actors attempt to control the impressions which others have of the actor. Bailey brought these arts across to his realisation of the Hopewood Experiment. The public representation of Hopewood is but one aspect of its being as a social phenomenon. As Goffman (1959) points out, all social situations have their intrinsic secrets. It is part of the task of social enquiry both to discover these secrets, and to illuminate the ways in which social performers seek to protect these secrets. This is just as much the case for Hopewood, and this work will attempt to analyse the ways in which the principle actors in the Hopewood experiment have sought to manage public impressions of the project.

Central to Bailey’s ethos was his notion of the importance of natural health methods as both a method of improving the health of those suffering from poor health, and a guarantee of continued good health for those who followed its practices. While it is difficult to give a single definition of what ‘natural health’ consists of, it can be identified to a set of dietary and medical practices including: vegetarianism, with a tendency towards reduction in the preparation of those foods; a preference to avoid the drugs and other artificial treatments of conventional medicine; and a vigorous advocacy of the virtues of mother’s milk for infants, and milk generally for growing children. Bailey’s health model was centred on the construction of an opposition between the natural and the artificial, an opposition which contained both ethical and utilitarian elements. Not only did natural health methods produce better
health (and Bailey sought to prove this scientifically), the methods themselves were also ethically superior, and by extension therefore had the potential to produce better citizens, better material for Bailey’s “race of super people” (YWAA Annual Report 1946).

Bailey’s own conversion to the natural health gospel came as the result of a serious illness which he himself recovered from in the 1930s as a result of using natural health methods, or so he said. Encouraged by his defeat of these personal troubles, Bailey read widely, and drew on a wide variety of influences, both in Australia and abroad, which were pushing the natural health bandwagon in the early years of the twentieth century, and leading up to World War II. The natural diet principles of people like the Kellogg brothers in the USA, the scientific parenting movement in the USA and Canada, had been brought to Australia and publicised by Dr Alan Carroll, founder of the Australian Child Study Association. Carroll was the principal influence on the formation of Bailey’s natural health ideas. Motivated by his own private struggle, Bailey thus took on ideas which had been circulating in the public forum and made them his own.

Bailey’s was also an experiment conducted within the public forum, and as such it both responded to, and took advantage of, social issues very much wider than a concern with diet and child rearing practices. The most significant of these for Bailey were issues of population (quality and quantity); and welfare issues, particularly responses to the problem of how society could best care for those children whose parents were either unwilling or unable to care for them themselves.

The early years of the twentieth century were characterised, in the USA, the UK and in Australia, by an ongoing debate regarding population choices for these
societies. In the UK this was characterised by concern over the loss of an entire
generation of the 'finest' of English manhood in World War I, concern over a
generally declining birth rate, and a concern over the differential birth rate between
the lower and upper classes (the lower classes being more prolific breeders, and
threatening to swamp their less prolific 'belters') (Soloway 1995). The concerns here
were both with quantity of the population, and its overall quality (in terms of
conformity to a white bourgeois ideal), and led to an open debate on eugenics issues
throughout the first part of the century. In the USA the eugenics debate was also
conducted in the open public forum, with eugenically-motivated laws being enacted
and upheld in many states (Paul 1995).

These concerns were also evidenced in Australia. The concern at a declining
birth rate was felt just as urgently in Australia as in the mother country, intensified by
the perceived need to populate the vast empty spaces of the Australian continent as a
matter of priority. World War II concentrated these fears, as Australia was now to all
intents and purposes isolated from its Anglo-Saxon racial brothers, confronted by
hostile and militarily threatening Asian enemies. The image of an overpopulated and
poor Asia eyeing the empty spaces and riches of Australia, which had been a spectre
in the Australian consciousness since at least the time of the gold rushes, now
appeared in the flesh and blood of the Japanese Imperial Army. To ensure its long
term survival as an Anglo-Saxon nation on the doorstep of Asia, Australia needed to
improve, first the quality, and then the quantity, of its people.

Bailey's vision offered a solution to this problem. Publicly, he offered his
natural health methods as the way in which Australia would be better able to defend
its way of life - feed your people better, take care of their health, they will fight
successfully, Australia will be a safer place. Bailey often mixed his natural health message with an appeal to nationalism, and his public appearances often closely associated him with national symbols such as the flag. In his private intent, it will be my contention that he went much further. Instead of a negative eugenics on the American model, which recommended the sterilisation of those considered unfit to pass on their genes to the next generation, Bailey proposed a positive eugenics, in which physical improvements in one generation would be passed on to the next, and so on - feed a selected group of people better, take care of their health, make sure they marry each other and have children, the children will be progressively stronger and healthier and will fight exceptionally well, Australia will be a safer place. The 86 children (43 male and 43 female) were to be the starting point of this project.

This thesis is also informed by an analysis of the scientific model of progress, and in particular the critique of Enlightenment rationality and instrumental reason developed by the Frankfurt school, specifically Adorno and Horkheimer (1992). From this theoretical viewpoint, "men seek to learn from nature only to be able to dominate it and other men more fully" (Adorno and Horkheimer 1992:4). Historical progress is the story of the gradual extension of instrumental reason, and hence of domination, to more spheres of human life. Whilst Habermas (1984) develops a critique of this approach, arguing that what he calls the 'rationalisation of the lifeworld' has consequences of liberation rather than domination, my own findings tend to confirm the original Frankfurt School thesis. The early twentieth century was also a high point in the popular acceptance of the scientific model of progress. Science, technology and medicine were all developing quickly at this time, and it appeared that nothing could not be achieved by the rational scientific mind. Eugenics
portrayed itself as a science, and utilised both scientific language and methodology in arriving at its conclusions. Bailey shared in this widespread faith in the efficacy of science, and took on science as the means by which his eugenics theories could be proven and gain popular currency. He structured the lives of the Hopewood children along the lines of a scientific experiment, establishing control conditions which attempted, as far as was possible, to isolate his charges from outside influences which would interfere with the progress of the experiment. He enlisted the support of the scientific, medical and dental communities in providing objective observation and verification of the results of his diet on the physical health of the children. The Enlightenment view of the primacy of human reason, which the scientific advances of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries so absolutely supported, was here perpetuated by Bailey. Bailey saw a social problem, had a theory about a potential solution, and saw the way to support this solution as being the application of rational scientific principles. His application of instrumental reason manifested as a tool of domination.

Concurrent with the population debate, and in some ways covering some of the same ground, was a debate centred on how to provide welfare assistance to children whose families, either through death, illness, or economic circumstances, were unable to adequately care for them. In Australia, the state had always played some role in these matters, and as the Depression called for larger scale solutions to the problem, calls for state intervention were heard more often (Dickey 1987). The alternatives for provision of such care were generally seen as being a choice between individual forms of caring, such as 'boarding-out' schemes, and larger institutionalised forms of care. In those days, as now, larger institutions were attacked for their impersonality,
lack of attention to the emotional needs of inmates, and their often harsh discipline. Bailey was careful to position himself between these two extremes: he offered an institutional solution to the problem it is true, but his institution was one characterised in public by a more nurturing, caring environment. Open days were carefully staged to ensure photo opportunities of ‘Daddy Bailey’ and his ‘children’, with the added bonus of having the scientific evidence of the children’s well-being available to reinforce this nurturing role. Bailey thus offered to the government an acceptable social solution which did not cost them money, and to his supporters offered the human face of institutional care for a group of ‘unfortunate children’. Philanthropy offered an acceptable alternate medium to all, socially acceptable and attractive to private capital, without making any monetary demands of public capital.

Bailey’s choice of institutional care was not of course totally determined by his desire to provide a desirable alternative to conventional models of care for ‘underprivileged children’. The institution acts as both an agent of socialisation, and, particularly in Goffman’s (1973) concept of the ‘total institution’, it is a primary instrument of social control, where the practices of the dominant can be enacted without interference or recourse on the dominated. Bailey aspired towards the principles and practices of the ‘total institution’ at Hopwood. In terms of Bailey’s scientific experiment, it allowed the practices of the rational method to be imposed on the children without fear that confounding variables from outside would be introduced. This process of collection of observations, and especially those controlled observations which eliminate as far as possible those factors likely to obscure the crucial data to be collected, is the core of the experimental approach to scientific data collection (Richards 1989:30). The practices of Hopwood, in terms of control over
diet, education and behaviour, demonstrate the practices of the total institution, with a scientific experimental intention.

Dominance and control are of course only attainable in any social situation where there are differentials of power and/or knowledge between the two parties involved. This is the final implication of Foucault’s examination of social power/knowledge:

They (power and knowledge) are inevitably linked in a power/knowledge spiral: forms of knowledge such as criminology, psychiatry and philanthropy are directly related to the exercise of power, while power itself creates new objects of knowledge and accumulates new bodies of information (Cohen 1994:25).

Those with greater access to knowledge are therefore advantaged in the exercise of power, and power is exercised by, among other things, the granting of access to, or the withdrawal of, knowledge. One of the most persistent examples of such differential power relationships in modern society is that between the child and the adult. Bailey’s was a program enacted on the bodies of children through the regime of diet imposed through the expected compliance of a group of powerless subjects. Childhood is a socially constructed phenomenon, a particular type of social status, and the ways in which childhood is constructed perpetuate such differential power relationships between adults and children. Children are constructed on the one hand as embodiments of innocence, needing protection from the harsh realities of adult life, and on the other as adults-in-the-making, with a primary value not in the present, but in their future capacity to carry on the values and practices of their society. Such constructions can be used to justify the ‘protection’ of children, which so often translates to their sequestration from society in institutions such as Hopewood. They also justify adult control, both over the sharing of knowledge, and over the bodies of children. Children are able to be dominated as a social group precisely because they
lack both power and knowledge, and must have such bestowed on them by the owners of the power and knowledge. In the language of adults, this domination comes to be constructed in such terms as protection, education and citizenship, all of which in fact mask the essential fact of adult dominance over children. Bailey appropriated these discourses, to ensure his own ability to dominate and control their bodies for his own purposes.

As 'illegitimate' children, this was a group of children without much attachment to wider society. There was therefore no counterbalance to the institutional demands for discipline and control enacted in the Hopewood experiment. These truly were 'helpless' children, subject to the exact authority of institutional dominance and power.

Within the framework of the total institution, Bailey was free to pursue and implement his theories without fear of outside interference. At the core of the process were his dietary and child rearing practices. For Bailey, the most important issue in the rearing of the children was control and discipline. These were not merely the moral absolutes of conventional wisdom in regard to child rearing, they were absolute necessities for the successful management of his eugenic experiment. The children's testimonies reveal an institutional system primarily aimed at ensuring that the children maintained their dietary regime. Without assurance that the diet was being strictly followed, the scientific evidence of the efficacy of his dietary regime would be fatally flawed. Eating was the most rigidly regulated of all activities in Hopewood, whether it took place within its walls or outside, through strict supervision of food preparation, surveillance of the act of eating itself, and segregation where there was a possibility of contact with unacceptable food.
Foucault (1981:139) identifies two complementary forms of what he calls ‘the power over life’, the assignment, first to the sovereign, and later to the machinery of the modern state, of the power to regulate and control the life and body of the individual and of the nation or state as species being. These two complementary poles of development are linked through a range of social relations, despite being applied at separate sites, in the individual body and the species being as a whole:

(the first pole) centred on the body as a machine: its disciplining, the optimization of its capabilities, the exertion of its forces, the parallel increase of its usefulness and its docility, its integration into systems of effective and economic controls, all these was ensured by the procedures of power that characterised the disciplines: an anatamo-politics of the human body. The second, formed somewhat later, focused on the species body, the body imbued with the mechanics of life and serving as the basis of the biological process: propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancy and longevity, with all the conditions that can cause these to vary. Their supervision was effected through an entire series of interventions and regulatory controls: a bio-politics of the population. The disciplines of the body and the regulations of the population constituted the two poles around which the organization of power over life was deployed (Foucault 1981:139).

Eugenics emerges here as a form of bio-politics, enacted through the regulatory control of the reproduction of the species body. Bailey’s program thus emerges here as a program of bio-politics, a regulation of health through reproduction. In addition, for Bailey, bio-politics is enforced through the techniques of anatamo-politics, the disciplining of the individual bodies of the children towards docility and compliance, as well as usefulness, both as economic labourers in the capitalist system and compliant components of the military machine. Institutional power as manifested by Bailey in the Hopewood project was a power enforced on the children as embodied subjects. The nexus between instrumental reason, techniques of bodily control, and the regulation of reproductive behaviour, provides some ground for resolution of the divergent arguments of Adorno and Horkheimer, Habermas, and Foucault, identified by Dean (1994). Dean’s primary thesis is that the pervasive progressivist model of history contained in the accounts of both Adorno and Horkheimer and Habermas is in fact an aspect of the wider application of social power/knowledge described by
Foucault, a process which is not unidirectional. My own work suggests certainly that Habermas' assumptions of progress and emancipation are perhaps a naïve account of processes of rational instrumental domination which, in this case, unite aspects both of Adorno and Horkheimer's 'dialectic of enlightenment' and Foucauldian modes of power/knowledge, especially regimes of bodily control.

While Bailey's institution was shaped by his scientific demands of the total institution, it also came to take on many characteristics of the family. Children were growing up in Hopewood, they were forming relationships with those they would come to regard as their siblings, and they were also forming relationships with Bailey, Cockburn and the other members of staff at Hopewood. As we have already noted, Bailey was 'Daddy Bailey', Madge Cockburn was 'Aunty Madge'. These attempts to construct the normalcy of family life at Hopewood in a situation which was clearly not 'normal', were important in managing the impressions which the external world had about Bailey and Hopewood. The continued existence of Hopewood as an institution was for many years heavily dependent on official goodwill, and, at least until the YWAA become financially secure in the late 1950s, was also dependent on public financial support. The projection of a positive familial image of Hopewood was therefore a key survival strategy, and the notion of the Hopewood family certainly provided this. For some of course this notion of 'Daddy' and 'Aunty' is more than just a carefully crafted impression, it is a genuine affection and admiration. The notion of the Hopewood Family is in fact the most enduring legacy, certainly in the lives of the children themselves, which Bailey gave to these children.
Beyond the effect which the Hopewood experience had on those who were part of it, Bailey and his successors were able to generate a lasting legacy for themselves. The principles of natural health, refined and legitimised by the experimental findings from Hopewood, have been used as the basis for the continued success of the Hopewood Health Centre at Wallacia, NSW. Philanthropy and capitalism intersect at this point, with philanthropy providing the socially acceptable face into which the excess profits of capitalism may be directed, which are then redirected, in partnership with a scientific intent, towards the generation of data which can be turned to profit by capital. As Donzelot (1997:55) indicates, philanthropy is a mode of preservation of the species being detached from an overt political role. While philanthropy clearly needs capitalism to succeed, the Hopewood experiment demonstrates the less clear position that philanthropy is able to repay this investment, by providing the raw material for the further generation of profit by capital.

The story of Bailey is not solely that of a man with a philanthropic vision to provide a group of children with a better life and opportunities. Without doubt Bailey had a personal agenda as the proponent of a lifestyle which he believed had saved his own life. However, he was equally responding to serious public issues, particularly the concern with the quantity and quality of the Australian population, and the need to find a solution to the child care problem. Bailey solved both these problems at once - a superficially ‘humanised’ institution which took away from the government the need to provide for these children, while at the same time providing a socially acceptable method for disposing of the excess profits of capitalism. While superficially ‘humanised’, the institution was in fact the method for arriving at the solution to the first, and for Bailey the far more pressing problem: he would show
Australia, and potentially the world, how to improve and cultivate a better breeding stock of humans.
CHAPTER 2 - RESEARCH METHOD – A DESIGN FOR BETTER LIVING

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is the result of an ongoing research project into the phenomenon of L.O. Bailey and what I have called the Hopewood Experiment (Ambury 1995). In my Honours thesis it was my contention that Bailey’s intention was to conduct a eugenics experiment based on scientific rational principles. The Hopewood Experiment was aimed at demonstrating the potential of Bailey’s natural health methods in achieving improvements in the racial stock of Australia, with the ultimate intention of using the children as the basis for breeding a ‘super race’ in Australia.

The focus in my doctoral research moved from the origins of Bailey’s work to an examination of the practices of Hopewood, in particular issues of child rearing and socialisation in an institutional context, and the effects of their early experience at Hopewood on the later lives of the children, who are now adults in their early to late fifties. The primary source for my Honours thesis was documentary evidence, especially the Annual Reports, covering the period 1943-1980, of the Youth Welfare Association of Australia (YWAA), which Bailey formed to look after the Hopewood organisation, together with Bailey’s official biography (Trop 1971), commissioned and funded by the YWAA. In changing the focus of my research to the children’s experience, I had necessarily retained a reliance on the documentation provided in the Annual Reports, as they provided the best extant and accessible record of Bailey’s statements regarding his aims, and records of his progress. Other documentary evidence available included contemporary newspaper and magazine reports, a range
of private correspondence and open letters originated by individual members of the Hopewood family and addressed and circulated to all members of the family, Bailey's war records and Will, as well as a large number of photographs in my own private collection and those of other Hopewood children. Other material available on the public record includes newsreel footage (Cinesound Review 1944) as well as television (Seven Network/Prime 1975) and radio programs (ABC Radio National 2000) devoted to aspects of the Hopewood story. Such background was essential in developing the organisational and social context in which the children's experiences took place. The new and original data gathering came from the children themselves, in the form of extensive interview/s. I interviewed 10 former Hopewood children, ex-staff members, Madge Cockburn, and Eric Storm, former vice-president of the YWAA. My basic method, then, has been a combination of a conventional historical review of documentation, combined with an interview process informed by the principles of sociology and of oral history. This is supplemented and enriched by a review of various modes of presentation of Hopewood and of the Hopewoodians, including photography, letters, and media representations.

THE HOPEWOOD FAMILY – CURRENT SOCIAL ORGANISATION

The method utilised in conducting this research, and in particular some of the difficulties I encountered during the process, has been heavily determined by the social organisation of the Hopewoods as they are today. Whilst this thesis does not intend to provide a fully developed analysis of the social organisation of the current Hopewood family, it is not possible to appreciate its complex research environment without an understanding of the complex social dynamic which the Hopewood children have developed over the years.
The children have remained in direct and indirect contact and generally describe themselves as belonging to a family, with the other children being their brothers and sisters. Bailey himself was 'Daddy Bailey' and his right hand woman, Madge Cockburn was 'Auntie Madge', no doubt as some form of deference to the children's natural mothers. As in any (extremely) large family there is a mixture of closely knit cliques, individuals operating either on the periphery or independent of the main group, and individuals who have taken on the role of leaders and, most importantly for the conduct of this research, information brokers or gatekeepers.

![Figure 2.1: Hopewood Family Reunion, 1995. Hopewood House, Bowral](image)

The practices by which group cohesion was developed and maintained over the children's developing years will be dealt with at length in my exposition of the children's accounts of their experiences growing up. Following the passage of the
children of Hopewood into adulthood and their movement away from a central locus of social control, a different set of social practices have been instituted by ‘Aunty’ Madge and the children themselves to maintain the solidarity and cohesion of what is now a group of adults mainly in their fifties. The primary means of achieving this up until now has been the annual reunion. These were instituted before Bailey’s death, with financial provision for their continuation made in Bailey’s will. Such ritual occasions are part of the development of what Turner (1974:45) calls communitas, “a bond uniting...people over and above any formal social bonds, that is ‘positive’ structure”. The effect of ritual, whether sacred or secular, is that

In these ways anomie is prevented or avoided and a milieu is created in which a society’s members cannot see any fundamental conflict between themselves as individuals and society. There is set up, in their minds, a symbolic interpenetration of individual and society...I am suggesting that this process only works where there is already a high level of communitas in the society that performs the ritual...Communitas in ritual can only be evoked when there are many occasions outside the ritual on which communitas has been achieved (Turner 1974:56).

The Hopewood reunions were carried on with an almost religious devotion until the controversies of recent years created an atmosphere of polarisation, a loss of communitas, which led to their abandonment as a formal celebration of shared experience and community.

Hopewood has, however, been a community centred in on itself, wary of the outside world and the attention of outsiders. Where outsiders have been allowed a glimpse within the walls of the Hopewood family, it has been through the carefully controlled viewpoint of particular gatekeepers. For example, Madge Cockburn appeared on the television show This Is Your Life (The Seven Network/Prime 1975), an Australian version of the popular British program in which the life and achievements of public and private figures are celebrated through the medium of encounters and interviews with people who have known them, or played a significant part in their lives. In this case, Cockburn’s personal and economic power, combined
with the fact that the program was a personal exploration of her life rather than of Hopewood per se, combined to sanitise the vision of Hopewood presented to the world at large. Gatekeepers have maintained a critical role in controlling outsider access to the Hopewood family.

In the time I have been studying the Hopewood phenomenon, this insularity has greatly increased, primarily because of events over the last seven years. The sounds of doors closing first started in 1994, when the *Sydney Morning Herald* published an article entitled 'Blind Vision' (Russell and Tom 1994). This article was based on interviews with seven adult Hopwoodians: Colleen Kelly, Maureen Galvin, Carmel Blake, Sandra Pendergast, Janice Berridge, Lloyd Jackson and Carol Day. Allegations of widespread mistreatment, including sexual abuse were made. In addition to this, there has also been legal action taken by a small group of Hopwoods alleging sexual abuse from some members of Hopewood staff. The effect of this has been to polarise the group into what they in their own terms define as 'good' and 'bad' sides. It needs to be emphasised that these are not terms which I have used to define the groups, these are the ways the Hopwoods' speak both of themselves and of the other group. The 'good' side obviously define themselves in these terms, whilst the 'bads' also speak of themselves as 'bad' and the 'goods' as 'good', in an expression and acceptance of their own notoriety within the group.

On the 'good' side, we have those who say life at Hopewood was wonderful and gave them many opportunities they would never otherwise have had, and anyone who spreads such vicious lies should be expelled from the family.

He was (how can I express it?) everything to me—my idol, whatever the beautiful word ‘home’ means, he represented that to me; no, he did not merely represent it—he was ‘home’ to me, and he was the incarnation of love (Anonymous Hopewood boy cited in Trop 1971:274).
For the most important part of our lives, we were well fed, clothes, and got as good an education as was possible. Those that had the brains or those that wanted went on to higher education. Others, like me, were given jobs if they wanted them. What more could Mr. Bailey do? I for one am very proud to be a part of Hopewood (Michael Hyland, letter to Sydney Morning Herald, February 12, 1994).

As part of our Reunion in December there will be an open forum where as a family we will decide what to do with Hopewood kids who deliberately and knowingly tell lies to the media. What will we do with these people? Will we do nothing and allow them to destroy our family? (Hopewood Adult, open letter to Hopewood family, 5 November 1997).

The ‘good’ group will not countenance any allegations of abuse happening to anyone and argue that even if there were abuses occurring it happened a long time ago, in a different time and everyone should be quiet about it, who’s it going to help to dredge up that old stuff? On the other side, we have the defined 'bad' group or trouble makers. This is a small group of people who have made public allegations of incidents of sexual or physical abuse whilst growing up under Bailey's care, and who now want recognition of these experiences both publicly and within their own 'family'. The polarisation of the group since the publication of the Sydney Morning Herald article has been dramatic and my ability to establish my neutrality in the case has been a critical factor in the success of the research.

These issues were exacerbated by the publication of Alan Gill’s book Orphans of the Empire in 1997. Gill’s work dealt ostensibly with the child migrants from England after World War II, however he included a few chapters on some other groups which he saw as having some common thread with the child migrants. One of these groups was Hopewood. The sources for Gill’s (1997:194-203) section on Hopewood were members of the ‘bad’ group, and the book repeated the allegations that members of staff abused some children whilst they were growing up. It also contained specific unsubstantiated allegations of sexual abuse by Bailey himself, the first time such allegations had been made. The effect of this was to make the previous differences wholly irreconcilable, to increase the insularity and suspicion of the
members of the ‘good’ group, whilst in no way modifying the agenda of the ‘bad’
group to have their concerns made public, investigated, and validated.

The Hopewood group has developed over the period of the research from a
relatively homogeneous group characterised by peripheral voices of dissent, to one
polarised around two contradictory constructions of the defining event/s in their lives,
their growing up at Hopewood. This polarisation has resulted both from forces within
the Hopewood group, seeking recognition, validation, and perhaps compensation for
negative aspects of their upbringing; and from the outside publicisation of these
issues. My own work is viewed as one of those external perceptions of Hopewood
determined to tell all the bad about Hopewood without telling any of the good. Whilst
from my own point of view I have always emphasised to everyone involved my desire
to tell the good as well as the bad, perception within the Hopewood group has
nevertheless categorised my work as within those who are unsympathetic to
Hopewood and its ethos. The end result has been a volatile research environment, in
which my own claims to objective research have sought to achieve balance with a set
of competing claims and counter claims between sometimes diametrically opposed
individual versions of Bailey. As Hamilton (1997:15) points out, oral history moves
into its most contested area where group memories are concerned, where there is
process of interpretation through a “collective process of remembering”.

**RESEARCH IN A DYNAMIC ENVIRONMENT**

The polarisation forced me to modify my methodology in progress, an
experience typical in most ethnographic work (Peacock 1993:54-8). In the very
beginning of the research I flagged the idea of using a survey, however the relatively
high levels of Hopewood children with poor literacy skills negated that approach. I moved onto the idea of a focus group from which I hoped to identify significant issues to be used as the basis for an interview schedule. The polarisation had meant that the risks to the research of bringing together such a group, provided they would have been amenable to such an idea, would have far outweighed any benefits gained by such an approach. A heterogeneous focus group would have been unlikely to function without breaking down into factions, whilst the use of a homogenous group would have run the risk of identifying me with one or the other faction, therefore restricting my access to all points of view and undermining the objectivity of my final evaluations. This was reinforced to me in one particular meeting at Clarissa's house where a number of Hopewoodians were present. Issues of talking to outsiders were discussed, and feelings ran extremely high as a number of opposing opinions were raised. The discussion degenerated into a shouting match between the participants, ending from my own point of view, with Ray telling me that I would get a copy of the full Hopewood mailing list 'over his fucking dead body'. Clearly I could not run the risk of an incident through the use of a focus group. Nor would it have been an ethically sound decision. Confidentiality was a key issue and as such, to bring all the participants together in a focus group, would have negated this, and possibly placed my respondents at risk. I was forced therefore to abandon the idea of the focus group and instead developed an interview schedule on an individual basis.

My method has been built around the particular nature of access to the group which I have. Up until the time of publication of the *Sydney Morning Herald* article, the family held annual reunions and I took the opportunity of these reunions to build up a network within the group, letting them know that it was my intention to conduct
some formal research on their experiences, thus preparing the way for the current project. Since the publication of the *Sydney Morning Herald* article, the group has fragmented. Although some attempts at reconciliation were made after the publication of the *Sydney Morning Herald* article; with the publication of Alan Gill's book *Orphans of the Empire* (1997) any chance of a bridge being built between the warring factions was now firmly out of the question, as the allegations made by Gill of physical and sexual abuse, particularly with regard to Bailey personally, had irrevocably polarised the already opposed groups. As my own personal contacts are with the 'bad' group, my affiliation with this side is one of the primary determinants of my interactions with members from the other side. My own qualifications as an objective researcher were continually being brought into question during the conduct of this research, again a common experience in ethnographic work (Peacock 1993:57-8). This questioning of my ability to produce objective research is pertinent, not only from their perspective but also from my own. I was aware of my own need to distance myself from the issues, from time to time, and this necessitated some fairly regular 'time out' from the process to ensure my own objectivity and freshness for the task.

After establishing contact via attendance at the reunions, I then sent out a formal letter of introduction to all those I had addresses for. After receiving a number of responses, the next stage was a second letter requesting formal consent. By this stage I had gone from a number of about forty affirmative responses to twenty. I think the reality that this was a serious research study hit home to the respondents and many baulked at the second stage. I then made arrangements to interview those who had given consent. This further reduced the number to fifteen. I have travelled
throughout NSW and Queensland to conduct these interviews, generally in the homes of the interviewees, or at any other location nominated by the interviewees. The interviews were originally planned to last for 3-4 hours, however in some cases these have extended to 5-6 hours, and in a couple of cases (Heidi and Rowena) have required follow up interviews to further explore issues which the interviewees have wished to elaborate on. My experience of the interview process has been that once the well of memory has been tapped, such reminiscences flow freely. It is very difficult in such a situation to limit the interview to a pre-determined timeline. From my point of view, some of my most valuable material had been obtained from these extended excursions by my respondents. My respondents valued the opportunity to tell their story, in their own words and in their own time. This entailed the devotion of extra time to the process and both of us were prepared to make that investment.

All transcription and analysis of interview material was conducted by me personally. Part of my ethical commitment to my subjects was that their interview material should be safeguarded appropriately, and that only I should have access to it. This assurance of safeguarding and confidentiality has been a particularly sensitive issue given the volatility of the Hopewood group during the time that interviews were conducted. As such, all references to their responses in the thesis will be by pseudonym. In addition, the one former staff member from Hopewood is also referred to under a pseudonym. For descriptions of other 'public' events, such as the account of the 1997 reunion (Appendix 1), or citations from 'open letters' as above, I have also used different pseudonyms to ensure that individuals cannot be identified.
A Case in Point – the 1997 Hopewood Reunion

The core group of Hopewood have a shared interpretation of their experience, an agreed majority narrative. The allegations of the ‘bad’ group represent a minority narrative which cannot be subsumed by the majority narrative, and which in fact offers a series of challenges to the account given in the majority narrative. The response to this challenge has been to reaffirm the veracity and value of the majority narrative; to deny and devalue both the minority narrative itself, and the purveyors of that narrative; and to impose sanctions on those who offer these alternatives narratives. The dilemma for the researcher operating in such an environment is that she is inevitably seen as attempting to offer another alternative, minority, narrative. If the majority narrative has already been reaffirmed as accurate and valuable, there is clearly no need for any alternative. The researcher’s position, then, is reduced, no matter what her intentions, to a status similar to that of the ‘bad’ group, and is thus potentially liable to the sanctions placed on that group. Whilst any research undertaken with a critical perspective must almost of necessity act as a challenge to existing narratives, the environment in which this research was undertaken was of a more volatile nature than most. This has affected, in particular, my own access to interview subjects. It is perhaps most ironic that those who had the best opportunity to move my narrative in the direction of the majority version, were in fact those who were most vehemently opposed to any cooperation with me. In the end, what has been produced is a narrative drawn from the evidence available. I have used the work of Erving Goffman as a perspective from which to view these issues of research method, and to offer some observations both on the research process as it has been conducted in this particular piece of research, and also to identify some issues worthy of further research and study.
In *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Goffman (1959) argues that social interaction can be understood through the use of an extended theatrical metaphor, which he calls the dramaturgical model. While the accuracy of the metaphor has been critiqued by a number of authors, as discussed by Manning (1992), as well as being initially modified and then abandoned by Goffman himself (Manning 1992:44-54), the dramaturgical metaphor offers a perspective on the conduct of the annual reunion. This is compelling both for the light which it sheds on the conduct of the various actors engaged in that situation, but also on the nature of the research process itself. I shall return later to discuss in more detail the critiques which have been advanced of the dramaturgical metaphor, as well as considering the particular applicability of the model to social research as a process.

Goffman (1959:9) offers the dramaturgical perspective as a way of describing social life within organised institutional settings, or in his words, "within the physical confines of a building or plant". The particular institutional arrangements which were present at Hopewood are described in Chapters 5 and 6, where I make the argument that the particular social relations engendered by growing up in that institution have carried through into the adult lives of the Hopewood children, in particular in their continuing relations with each other. The 1997 reunion represents a specific, closed encounter in which these social relations are enacted and re-enacted. The situation thus fits Goffman's own criteria for the application of the dramaturgical perspective (Refer Appendix I, Hopewood Reunion, 9th December 1997).

Goffman argues that observed social behaviour can be characterised as a performance. Performance is defined as "all the activity of a individual which occurs
during a period marked by his continuous presence before a particular set of observers and which has some influence on the observers" (Goffman 1959:32). The Hopewood reunion as a regular event has been established and maintained for a number of purposes. It allows the renewal of the bonds of shared experiences on a personal level between the members of the family; it maintains for the group the notions of solidarity and belonging which they have constructed for themselves over the years; and it perpetuates and sanctifies the memory of ‘Daddy’ as a positive influence in their lives. Its intention is clearly to influence the participants in the maintenance of the truth of the accepted narrative of their lives, namely, that ‘Daddy’ was a great man who gave them a life of opportunities and that Hopewood was a positive place to grow up in. It is also to influence those other members of the audience present, the Hopewood extended family, friends, and any others present such as in this case the present owners of Hopewood House.

A number of other aspects of the performance of the reunion can also be identified, which also accord closely with Goffman’s schema. A ‘front’ is, as Goffman (1959:32) identifies, “that part of the individual’s performance which regularly functions in a general and fixed fashion to define the situation for those who observe the performance”. He identifies both situational factors, such as scene and setting, as well as personal characteristics such as appearance and manner as contributing to the construction of front. The most important aspect of this in terms of the reunion is the setting, being at Hopewood House, with all its memories and associations for the group, which actions such as the guided tour serve to reinforce. The setting is managed to achieve and reinforce the connection of the Hopewoods both to themselves and their shared past.
Performances are also, according to Goffman (1959:45), 'idealised', that is to say, they "tend to incorporate and exemplify the officially accredited values of the society". This is in fact perhaps the most important intention behind the Hopewood reunion as a performance, its intention is to exemplify and reinforce the values of Hopewood, as demonstrated by the life and teachings of L.O. Bailey.

Performances are, according to Goffman (1959), the work of teams. It is easy to see the operation of teams in this particular context as individuals, either through their own or my initiation, interact with me as a very particular member of the audience. The primary team affiliation is with the official Hopewood line, with team members' interactions with the audience intended to influence the audience, and also to function as a means of gathering intelligence on the audience's standpoint. The reunion is a performance by the 'official' Hopewood team, aimed at perpetuating and reinforcing their particular version of the narrative of their lives. It is a ritual of unity that failed to achieve unity, as Geertz (1973:168) demonstrates in relation to broader ethnographic observation, deriving from "an incongruity of the cultural framework of meaning and the patterning of social interaction". It is a demonstration of an absence of communitas (Turner 1974:45) which ritual alone cannot revive.

Performance action by teams takes place in both on stage and backstage areas. It is in the backstage areas that teams both rehearse performances, and share secrets. It is in this notion of secrets that Goffman's dramaturgical concept has the most to offer, both in terms of explicating the particular events of the reunion, but more importantly in illuminating my own experience of the research process, and of research methodology in general. Goffman (1959:141) argues that in backstage,
teams are able to share secrets, or what he calls "destructive information", or "facts which, if attention is drawn to them during the performance, would discredit, disrupt, or make useless the impression that the performance fosters".

Goffman (1959:141-3) identifies four categories of secrets. Firstly, dark secrets: these are facts known and concealed by the team which are incompatible with the intended ideal image of the team. Clearly the allegations of sexual abuse fit into this category. As dark secrets, the team’s performance must either ignore these secrets, or challenge those who expose them. Secondly, inside secrets: these are secrets which mark an individual as being a member of a group. For the Hopewood group, shared memories of a unique childhood abound, and fall into the category of inside secrets. The sharing of these secret memories forms an important part of their definition of their own identities in relation to Hopewood. Goffman points out that such secrets may not be very dark, and may be revealed to the audience without necessarily affecting the efficacy of the performance. Thirdly, entrusted secrets: these are secrets revealed to outsiders, which the outsider must not reveal in turn, in order to demonstrate their trustworthiness to members of the team. I would argue that in the Hopewood case, much of the ill feeling has been caused by the misuse of entrusted secrets, by the revelation of such secrets by outsiders who have not maintained the trust given to them. The last category is free secrets: these are another’s secrets which are known to oneself and can be disclosed without diminishing the efficacy of one’s own performance.

Having established the nature of performance teams as keepers and controllers of secrets, Goffman (1959:145ff) then identifies a number of what he terms
“discrepant roles”, either team members or members of the audience who steal secrets by gaining access to the backstage. The type of discrepant role is defined both by the method by which access to the secrets is gained, and by the uses to which the secrets are put. It is these two concepts, of the secret and of discrepant roles, that have the most profound implications for my own research and for social science research in general. It has been my experience through the conduct of this research to be a part of the audience, whether it be in a passive role such as at the reunion, or in a more interactive role during the conduct of interviews. From the researcher’s point of view, the research process may be characterised as the discovery of secrets, not necessarily dark secrets, but also those inside secrets which define the unique experiences of the members of a shared community. It is also up to the researcher to identify the types of secrets which are disclosed, and to use them appropriately. From the point of view of the subjects, the researcher is clearly in a discrepant role, and part of the subject’s own action during the research process will be attempts to identify what type of role the researcher is playing. It was remarkable on how many occasions I was asked by Hopewoods “What was I getting out of this?” as if the purposes of my own enquiry in search of their secrets would justify the extent to which they would disclose to me. Subjects may offer entrusted secrets, and will modify their responses to the researcher based on how they perceive the researcher uses their secrets. The outrage which followed the perceived betrayal of trust by entrusted outsiders offers clear evidence of this issue.

This brief analysis of a particular incident which occurred during the research has been offered for two reasons. Firstly, to demonstrate the efficacy of Goffman’s account in elucidating social encounters where a clear delineation can be made
between the performance team and the audience. Secondly, as an extension of this, to offer the dramaturgical perspective as a general model of the interactions between the participants in the research process. Whilst the applicability of Goffman’s metaphor to a wider range of social settings has been questioned by a number of authors, not the least of which is Goffman himself in his later writings (Messinger et al 1962; Ryan 1978; MacIntyre 1969; Anderson and Sharrock 1982; Watson 1987; all cited in Manning, 1992:48-54), it is able to withstand scrutiny as an account of the research process. The researcher does enter into the research environment as an audience, and will experience a variety of performance situations. If the researcher’s intention is to penetrate beyond the idealised world of the surface performance, it then follows that the relationship with the research subject, and the ways in which the research will unfold, will be affected by the ways in which the subjects perceive the nature of the discrepant role played by the researcher. The ways in which access to secrets is given, the understandings of the basis on which that access is granted, and the uses to which privileged information is put are critical factors in the construction of a research project. Their impact on the research must both be understood by the researcher, and articulated in the presentation of the research findings. The researcher’s position is an ambiguous one.

Seeking Respondents

As already indicated, my initial approach to the Hopewood community as a whole was by way of a letter, in which I introduced myself formally as a researcher, and sought expressions of interest from those who would be willing to participate in the research. This was followed up a couple of months later by a second blanket invitation to members of the Hopewood community to participate in the project. While this was going on, I was also actively pursuing contacts with others who,
although not Hopewood children, were either key players or who could offer particular insights into aspects of the Hopewood experience, including Madge Cockburn, former YWAA Director Eric Storm, former Hopewood doctor Dr Alec Burton, and former Hopewood staff member Jesse. From the responses to my letters, a total of ten former Hopewood children consented to be interviewed.

ACCESSING HOPEWOOD – THE OUTSIDER WITHIN OR THE INSIDER WITHOUT?

My own relation to the Hopewood family is ambiguous, in fact something of a ‘discrepant role’ itself, and thus the source of both advantages and disadvantages. It also raises a number of methodological issues. My mother was one of the Hopewood children and I have been a part of the extended Hopewood family for most of my life, albeit in a peripheral way. While the children and the partners of Hopewood children have been valued as members of the Hopewood community, there is still a definite sense that the core of the community can only be those who have experienced at first hand growing up in the Hopewood community. Membership in the Hopewood community is defined by the possession of inside secrets, including dark secrets.

Some of these people I have viewed as ‘aunts’, my main few close contacts within the family being those women who were close to my mother when they were growing up. With these exceptions, most of my contacts within Hopewood have been of a superficial nature, lacking the close intimacy which is obviously apparent between many members of the group itself.
Hopewood has always been a part of my life. One of the principal questions which I have to ask myself, and this is a recurring theme, is how can I maintain my supposed detachment and objectivity from the situation as an object of academic study, whilst still maintaining the relationship I have with these people. Utilising the perspective of Goffman (1959) mine is clearly a discrepant role in the Hopewood performance. I am not a part of the official performance team itself, whose membership is defined by certain shared life experiences, memories, and secrets. I do, however, have some share in the performance by virtue of my relationship through my mother. Discrepancy arises by virtue of the need to remain detached as part of the audience, whilst still accessing the backstage secrets of the performance team.

Whilst in the main I have had relatively few close emotional ties with members of Hopewood, the fact that I am Joan’s daughter has provided me with one primary advantage, and that is access to the group. There have been a few researchers who have attempted to gain access in the past. These have been discrepant audience roles which have been more visible to the performance team, and hence access, or more usually denial of access, has been more easily managed. The Hopewoods have tended to be quite insular and resistant to outside interest. My own status is as Abu Lughod (1991:38) states - a 'halfie', half in and half out. On the one hand I don't really belong, I am not a Hopewoodian as such, however, through my mother, I am a part of this story. My own status as an insider to the group has allowed some barriers to be reduced, and that is a pertinent word, 'reduced'. I am still not privy to a whole host of insider dynamics, their inside secrets. These I can only observe from the
outside. However, I have been granted privileged access to what is, to my knowledge, a unique social experiment.

While my special status within the group has given me this privileged access, it has also been something of a two-edged sword. There had been some difficulties in gaining acceptance as a serious researcher rather than just as 'Joan's daughter Debbie'. This has involved the treading of a very fine line. On the one hand I accept the consequences of my special status, whilst at the same time having to distance myself emotionally from the issues I am confronting, and present myself as an objective researcher rather than as 'one of them' and all the questions of 'whose side I am on' that this entails. I can't say in all honesty I have always been successful here. At times the difficult task of asking people to lay bare their souls has resulted in emotional overload for myself, and there have been many times when I have thought, "I can't possibly continue with this, it's too much." And, more importantly, I was concerned for those who were exposing so much of their inner selves to me and the repercussions that could ensue from that both emotionally and socially.

Clearly, my own status within the Hopewood family violates to some extent the methodological precepts of traditional social science which requires a formal gap to be established between the researcher and the researched. This was an issue which needed to be confronted to some extent in my earlier research for an Honours thesis, however as the sources of that thesis were primarily documentary sources, the confrontation of my status in relation to these sources was not as intensely felt. This research was of a different kind, for as well as further interaction with the documentary sources, there is also the issue of direct interaction with a group of
people I had known for most, if not all of my life, even if only as a mostly peripheral part of the group. In such a situation, I needed to confirm, both to myself and to those involved in the research, my status as an objective researcher, and my ability to produce quality research within such an intimate environment. Whilst my status was nominally that of an insider, in negotiating the controversies which came to light during the progress of my research, I was pushed more to the outside, experiencing "the tension experienced by any group of less powerful outsiders encountering the paradigmatic thought of a more powerful inner community" (Collins 1991:53). In such a situation, my status became both that which Collins (1991) calls 'outsider-within', as well as a privileged, if ambiguous, insider.

My justification for my own methodological choices was found in the recent literature on feminist research methods. The feminist critique of the notion of the objective, detached social researcher is well-documented (Neilsen 1990; Fowow and Cook 1991; Keller 1990), as well as being argued from a non-feminist, but still highly critical viewpoint as well (Johnson 1975). Without providing a detailed summary of the arguments of these works, the notion of the traditional social science researcher conducting research in a detached, objective way is difficult to sustain on scientific, let alone political, ethical or moral grounds. Further, such a notion works against the production of high quality, subject centred research. Non-hierarchical interviewing is clearly presented as arising as much from a quality as from a political imperative (Clegg 1985:94), in that a closer engagement with the subject can illicit a deeper level of disclosure than more detached methods of data gathering. Oakley's (1981) study on the transition to motherhood is often cited as an exemplar of the production of high quality research which proceeds from a close engagement between researcher and
subject. In taking such an approach, it becomes inevitable for those being researched to become active agents and equal contributors to the research process itself in collaboration with the researcher:

the 'objects of social science investigations experience their actions as subjectively meaningful (or meaningless). Indeed they are not 'objects' at all but acting subjects. Thus the meaning of an action from an actor's perspective must be taken into account if one desires a true (or intersubjective) understanding (Johnson 1975:16).

These less hierarchical, more engaged, approaches provide a resolution to the problem of, in Goffman's (1959) terms, the discrepant role of the researcher, particularly in the one-on-one environment of the individual interview. They reduce the distance between researcher and subject, between frontstage and backstage, providing an environment in which the exchange of secrets and intentions can facilitate a more effective disclosure, and relationship between the parties.

This engagement and validation, with the intent of a reflexive process of consciousness raising (Fonow and Cook 1991:2-3) has an overtly political dimension within the feminist project. Whilst my own work is not of an overtly political nature, the issue of empowerment of my subjects was also critical to the development of the work. In a group of children which has been powerless from birth, subject to rigorous control and discipline until adulthood, these issues had the potential to assume critical importance. In fact one of the themes which grew out of the work was the consequences and implications of the ways in which we exercise social control over children, particularly as it is such a paradigmatic view within society that children are legitimate objects of control until they reach adulthood. In the Hopewood situation, this was made even more intense by some of the more horrific accounts of control and abuse which surfaced during my research. It is my hope that the chance to talk about these experiences, which for some was in itself unique, and the opportunity to reflect
on these experiences in the light of my own understandings, may lift some burden of oppression from these people's lives. Certainly for some the experience was cathartic. Of course, for those whose experiences of Hopewood were more fortunate, the validation, though just as real, may not be needed so much. In any case, as Gluck (1984:226) points out, the collaboration between interviewer and interviewee results in access of people to public expression of their experiences to which they would normally be denied.

Such a methodological approach does have its dangers, however, particularly with reference to the ability of such research to produce material that is both reliable and valid. Silverman argues that the concentration of many methodological texts on the mechanical aspects of ensuring reliability (pre-testing of interview schedules; interviewer training; emphasis on fixed-choice answers; and inter-rater reliability checks) tend to "deflect attention away from the theoretical assumptions underlying the meaning that we attach to interviewee's answers" (1993:149). This has been my experience in this research. The critical issue in developing an interview schedule which would prove reliable across a number of different respondents was that it should be developed within a strong theoretical framework which enabled an appreciation of the meanings which would be attached to the questions by a variety of respondents. This should be translated into a an interview schedule which was interpretable consistently and reliably by each respondent, but able to be contextualised both by their shared Hopewood experience and unique individual experience. My own unique position was able to assist in this to some extent, as my own peripheral involvement in their shared meanings allowed me to develop an approach which was able to operate within those meaning systems. Additionally, the
development of the interview items took place subsequent to the gathering and examination of the majority of the available written resources available on the Hopewood project, and thus proceeded from a firm appreciation of the shared historical context within which the experiences I was interested in took place.

The choice of what experiences to focus on with the subjects of my interviews, and the ways in which the outcomes of the interviews have been structured and reported on, have of course been mine. What is presented here as my research findings is therefore of necessity structured and circumscribed by my own set of values, and by how I personally have both identified and defined the experiences of the Hopewood children. Again, the oral history method explicitly recognises, without necessarily resolving, this contested ground between “the story the interviewer wants to hear and that which the participant wants to tell” (Hamilton 1997:15). These values are underpinned by a concern with the issue of children’s rights, and the ways in which society constructs children as passive objects of adult socialisation and values, rather than active agents with their own agendas and implicit rights. Ultimately, Hopewood stands as a testimony to the lengths to which this particular functionalist construction of the social role of children can be extended. My underlying value in determining the structure for my own investigation and presentation of knowledge in relation to Hopewood was therefore to understand the interviewees’ experiences as children, how Hopewood thought of and acted towards them as children, and how their social status as children impacted on the outcomes of Hopewood for them. The other issues, diet, eugenics, socialisation, all emerge as subsidiary to this prime value concept in my understanding of Hopewood.
Notwithstanding my confidence in my method's capacity to deliver a reliable result, I faced a greater concern with the issue of validity of my conclusions. Silverman (1993:154-5) provides a critique of the feminist approach to research methodology, using that of Stanley and Wise (1983) as an example. He particularly emphasises its ability to deliver valid research outcomes (Silverman 1993:154). He critiques the feminist methodological project on a number of grounds. Silverman's primary argument is that 'experience' is in fact structured by cultural and linguistic forms, and is therefore not the only true and valid source of sociological knowledge, but is just as contingent as in other forms of knowledge criticised in feminist methodology. He goes on to argue that the attempt to generate valid knowledge lies at the basis of any dialogue, and is not a singularly male standard of truth. He also questions the use of feminist research for political emancipation rather than the creation of valid knowledge, as this runs contrary to what the aims of research should be, and is dangerously close to the political forms of research undertaken by the Nazis and the Soviets.

These questions needed to be answered for this research. In oral history, the historian is inherently present in the story (Portelli 1998:73). Was the research purely experiential, or did it seek derive knowledge from those experiences which could be independently tested and validated? Did my own political position within the Hopewood group, and those of my respondents, represent an agenda which potentially invalidated my research findings? In the end, the structure of the research itself answered these questions. The independent 'triangulation' (Silverman 1993:156-8) provided both by the use of documentary and other evidence, in addition to the interviews, gave the opportunity to test and validate both claims made by the
interviewees, and my interpretations of the interviews. Similarly, although there was a predominance in my interview group of those characterised as the ‘bad’ group, the presence of some ‘good’ or ‘neutral’ members offered the opportunity of another form of triangulation. Despite, then, the potential for the findings of my research to be critiqued on grounds of validity, my research design was robust enough to overcome such problems.

The issue of the use of memory as a source raises additional methodological issues. Oral history does not have a long history of acceptance in sociology, and methodological questions of accuracy and interviewer intrusion have been raised (Grele 1994:41). My research method recognises the limitations of memory as a source, and makes the appropriate methodological adjustments (triangulation, validation of testimony through a number of sources) to overcome these limitations. At the same time, I also recognise the richness that oral history can produce, that the substance of this work is based on people’s lived experiences, producing work that although different in kind, is of equal validity to conventional historical narrative.

In pursuing this research, I have had to be keenly aware of my ambiguous status, my discrepant role, within the Hopewood community, and the potential for my objectivity as a researcher to be questioned, most openly by myself. In doing so, I have adopted a duality of focus in accessing my sources. I have utilised those documentary sources available to me. These are, in the most cases, the words of Bailey himself, presented in a form intended for preservation. Bailey speaks then in his own words, and I believe there is enough consistency in these words for there to be no mistake in what he meant. These are, however, only the words of intent, and to
some extent of practice. The full extent of practice, and its consequences, is to be found in the words of the Hopewood children who consented to be interviewed by me. It is in these interviews where, as I have said, the children are given the opportunity to speak. In analysing and interpreting the content of these interviews, I have approached them with what Mies (1991:79), calls ‘partial identification’:

the concept of partial identification means first that we proceed from our own contradictory state of being and consciousness. That is to say, not only do the ‘other’ women have a problem but I do too. This enables a recognition of what brings me to the ‘other women’ as well as that which separates me from them...Partial identification means that I also recognise what separates us.

By partial identification, I can more clearly utilise the shared threads I have with my subjects, whilst still acknowledging that their experiences are unique and worth telling.

GATEKEEPERS – ANOINTED AND SELF APPOINTED

My closest contact in the Hopewood family is my ‘aunt’, Miriam. Miriam is one of the youngest of the children. She was subjected to sexual abuse from an early age, at Hopewood itself and at other properties, and is one of the driving forces behind the current court case against a former member of staff for alleged sexual abuse. The case itself has created a great deal of interest in legal circles, dealing as it does with allegations of abuse alleged to have occurred in the 1950's. The defendant in the case, a man now in his eighties, was committed for trial in 1997. However, the trial was deferred on two occasions due to his ill health, and has now been formally dropped. Miriam was also one of the people interviewed by journalists from the Sydney Morning Herald (Russell & Tom 1994), and was the catalyst for the story. For her own sake, Miriam needs some sort of affirmation from those she sees as her brothers and sisters, and tried to air her concerns and troubles via a newsletter,
distributed to Hopewoodians. This set in motion the fragmentation that was to occur and at this particular point in time, seems unlikely to be resolved. She has effectively been cut from the family, with her expulsion actually dominating the last Hopewood reunion at Bowral (1997). She is thus the epitome of the 'bad' Hopewood children, and is seen by the 'good' children as the ringleader and a troublemaker. And as further evidence to demonstrate her unreliability she is a lesbian which as another Hopewoodian put it: “you can't trust anything she says as she is a lesbian”. Therefore she represents everything that is deviant and immoral.

Miriam has been a source of great support and assistance to me in this project. She has her own network within the group which has been important in developing contacts I would not otherwise have had access to. She has negotiated on my behalf with a number of Hopewoods who are not part of the core group, having backgrounds (histories of mental instability, crime, sex offences, including with juveniles) which do not conform to the ideal Hopewood citizen espoused by the upholders of Bailey’s legacy. She has also provided me with a great deal of documentary evidence, especially the Annual Reports of the Youth Welfare Association, which I would have had difficulty accessing through ‘official’ channels. However, she also acts as a ‘gatekeeper’ to a certain extent, constraining my access to her network on her own terms. Given the politics of the group and my close association with Miriam, I am viewed with a great deal of suspicion by the members of the ‘good’ faction. My initial interactions with that group were always prefaced by their concerns that my work will be improperly, from their point of view, influenced by the ‘wrong’ side of things. That was during the years 1996 until 1997. In 1998 and through 1999, a shift occurred, and now I am persona non grata, to the ‘good’ group.
If Miriam has acted as a gatekeeper on the ‘bad’ side, I have also had to deal with other gatekeepers on the ‘good’ side. After sending out my first letter of introduction to the Hopewood family, I was surprised when Ben contacted me as I knew he was one of the most fervent supporters of the ‘good’ group. Ben’s approach, whilst not overtly hostile, was at the very least intimidating. He voiced his concerns that he hoped that my research was going to portray the ‘right’ story, and that the ‘lies’ of the ‘bad’ group should not be allowed to intrude. This concern had been expressed by a number of other people as well. I did my best to allay his concerns, although in the scheme of things I wasn’t terribly successful as I received no further response from him. However it does highlight the issue that Ben as a gatekeeper, by finding out what my intentions were, was determining the appropriateness of his own group (clique) to participate.

Owen chose to reply to me in writing. Owen is a member of the ‘good’ faction and denies that there was ever any of the wrong doing or abuse alleged to occur. Owen’s response began with the usual concern that I would be telling the ‘right’ story and that I shouldn’t pay any attention to the lies of the others. As his letter went on, however, the tone became more strident and abusive. Owen stated he couldn’t accept my credentials as a serious academic researcher as my mind had been poisoned by the claims of the ‘bad’ faction. He then proceeded to blame the lies of sociologists for the privileged situation of Aborigines in Australia. This had little direct relevance to either Hopewood or my research, except to indicate that from his point of view sociologists were untrustworthy. He promised that he himself was writing a book about Hopewood that would tell the ‘true’ story.
My first response was to either call Owen myself or write a letter in reply defending myself. After consideration, I decided to let the matter rest. Owen’s reply was after all just the most extreme of a set of generally negative reactions to the research on the part of those who stood to gain least, or lose most, from the research. The hostility which had been generated by the events of the past few years was now being directed towards me, instead of within the group. Whilst as an individual I may not agree, or even be offended by their views, as a researcher it was necessary for me to accept the legitimacy of all views within the research context and incorporate them in my final analysis. The greatest pity, at least from Owen’s point of view, is that his obviously passionately held view will not be a part of this final assessment, by his own choice.

The issue of access, and control of access to the research environment, is of course of critical importance to the research process. Johnson (1975) gives the most complete account of the ways in which access can be gained and maintained through the research process. Even his account, though, fails to adequately emphasise the importance of gatekeepers in controlling such access. This is in part a function of the peculiar social dynamic of the current Hopewoods, where information, allegation and access are critical resources in the maintenance, construction and deconstruction of their past and present social identities. Notwithstanding this, I believe that the matters such as the status, conduct and affiliation of gatekeepers have the potential to significantly effect the outcomes of sociological research.
REFLECTIONS ON RESEARCH METHOD

I have drawn on a few accounts here to illustrate a number of methodological issues which confront us all as researchers in sociology. Politics is an ever present part of social life and part of our role as social scientists is to identify the structures and power dimensions through which political power is manifested in society. What is equally important for us to realise is that our own researches are inevitably directed and constrained by the political structures of the social entities which we are studying. The Hopewood group is, as a result of recent events, a highly politicised and polarised group. The extent to which, as a researcher, I am identified with one group or another, or alternatively my ability to maintain academic detachment, will clearly be one of the determinants of how successful the end product of the research will be. Additionally, we must be aware that groups or individuals in such a study will try to influence the outcome of the study to the ends that are acceptable to them.

We also need to understand the critical role of gatekeepers in influencing the acceptance of the researcher and the direction of the research. We rarely make contact with groups on a group basis, we are usually initiated into groups by an individual. In my case, gatekeepers on both sides of the fence have been the initial contacts for me with their groups, the connection with my mother aside. There is a process of testing the researcher, determining their bona fide and intentions, and the researcher is only admitted into the wider group once these have been established by the gatekeeper. The researcher’s first contact with those who can be identified as gatekeepers is a process which needs to be carefully managed to maximise its contribution to a successful research outcome. This raises the question: what is a successful outcome? Individuals of course perform their own processes of testing as
well, determining whether what the researcher proposes has any relevance or contribution to their own needs and aspirations.

While this all may point to a maximisation of the objectivity of the researcher, this too can only go so far. At the core of this we are still dealing with the lives and emotions of people and these will necessarily affect us in some way. We all bring to our research part of ourselves in some way or another. While in my own case the connection between my own private world and the public issues which I am studying is perhaps more intense than others may find, research always negotiates the territory between academic and intellectual detachment on the one hand, and a response based on our own knowledge, experience and emotions.

Research also needs to be seen as an iterative process between researcher and subject. Too much research focuses on the presentation of a snap shot in time of a particular social milieu. My research has clearly demonstrated that the presence of research interest has the potential to affect, either positively or negatively, the research situation. As researchers, we need to be aware that we too are a presence on the social scene which we are trying to document, and that the very act of social observation and reportage has the potential to modify the social system under study. Social systems are not laboratory experiments around which convenient walls can be built through which the sociologist observes and reports. By doing researching, we become part of that system and both affect and are affected by it. This research has attempted to accept that fact, and provide a voice for those in the system to express themselves through the medium of the social researcher.
Appendix - Hopewood Reunion, 9th December 1997

Letters had flowed back and forth in the month preceding the December 1997 reunion at Hopewood House, Bowral. Nathan’s letter (5 November 1997) stated the aim of the reunion, this was not just a ‘get together’ as in the previous years but rather to have a forum to discuss how to ‘deal’ with the ‘bad group’. Those designated as ‘bad’ were those who spoke ‘negatively’ about Hopewood. Speaking ‘negatively’ about Hopewood meant sharing anything other than the official version of events or even questioning aspects of Hopewood life with journalists or researchers. Gemima (9th November 1997) responded with a letter of condemnation at Nathan’s presumptuousness in calling for a forum and his allegations against her and Miriam. Greg (Fran’s husband) also responded to Nathan’s letter, repudiating Nathan’s claims and defending Miriam. It was evident that the tone of this reunion was set and it was going to be a dynamic meeting with tensions running high. I faced going to the reunion with a great deal of trepidation as I knew from telephone discussions with various other Hopewood people, my own role was going to be on the agenda. Particularly my involvement with Alan Gill and the allegations made in his book *Orphans of the Empire* (1997).

I picked up Aunty Rachel from Panania station at 10.00am on the Saturday, 9th of December 1997, and we drove to Bowral. Rachel was very excited at the prospect of socialising with those that might attend as this was the first real reunion (there had been others at Homebush Bay but the numbers were quite small) since 1994. We arrived at 11.30am. I parked the car in the driveway leading up to the pavilion, a building just off to the main house. As we walked up to the pavilion where everyone
was to meet, Lisa rushed out and gave me a big hug and whispered in my ear, “a show of support”. As Lisa had already arrived at Bowral a few hours before, this was an indication that I had already been a topic of conversation. I thanked Lisa, as it took considerable courage to publicly support me given the proposed mood of the group.

We moved inside the pavilion where the tables and chairs had been set up in preparation for lunch and where a few of the others had congregated. A few people said hello to me, including Sheryl. Sheryl is an interesting case, from my perspective anyway. Sheryl was a very close friend of my mother’s and they had kept in close contact for many years before Joan’s death. Joan had even named her second daughter after Sheryl. Sheryl was also a staunch supporter of the ‘good’ group. Sheryl’s support I had previously mistakenly taken for granted given her close connection to my mother. After two phone conversations prior to the reunion, Sheryl made it known she didn’t wish to be included in my research. I had thought there was no animosity and was looking forward to seeing her at the reunion. However this was not the case. Sheryl was most distressed that I was writing about Hopewood and that their secrets would be revealed to all and sundry. An aside here: Joanne is closely aligned to Aunty Madge and even though she expressed concern and didn’t want me to continue with my research we still keep in close contact and we don’t discuss the research. This has not created friction between us.

Hopewood House had recently been sold to a couple who intended to set it up as a bed and breakfast place and was undergoing renovations. A Hopewood boy, Norm was overseeing the renovations and took those who attended the reunion that morning on a guided tour of his work. We moved upstairs to the top floor of the
pavilion which used to house the sleeping quarters and playroom of the children. Whilst I was standing there talking to Aunty Rachel, Eve came up to me and apologised for reneging on our proposed interview. She indicated that one of her Hopewood sister’s and her husband had persuaded her it was better to let sleeping dogs lie and not discuss the past. I assured her that it was totally her decision and that I perfectly understood.

At this time Maria came over and informed me, in a very loud voice, in front of those present “We’ve decided to have a forum and we’ve decided that you can’t be included.” She further qualified this by stating, in a more normal tone, “It’s not just you we’re excluding but also partners and children of Hopewoods. It’s only for Hopewoods.” Once again I replied that I perfectly understood though I did ask whom the people making this decision were. Maria didn’t reply and walked off.

Rachel and Lisa became upset at my exclusion and Lisa told me she had come to the reunion purposely to have a confrontation with Nathan about his letters and she wanted me there when she fronted him. God how I hoped that wouldn’t be the case. My position was already tenuous enough and it was to get more so as the day wore on. Lisa also told me she was writing a list of everyone who attended today so as she could give it to me and help in my research. I told her whilst I appreciated the effort, it really wasn’t necessary.

After admiring Norm’s handiwork on the existing woodwork and listening to his visions for further structural work, we moved back downstairs in small groups. I noticed Nathan, James and Kevin standing in the pavilion, by the open archway
leading back out into the driveway and said “hello”. I received a cursory reply back. Obviously they weren’t in the mood to talk to me. I gave James a photo of himself as a young boy and we had a brief conversation about how I came to have the photo.

I moved outside to have a solitary cigarette and contemplate life, the universe and everything when Sheryl came up to me and asked me about my research. She was concerned on a number of counts. Firstly she cautioned me on being taken in by those few ‘troublemakers’, they were lesbians and therefore it should be self evident they were liars. Secondly she queried the allegations made in Gill’s book and wanted to know what connection I had with him. I explained my work about wanting to document a unique piece of Australian social history and my interest in sociology and in particular eugenics. Further I explained that Alan had not referenced my work correctly and that I had been taken out of context. I reiterated I had nothing to do with the paedophile allegations aimed at Bailey. Sheryl said if that was the case I should get up in front of everybody and explain. I replied that I didn’t think that was appropriate as I was here today, just as I had been at all the other reunions, as Joan’s daughter – not to gain recruits for my research. As I had already sent out two letters explaining my intentions, I thought that really was enough.

Sheryl said she would like to help me but she won’t say anything bad against Hopewood, Daddy Bailey nor Aunty Madge. I replied that I wasn’t asking her to say anything ‘bad’. I would include anything anyone told me and if I heard ‘good’ stories then of course they would be included in the analysis. I stressed to her that in fact these ‘good’ stories were essential in offering a balanced account.
Sheryl left and I stayed outside rethinking my position and whether I had made a mistake in coming here today. I had taken along photos of Hopewood people as children which had been sent to me by an unknown person shortly after my mother’s death in 1984. Over the years I had spent considerable time with many of the Hopewood people in a bid to identify those in the photos and hand them out. Now was the perfect time to move among the crowd and talk to people and hand out the photos, as by this stage more had arrived.

Phillipa had attended this reunion and it was her first in many, many years. Comments were made regarding her presence given her long previous absence. She had also brought her daughter and grandchild. I was surprised to see her. Phillipa was also a close associate of my mother’s. I approached Phillipa and gave her the few photos I had of not only her but also a photo of myself and her daughter as children on the front lawn of her house. We conversed lightly for about five minutes and then someone came and whisked her away from me. Once again I was left standing by myself. I looked around and decided to approach Corrine as she was talking to Doris (an ex staff member of Hopewood) and wasn’t in a big group. I must say my nerve was beginning to fail me at this point and I felt I needed to plan carefully my next move. I gave Corrine the photo of herself as a young girl and she invited me to join in their conversation. Corrine asked me about my research and I told her the same things I had told Sheryl. Doris said she had received my letters and said she would think about it some more, as to whether to participate or not. Corrine said she was interested and to give her a call to tee up an interview. (Which I did but Corrine never returned my call).
Sheryl approached me again and asked if I had any photos of her as by this stage word had got around that I was giving out photos. She was sure that because of her close association to my mother that I would have some. I told her the story of how I came to have these photos and I said that if I had known she was going to be here today I would have brought them with me. I promised to send them to her.

Martha (another person my mother was close to) walked past me without acknowledging my presence. I stopped her and handed her the envelope with her photos in it. She snatched them out of my hand and stalked off. There was no acknowledgment on her part whatsoever, which in part I found a little disappointing, though understandable. Martha felt I had betrayed the Hopewood people due to the allegations in Gill’s book. I had tried to explain myself but the damage had been done.

Whilst I had been handing out photos to people, Jacqueline and Emma had been moving in the background from group to group, handing out a photocopy of the chapter in Gill’s book regarding Hopewood, and pointing to me. I had been watching them out of the corner of my eye.

I went back outside to talk to Lisa who was standing by herself. Sheryl came over to us and addressing me said, they had decided (I wasn’t exactly sure who the key decision makers were in this instance) I could be included in the forum but I couldn’t write about it. Whilst I acknowledged Sheryl’s concerns, I replied that I wouldn’t be staying for the forum but thanked her for the inclusion nonetheless. This indicated once again that I had been a topic of conversation.
As that conversation ended, Nathan called everyone together into the pavilion for the memorial service. Instead of going down to the tree where the service had always been held, due to the heat it was decided that the annual service, remembering those who had died, would be held in the pavilion. Another change in the rituals.

I came inside and worked my way down the back of the room where, whilst it was quite packed, Lisa and Matthew were sitting at a table by themselves. Nathan read from the Bible and listed those who had died. He then asked for a minute’s silence. Fortunately he remembered my mother’s name this year, although he nearly forgot Rosalind’s until someone in the crowd (by now there were about thirty people gathered) shouted out her name.

Discussion then started. Apparently it needed to be discussed as a collective this time, who was to be included in the forum to be held after lunch. The social dynamics were spectacular. I should point out that Madge and her family had arrived ten minutes beforehand. I assume people were waiting for their arrival to ‘officially’ begin discussion.

Nathan tried to lead the discussion from the outset, given that he was the oldest Hopewood boy he obviously felt it was his role to adjudicate proceedings. During the ensuing discussion though he did have a few challenges from other Hopewood boys. Not so surprisingly the women seemed to accept this jockeying for position. I would argue that the dynamics I witnessed unfolding this day, playing along gendered lines, would have been similar to those enacted when they were children. Very patriarchal.
Nathan opened these preliminary proceedings by saying that a vote needed to be taken as to whether there should be a forum in the first place or not. Some had openly expressed their unwillingness to be part of a kangaroo court and said that it wasn’t the aim of the reunion. The reunion was about coming together as a family and catching up, not to castigate others. These were only in the minority though. Nathan did qualify by saying it was expressly stated in the newsletter this forum was on the agenda for today.

Corrine asked the intent of the forum. Nathan replied, “to discuss whether to change the date of the reunion”. Corrine pressed him further and he said it was also to discuss what they were going to do about the ‘others’. It seemed accepted by the crowd who the ‘others’ were.

A few objected to this however, including Corrine and Phillipa. This sparked off a round of hostility that was uncomfortable to watch. Mel said that the ‘others’ weren’t here today as they didn’t have the balls to come and face them and they deserved everything they had coming to them. Thea agreed most vehemently. Andrew (a barrister) tried to take charge and direct proceedings as per a court of law. He requested permission from Nathan to put a motion forward re: 1) if to have a forum in the first place and 2) who will attend as per consensus of the majority. Ben interjected and said how appalling he was by Greg (Fran’s husband) writing a letter to everyone. This comment seemed to come from left field. Ben claimed Greg had no right to do that. His feeling was that they (Hopewoods) could say anything they wanted, as long what was said was ‘true’ and as Greg was not a Hopewood he
obviously shouldn’t say anything. That set off a clamour and once again Andrew tried to gain order by bringing it back to his earlier propositions.

Order was eventually restored and voting by a show of hands commenced as per Andrew’s propositions. Who doesn’t want a forum? A few hands raised. Who wants to have a forum? Majority rules. Hence a forum was to go ahead. Now the tricky part – who is to be included in the forum? This time three propositions were put forward by Andrew: 1) Only Hopewoods 2) Include all the people here but only the Hopewood could participate and 3) Everyone should be involved.

Before voting took place over these new propositions a few people wanted to address the gathering. Andrew stated that it should include everyone but only Hopewoods should speak. He did this in the manner of ‘may I approach the bench’. I was most surprised when Paul Cockburn, Madge’s eldest son, argued that everyone should be involved and allowed to express their views. His rationale for this was misinformation would be lessened and given the letter wars this would be an acceptable practise. On reflection though it’s not surprising he suggested this as technically he is not a Hopewood as such and therefore would be officially unable to express his own views on the matter. Both Andrew and Paul made some very logical and cohesive points.

A vote by show of hands commenced and the second option won out: Everyone could be included in the forum but only Hopewoods could speak.
Nathan then stepped forward and apologised to Madge regarding the allegations of sexual assault made against Lem by two of the Hopewood girls not present, in fact they don’t keep in contact at all. He told the group that Lem had been taken to Rose Bay Police station for questioning regarding the allegations but was released with no charges laid. This contradicts what I had heard from the complainants. However I am unsure as to how I can verify this. Nathan offered his thanks to Madge for all her endeavours and offered thanks to the new owners for allowing the reunion to be held at Hopewood House. The new owner stood up and stated his commitment to Hopewood House and assured everyone that they were most welcome today and in the future. Ben then stood up and offered his thanks and support to Madge on behalf of everyone. Emma stood up and did the same. Irene became very emotional and physically jumped up and down trying to express how she was sick and tired of these ‘others’ and their allegations against Daddy Bailey and Uncle Lem. Daddy Bailey was a kind and loving man and these ‘others’ must be stopped at all costs. There was sporadic applause after each speaker. The meeting was declared over and everyone broke into smaller groups in readiness for lunch.

At this point I indicated to Rachel that I didn’t feel comfortable nor did I think it was appropriate for me to stay as emotions were running high. It was time for me to leave. I could only imagine the mood of the forum meeting after lunch if the preliminary proceedings induced so much anger.

I walked outside and waited for Rachel to say her goodbyes as Rachel had decided to come with me rather than stay. Sheryl broke away from the groups inside the pavilion, came up to me and said once again that I could come to the forum just
not write about it. I told her I had to leave as it was too much of a volatile crowd for me. Sheryl commented, "I'm sorry you feel like that, it's a shame" but she didn't try to dissuade me. I think, in part, she was relieved I was leaving, whether for myself or on behalf of the group, I'm unsure.

As Rachel and I were walking back to my car Sheryl came running after us saying that Aunty Madge wanted to see me. I walked back and Madge met me just outside the pavilion entrance. She gave me a kiss and recounted two little anecdotes from my mother's childhood. I said I had to leave and we said goodbye.

To drive out of Hopewood House I had to drive past the pavilion, an experience I wished I could have avoided as I felt that my leaving was exactly what the core group wanted. I would have liked to have been brave enough to stay but it was more than I could handle. As I drove pass the pavilion, Rachel waved to those outside watching us leave. It hadn't been a good day.
CHAPTER 3 - BAILEY, HOPEWOOD AND EUGENICS –

DREAMS OF AN AUSTRALIAN SUPER RACE

If we want to produce a race of super people, capable of holding Australia 50 years hence, we must start right now. We won’t admit coloured people and whites won’t come in sufficient numbers. Consequently, we will need to produce a population composed of supermen and women. Since we won’t have sufficient numbers, we must have quality.
L.O. Bailey, Youth Welfare Association of Australia Annual Report, 1946

INTRODUCTION – THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND MEANING OF EUGENICS

Eugenics was a social, political and scientific movement which had its beginnings in Victorian England. As an organised force, its heyday was in the years between the turn of the century and World War II. Eugenic thought continues to exert an influence, through the I.Q debate and more recently the debate around the status, direction and intentions of the Human Genome Project (Paul 1992:664). At its peak, eugenics was a world wide movement, having influence not just in its native Britain (Blacker 1952), but, to name just a few of the areas where the eugenics movement has been studied systematically, the United States (Paul 1995), Germany, France, Brazil and Russia (Adams 1990), as well as Australia (Bacchi 1981, Garton 1994, Watts
The founder of the British eugenics movement, Francis Galton, defined eugenics as

the science of improving stock, which is by no means confined to matters of judicious mating, but which...takes cognisance of all influences that tend in however remote degree to give the more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing speedily over the less suitable than they otherwise would have had (cited in Paul 1995:2).

Eugenics as it originated in Britain drew on the prevailing notions of laissez-faire capitalism, imperialism, Mendelian genetics and Darwinian biology, supported by an unshaking faith in the utility and rationality of the scientific method to define a science, and ultimately a social policy, of heredity. Galton was a cousin of Darwin’s, whose *The Evolution of Species* (1859) provided the mechanism by which the species would progress towards, presumably, the state of the perfectability of man. Mendel’s experiments with genetics provided proof, in the form of the scientific data which the new rational Victorian man would devour with gusto, of the laws by which the inheritance of subsequent generations could be controlled. If Mendel could scientifically control the breeding outcomes for garden vegetables or farm animals, there was presumably no reason why the same laws could not be applied to the breeding of human beings. *Laissez-faire* capitalism, particularly the British mercantile version thereof, brought with it its own inescapable conviction in the idea of progress. The successes of British mercantile capitalism made it all the more clear to contemporary observers that the battleground for this progress, where survival of the fittest would be applied, and where the Mendelian laws of heredity were in their element, was in the area of race. In using the term race, I use it to refer not only to generic racial groupings based on skin colour, but also to more specific constructions of race in the context of the contemporary nation state. It was as the level of the nation state, as much as at the level of white versus black, that the debate on race suicide was conducted (Soloway 1995:60-1). It was in the conflict between races, and
in the growth of the superior races and the decline of the ‘subject’ races, that eugenics had its origin, and where its proponents saw it finest application.

Galton’s original eugenic thinking was based primarily on the issue of intelligence, having been led to his proposal through a study of the incidence of high intelligence in prominent British families over a number of generations. For the early eugenicists, the prime quality which eugenic programs would preserve and enhance in heredity was intelligence, defined in terms of academic and intellectual endeavour:

A really intelligent nation might be held together by far stronger forces than are derived from the purely gregarious instincts. It would not be a mob of slaves, clinging together, incapable of self-government, and begging to be led; but it would consist of vigorous, self-reliant men, knit to one another by innumerable attractions into a strong, tense and elastic organisation...The hereditary taint due to the primeval barbarism of our race, and maintained by later influences, will have to be bred out of it before our descendants can rise to the position of free members of a free and intelligent society (Galton cited by Blacker 1952:95-6).

At its inception, eugenics was a movement which aimed at preserving and enhancing the dominance of that particular creature of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the archetypal Englishman, founder of Empire. It was his characteristics: endeavour, reason and law which were valued by the eugenicists. Unsurprisingly, the notions of racial dominance, race conflict and superiority, once transplanted from their English soil, proved fruitful throughout the world, although local factors would modify the emphasis. Adams (1990:217-19) warns against the danger of simplifying the objectives and methods of the world wide eugenics movement into a universal model. This was not the case. Some eugenicists took a Lamarckian rather than a Darwinian view of evolution (Adams 1990:218). For others, physical rather than intellectual perfection was more important, some representatives of the Australian eugenics movement in particular portrayed images of physical, rather than intellectual, perfection, as its ideal, see for instance Ramsland (2000), and Rodwell (2000).
What these international movements shared was an intention to improve, by whatever means, the stock of the next generation through some form of control over the reproductive process. For the purposes of this thesis, the focus will be on the British and American models of eugenics, which for reasons of culture and language were the models most readily accessible to Australian eugenics.

It should be noted that the negative connotations currently associated with eugenics, based on its association with the excesses of such instances as American forcible sterilisation legislation, and Nazi racial theories, are absent from Galton’s original definition of eugenics, and from the programs of its early proponents. In its heyday, eugenics was a movement which could attract both the conservative and the radical, including such diverse radicals as British socialists Havelock Ellis and Lancelot Hogben, and even Fabian socialists such as Bernard Shaw, and Beatrice and Sidney Webb. Despite its inherently racially patriarchal nature, assuming as it did a hierarchy of races culminating in the white Anglo-Saxon, eugenics was nevertheless at its peak considered a science in its own right, and a legitimate vehicle for social
progress. Its proponents would not necessarily have endorsed either Nazi death camps, or the forcible sterilisation of the mentally deficient.

What remains from Galton’s original definition, is a formulation of eugenics from which a number of features can be isolated, and which have equal applicability to all the various manifestations of the movement. Eugenics is primarily interested with improving the human “stock”. Some authors substitute the term “germ plasm”, which carries with it particular connotations of the inviolability of hereditary characteristics. “Germ plasm” was a term coined by the German embryologist August Weisman (1834-1914), to describe the bodily agent responsible for passing inherited characteristics between generations. Germ plasm could not be changed by environmental conditions: only by selective breeding could stronger germ plasm increase in the population (Weiss 1990:13-14). Eugenics as a movement is concerned with propagating the improved “stock” by influencing, directly or indirectly, coercively or voluntarily, human reproductive behaviour. In its fundamental form, eugenics is open to examining all influences (be they environmental or hereditary) which may act towards this improvement of “stock”, although we have already noted that specific manifestations of eugenics, across both time and geographical boundaries, may be more or less either hereditarian or environmentalist. Finally, eugenics identifies eugenic principles operating within an environment made up of groups identified by their hereditary make-up (“races or strains of blood”) which are engaged in a struggle for dominance, in which the results will be determined by the relative strength of the “stock” of that particular group. Following Galton’s original definition, eugenics presented itself as a science, with a rational methodology and set of conclusions.
As a form of bio-politics (Foucault: 1981) the primary focus of power for the eugenics practitioner was what Foucault calls the 'species-being', generally defined by particular eugenic discourses in terms of race, nation-state, or some similar formulation. The eugenic ideal was a mass ideal, manifested at the aggregate level of the population. Its only individual focus was on the individual interventions, those regulations of bodily health, reproductive and nurturing practices which guarantee the vigour of the species body. Individual behaviour was only important insofar as it contributed to the greater health of the mass.

The above definition identifies eugenics in terms of organised agency and ideology. Eugenics in this case is a specific policy, either of an organisation or government, which is applied to alter the genetic status of a population. As Paul (1992:667) points out:

eugenics may also be defined in terms of consequences. In this case, agency is attributed to individuals, as well as state or other social institutions. Motive is no longer relevant. Individuals do not necessarily (or even ordinarily) intend to produce population effects.

We can apply both of these definitions in our analysis of Bailey’s project. The Hopewood Experiment was certainly an act of conscious policy, aimed at implementing a set of institutional arrangements with the eugenic intention of modifying the reproductive behaviour and heredity of the children under its control. This policy was conducted within an ideological framework of functionalist socialisation. Its long term goal, the ultimate improvement of Australia’s health and vitality through the agency of subsequent generations of individual natural health practice, was equally eugenic in its consequences. Its achievement was presupposed on the individual adoption, and inter-generational perpetuation, of a set of dietary and health practices, rather than being managed and controlled by organised agency.
Eugenics had two strands, each of which approached the fundamental eugenic problem in different ways, what have been termed positive and negative eugenics (Watts 1994:322). Negative eugenics was primarily aimed at improving the race by preventing the reproduction of undesirable stock within the population. This strand of eugenics ultimately manifested itself in the forcible sterilisation laws in many American states in the inter-war years, in the Nazi racial purification program, and can be seen operating today in the debates over such issues as choosing the sex of unborn children, or of termination of foetuses which may not prove to live up to the ideal set for it by its parent.

Positive eugenics on the other hand seeks to encourage the reproduction of the desired element in the subject population. Eugenic utopias, such as Galton's "Kantsaywhere", were generally based on principles of controlled mating of the more desirable members of society (Soloway 1995, 66-7). Galton's own model of eugenics was in fact primarily one of positive eugenics: he sought far more to promote the reproduction of the more desirable in society, rather than to prevent, by whatever means, the reproduction of the least desirable. Such behaviour could of course neither be legislated for, nor coerced, in the way that negative eugenics programs were able to implement their policy. Disciples of positive eugenics, whilst still holding to the importance of guaranteeing the reproduction of socially desirable traits, tended to extend their concerns into attempts to ameliorate the environment in which reproduction took place, and improve social conditions, with the intent of acting directly in socially desirable areas such as health or education. The intent was that by improving the health, or level of education of one generation, these improvements
would be passed on to the next generation, thereby resulting in the incremental
development of the stock of the nation on eugenic lines.

In these terms, Bailey's experiment was primarily an experiment in positive
eugenics: his intention was to improve the health of the subjects in his charge through
the agency of diet, in the expectation that the demonstration of the efficacy of the diet
would encourage its acceptance by the community at large. The resultant general
improvement in the stock of the nation was one of his principle goals. What is more
extraordinary is his avowed intention at the start of the project to continue the
experiment one step further, by encouraging the intermarriage of the children, thereby
encouraging not only the general propagation of the improved stock in Australian
society as a whole, but also creating an elite genetic core of material formed under his
own control. The children's bodies thus became not just a site for the domination of
nature by science in their day to day lives, but the paradigm was intended to dominate
their existence as reproductive beings, subjecting the entirety of their bodily functions
to the authority of the Bailey program.

RACE SUICIDE AND THE DECLINE OF THE WHITE RACES

During the years of the formation of Bailey's philosophy, the efficacy of the
white races to stand against other races was being questioned. There was talk of "race
suicide" (Soloway 1995:5), of the European races both not breeding enough in
general, and specifically not breeding enough children of the right quality. Whilst this
had been an ongoing historical debate over the early decades of the twentieth century,
the Second World War showed dramatically the vulnerability of an underpopulated
Australia. While the discourse of both the British and American eugenics movements
was primarily that of social status and social class, the Australian model which Bailey represented had a significantly higher racial component. Bailey took 86 children with the intention of demonstrating scientifically that it was possible to improve the stock of this group by the selective manipulation of environment, primarily by the close control of diet. The nutritional and moral virtues of this diet (to be discussed further in Chapter 4) were to be the source of improvement for the children. The project was to demonstrate to the wider public the virtues of Bailey’s dietary principles, in order to promote the wider adoption of this “stock-improving” behaviour. It was also expected that the children would intermarry, thereby passing on the benefits of their improved stock to the next generation. What follows is not a history of the eugenics movement per se, but rather an overall interpretation of it, which will be used to inform the subsequent analysis of Bailey’s status as a eugenic practitioner. The primary purpose is to define the major national and international debates within the eugenic discourse which were most relevant in the formulation and practice of Bailey’s project, before placing Bailey within the particular national context of Australian eugenics.

Debates over the future of the European (white) races flourished in Britain, the United States and Australia from the turn of the century right up to World War II. The most thorough account of the debate is Soloway’s (1995) account of the British debate over the declining birthrate and its links to the eugenics movement. Browne’s (1979) general Australian study of fertility and fertility control covers a similar time period. The debate partook of several contemporary discourses, all of which had been constructed from a conservative response to major social, economic and political changes of the time. These debates were principally informed by a racially based
discourse, in which the proper relationship between white races and other races was primarily one of servant and master. The race suicide argument held that the fertility of the white races was in danger of being overcome by the more fertile hordes of the coloured races:

In the context of the Depression and the mounting international tensions of the 1930s, the menace of underpopulation stimulated revived fears of the ‘Yellow Peril’, and countless warnings about ‘the shadow of race suicide’ descending on the white races, and, more directly, on the British Empire (Soloway 1995:240).

Australia in World War II was at the forefront of the struggle between the British Empire and the ‘Yellow Peril’, a fear which had cast a shadow over Australian history since at least the coming of the first Chinese miners to the Australian goldfields in the 1850s.

Supplementing the race based discourse of the population scare-mongers, there was also a class based discourse, in which issues of social class were used to determine social worth from a eugenic point of view. From this point of view, the major birthrate issue was that of ‘differential fertility’: the apparent fact that the more ‘worthy’ classes of society (those identified by Galton as responsible for the ‘great leaps forward’ in human society, the doctors, scientists, engineers, and the professional and business classes from which they were drawn), were reproducing at a lower rate than the ‘less worthy’ sections of society. Eugenics, wherever it was practiced, was primarily a movement of the professional middle class, and as such it was their particular characteristics which were defined as eugenically worthy, and their population status in relation to the greater masses which was the issue for those concerned with ‘differential fertility’:

The worth of the individual was measured in terms of usefulness to society. Not only did the prosperous and professional classes see themselves as having the superior germ plasm, but the professionals also, by virtue of their expertise, were ideally suited to assess, in terms of their particular science, the eugenic or dysgenic properties of others (Cawte 1986:42).
Differential fertility was an invention of the privileged and educated classes, a form of moral panic intended to galvanise these classes into perpetuating their social position through a continued commitment to its physical reproduction. It was also an expression of contemporary sexual politics, arguing for a return of the middle class woman to the traditional role of wife and mother, in the context of a growing independence, and neglect of traditional home duties.

The discourse of the population debate extended far beyond the interests of class and gender, important as these might be. Interracial conflict, physical decline and the differential birthrate were all symptoms of a much more insidious overall decline of Western civilisation itself:

European racialism was preoccupied with degeneracy and decadence, with moral and spiritual decay, and the very decline of civilisation. On a more mundane level, concern with deterioration in natural physique, combined with an observed differential decline in the birthrate between social classes, led to alarm about national decline (Cawte 1986:42).

These tendencies, if continued, were argued to be likely to lead to the decline of Western, white civilisation.

Voluntary sterility is not a new thing in the history of the world. It has already been observed in a certain period of past civilisations. It is a classical symptom. We know its significance (Carrel 1935:33-4).

Carrel was one of the principal influences on Bailey’s eugenic thought, and we will return in detail later to his influence on the formulation of Bailey’s ideas. By reducing the number of births of that class of people whose contributions had led to most of the major leaps forward for civilisation, Western civilisation was heading for stagnation and decay. The population would be fit only for the role of slaves, with no elite group available to lead them.

These concerns were with the quality, rather than the quantity of people. Intelligence was argued to be declining overall in the population (Cattell 1937:1). It
was argued that the environmental and social improvements of modern society had led to the increase of weaker strains in the population (Jennings 1930:351, Carrel 1935:201). This was supported by the eugenics movement's appropriation of Darwinian notions of survival of the fittest. If modern civilisation made life so easy that all were able to survive regardless of their relative fitness, the prime Darwinian law which facilitated the progression of species and the race was broken, and racial and civilisation decline was the inevitable result. Eugenics as a movement privileged a state of nature, in which scientifically derived laws of natural selection operated to ensure the continuing progress of the civilisation of the white races. This state of nature was contrasted to the culturally elaborated practices of modern society, which were against nature and ultimately self-destructive.

The eugenics movement was also very careful to align itself with the methods and ideologies of scientific rationalism. Galton's original definition of eugenics defined it as a science. Man could be viewed as a biological specimen, able to be subjected to the same sorts of experimental rigours as any other specimen (Jennings 1930:203). Galton himself utilised numerous methods of testing to provide his own eugenic data, testing such factors as aesthetic and literary appreciation, anthropometric measurements, physical fitness, intelligence and character (Blacker 1952:186ff). In the United States...

Science provided a model of impartial expertise. Moreover, science, being disinterested, could provide unity to a society that seemed to be culturally disintegrating. Above all, science could supply the tools to manage humans and their environment efficiently...Science could also address the root causes of social problems and not just their symptoms (Paul 1995:78).

The acceptance of Darwinian evolutionary principles provided the underlying scientific mechanism by which racial groups progressed or disappeared. The discoveries of the principles of genetics in the early years of the century provided
further scientific proof to the eugenics movement of the importance of heredity, and the potential for control of reproductive behaviour to result in improvements to the human stock. The point of departure for the eugenics movement was not the possibility of racial improvement through reproductive control, but on how this control should be exerted: for negative eugenics, the emphasis was on preventing the breeding of the weaker portions of the population; for positive eugenics, on facilitating the reproduction of the more able portions of the population.

Eugenicists were divided, primarily along the above lines, over the importance that environment had in affecting the overall standard of the human stock. This division is part of the long debate over the influence of nature or nurture in Western civilisation, and must be seen in that context as well. Overall, negative eugenics tended to play down the importance of environment in determining individual potential, arguing that heredity was the most important, if not the sole determining factor. Given the nature of negative eugenics, this is not surprising – it would hardly be consistent to argue that genetically inferior individuals should be prevented from reproducing, whilst at the same time allowing that their offspring’s potential could be improved by an appropriate environment. Positive eugenics was more open to accepting the possibility of improvement through environment, even though heredity still played a large part in the positive eugenic outlook:

Permanent modifications of body and consciousness may be produced by adaptation...In this manner, environment stamps human beings with its mark...These new structural and mental aspects appear in the individual and also in the race (Carrel 1935:204).

In fact, Carrel argued that the germ plasm itself was not immutable, and that it could be modified by environmental conditions:

germ plasm is not immutable. It may change under the influence of the organic medium. It can be altered by disease, poison, food, secretions of endocrine glands. Syphilis in parents may cause profound disorders in the body and consciousness of their children. For this
reason, the descent of men of genius sometimes consists of inferior beings, weak and unbalanced (Carel 1935:247). Hereditary factors also played an influence on how open individuals were to environmental influence, for instance in one account the more intelligent were more responsive to environmental conditions, whilst the less intelligent were more formed by genetics (Jennings 1930:175). Galton himself developed a classification of characteristics which graded from those most affected by environment, to those least affected: this included (from least to most affected) physical abilities, intelligence, educational achievement, and personality or temperament (Blacker 1952:259). By admitting environmental influence into its deliberations, positive eugenics developed a model which combined aspects of both the Darwinian and Lamarckian paradigms of evolution, incorporating the model of the survival of the fittest with Lamarckian notions that changes to characteristics developed in one generation could be passed on to the next generation. Lamarckian notions were rejected by negative eugenicists such as Popenoe (1933:23) as ‘pseudo-science’. However Adams (1990), in an examination of eugenics movements in France, Germany, Brazil and Russia, finds that major eugenics movements have taken the Lamarckian approach in a number of countries. An interest in the potential of environment to improve breeding stock, which could then be passed on to subsequent generations, is therefore entirely consistent with the eugenics program as a whole.

As a corollary to the concerns of the population scare with issues of race, gender, demographics and intelligence, an economic debate was also introduced, in which individual eugenic value was defined in economic terms, rather than in those of race or social status. This had many outcomes: the debates over negative eugenics in the USA were to a large extent economic debates, over the economic value (or more
precisely the economic drain) which the 'subnormals' presented to the American economy (Paul 1995:134). In Britain, the work of Titmuss, during and immediately following World War II took a similar approach (Oakley 1991). Titmuss was largely concerned with a positive eugenics approach to improving the living conditions and environment of the 'virtuous labouring poor', with the intent of both reducing the drain on the public purse of providing for their welfare needs, and also of improving their economic productivity. For Australia, as an underpopulated, economically developing nation, the development and maintenance of human capital was critical for its continued economic growth, particularly as a response to the years of the Depression. Bailey responded to this need wholeheartedly: his aim was not to produce doctors and engineers (although he did support those who showed potential in those areas). His intention was to improve the ranks of the honest labouring classes: the farm labourer, the domestic, and the shop hand, in order to bolster the growth and vigour of the instruments of economic production.

Racism can be seen to be built on a conception of the proper relationship between the races which is fundamentally economic in character: that there are some races which are naturally owners of the means of production, and there are some races which are naturally designed to be sources of labour for these subjugated races. It can be argued that notions of racial superiority and inferiority are fundamentally based on the economic relations, which either exist, or are aspired towards, between the subjugator and the subject. In pre-modern social orders, these economic relationships then generate a discourse in which ethical, moral and religious principles are co-opted to reinforce these patterns of economic dominance and submission. In modern social
orders, the rational power of science is joined to these forces upholding the established set of economic relations.

Eugenics applied the principles of scientific rationality to the upholding of the racial status quo. It applied scientifically acceptable concepts of controlled breeding, which were given further impetus in the early years of the twentieth century by the discoveries of the new discipline of genetics. It played out these principles in an environment of conflict between different hereditary groups given scientific authority and legitimacy by the theories of Charles Darwin. In the Darwinian context it was easy, although totally unscientific, to substitute conflict between the races for conflict between species, with survival of the fittest being the desired result in either context. The end result of the struggle for the survival of the fittest was the subjugation of the other races of the world by the imperial powers of old Europe, which reached its peak in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Military subjugation was the precursor, and agent, of the extension of European economic domination over the other races of and nations of the world. It therefore followed that any decline in the military potentialities of the master races had significant implications for the future relations between the races. In these times before technology became the dominant force on the battlefield, military success was to be determined by the quality and quantity of the fighting force of the nation. Population issues were military issues, and the eugenics movement could very clearly draw on these concerns in promoting its programs. In allying himself with these views, Bailey strongly promoted the necessity of ensuring that Australia's racial stock was of a quality, if not a quantity, which would allow it to hold Australia against
aggression from other races. Eugenics provided a model, and a *raison d'être* for a program which sought to produce the kinds of Australians who would be able to fulfil this important role.

**Eugenics** originated and developed in times in which the economic position of the white races, even though still clearly dominant, was coming under threat. The forces, which eventually led to the demise of the British Empire, were emerging, and this coincided with the decline of British economic and military power following World War I. Britain was beginning to unwillingly relinquish its status as the world power to the United States. The rise of eugenics in Britain can be seen as a response to these forces, an attempt to recover and sustain the past glories of the Empire. Eugenics was "a biological way of thinking about social, economic, political and cultural changes" (Soloway 1995:xxiv), and was "a manifestation of growing apprehension about the future and concern about change" (Soloway 1995:22). British stock had already proven that it was superior to the rest of the world: what was now needed was the preservation and propagation of the best features of that stock to maintain Britain's rightful place at the head of the nations of the world. Soloway (1995) provides a comprehensive account of the progress of the population question in Britain in the twentieth century. His analysis is centred primarily on the internal social factors, in particular issues of status and class, which informed the debate in the UK, together with the peculiarly European concerns of Britain's differential birthrate, especially in relation to that of continental powers such as Germany.

Emancipation posed a similar, if more direct, threat to the economic domination of the white races in the United States, and its consequences were still
being felt in the early years of the twentieth century, as they are today. Free labour was no longer available to the former slave owners of the South, meaning the end of the plantation economy that had perpetuated their position of economic dominance. Poor rural whites were threatened with competition from the newly emancipated slaves for land; whilst urban whites now had to compete in the labour market with the freed slaves. The generality of the American response to emancipation is beyond the scope of this work; however, the American eugenics movement can be seen as one part of that response. American eugenics, more so than the British version, had a strong tendency towards negative eugenics. In particular this was directed at the ‘feeble-minded’, with popular studies of such families as the Jukes and the Kallikaks\(^1\), reinforcing in the public mind the dangers of the proliferation of the feeble minded in society. These dangers were always presented, in their fundamental form, in economic terms: the feeble minded were a drain on society who did not provide any worthwhile benefits back. At the same time, they threatened to pollute the breeding stock of ‘good white folks’ at a time when their economic well being had been undermined by emancipation. It is no accident that most of the ‘eugenic studies’ of the feeble minded in America at this time were of poor Southern white families, such as those detailed in Popenoe (1933), just the group which was subjected to the most intense economic conflict resulting from emancipation.

In Australia a similar pattern can be seen emerging. Australian intellectual and cultural roots were strongly influenced by British thought, and the Australian

---

\(^1\) The Jukes and Kallikaks were two families of poor southern whites, who were studied as prime examples of a genetic predisposition to petty crime, intellectual disability, and poverty. They
eugenics movement was strongly influenced by these principles. Australian thought still constructed the country as an outpost of the British Empire, and its ideas on race were very founded on this basis. Local circumstances were also fruitful sources of eugenic ideas. The perceived decline of the Aboriginal race appeared to be proof positive of the Darwinian notion of survival of the fittest among the races (McGregor 1997:59). Australia’s place as an Anglo-Saxon outpost in the Asian area also made it appear vulnerable to the populous Asiatic hordes to the north. The White Australia policy was a eugenic policy - it intended to maintain the racial purity of the Anglo-Saxon Australian population, not allowing it to be weakened by mixing with other racial types.

In Australia, these concerns with the size of the population had been manifested consistently since Federation. The 1904 Royal Commission into the Birthrate found “the signs of National degeneracy as seen in the decline of the birthrate” (Browne 1979:24), and attributed most of the blame on the declining birthrate to contraception (Browne 1979:37). In the early years of the century, the birthrate in Australia never exceeded 30 per thousand, declining to an all-time low of 16.4 per thousand in 1934 under the pressures of the Depression (Browne 1979:11).

Responses to this perceived problem varied: for some, as with the Royal Commission, the answer was to reduce the use of contraception, and encourage the formation of large families in all groups of the population. As the American eugenicist Popenoe (1933:110) argued, early marriages were the key to an increased...
population. For others, the only solution to Australia’s population problem was to increase immigration. While the traditional view of immigration, in accord with the White Australia policy, was that immigration should only be allowed from acceptable racial groups, others argued that Australia’s wide open spaces, compared with the overpopulated areas of Asia to the north, made it imperative that Australia accept immigration from these areas. This would both ease the general world overpopulation problem, and provide a buffer of good faith against an inevitable tide that would engulf Australia unwillingly (Wilkinson 1930:244).

**EUGENICS IN AUSTRALIA**

A comprehensive history of the Australian eugenics movement is yet to be written. The point of departure for the historiography of Australian eugenics is the work of Bacchi (1981). Bacchi characterised the development of Australian eugenics as occurring in two periods. Prior to World War I Australia had, according to Bacchi, been characterised by an optimistic, environmentalist approach, which stressed the capacity of improved social conditions to positively effect the growth of human potential. These were the confident years of Australian social policy experimentation. In such an environment, Bacchi argued, a eugenics of hereditary determinism struggled to thrive. A crisis of confidence immediately before the War, emphasised by the war experience itself, led to a more pessimistic view of the possibility of enduring social change. In this period, the ‘gloomier’ prescriptions of hereditarian eugenics enjoyed more enthusiastic support. Bacchi’s account became the basis for a

were standard inclusions in contemporary eugenic texts such as Popenoe (1933).
conventional view of the development of eugenics in early twentieth century Australia, becoming the underlying theoretical assumption for accounts of a number of specific instances of eugenic programs, including Cawte (1986), McCallum (1983), and Davison (1983).

Concern with the accuracy of Bacchi's formulation led to the publication of revisionist accounts of the development of Australian eugenics, primarily Garton (1994) and Watts (1994). Both found a greater complexity in the application of eugenics in an Australian context than was implied in Bacchi's account. Both found eugenics concerns manifested in the work of inter-war reformers in a number of fields, including educational psychology, sex education, maternal and child health, parental education, public health and medicine, urban reform, and delinquency and youth policy. Workers in these fields, whilst manifesting their eugenic concerns, also still exhibited a strong commitment to environmentalist solutions to social concerns. Eugenics as we have already seen, is a multi-dimensional phenomenon. The account given by Bacchi appeared to oversimplify what was a more complex historical and social discourse.

The revisionist approach to the history of eugenics in Australia locates the eugenics movement within a wider context of the contemporary debate on issues which went under names such as 'national efficiency,' or 'race hygiene'. Garton in particular locates this within a wider modernist discourse on the subject of degeneration, a concern that "modern civilisation was moving at such a pace that it was outstripping the capacity of humans to adapt successfully" (1994:176-7), or, in the terms which I have used above, the suicide of the white races. Symptoms of modern degeneracy included the declining overall birth rate, differential fertility,
mental deficiency, the problems of the urban poor, to name but a few, all of which were of concern to the contemporary eugenicist (Agar 1939). However, those who responded to these symptoms were not just those who described themselves as eugenacists. The response was from a variety of new professional constituencies and reformist societies: educationalists, psychiatrists, mental hygienists, baby health experts to name but a few. What all had in common was a shared discourse that moral, social or racial degeneration was the major issue facing modern man, and that the solution to this problem lay in the application of rational and scientific principle by a technically qualified and vocationally specialised professional elite:

Eugenics in Australia was an attractive, persuasive and credible aspect of a wide-ranging progressivist and professional culture in the years both before and after 1939. All shared a preoccupation with administering and managing a stable, well-ordered, healthy and intelligent citizenry able to contribute to the growth and development of the economy and to the defence of the nation or Empire... As exemplary children of the Enlightenment, “science” was the god of daylight, and its application to the solution of any number of pressing social and problems their main ambition (Watts 1994:324-5).

These aims and methods were of such common currency, that, as Garton (1994) demonstrates, groups within these progressive constituencies shared members, with no suggestion of conflict either of interest or intent. If eugenics advocated a particular method, that being the control of human reproductive behaviour, that did not make it incompatible with the program of, to use Garton’s (1994) specific example, the mental hygiene movement. In fact, a population which had the benefit of a sound mental hygiene program would of necessity produce eugenic results, by developing a more intellectually able group of parents from which to produce the next generation. These are the ‘eugenic consequences’ of individual action identified by Paul (1992), as being just as significant in the development of eugenics as the actions of organisations and agencies with specific eugenic intentions.
The influence of eugenic thought has now been charted in a wide variety of Australian endeavours in the years before World War II: including a wide range of social progressives and reformers (Roe 1984); in the child welfare movement (Garton 1986); the social application of craniometrical measurement (Cawte 1986); management of the insane (Garton 1988); the development of the Theosophy movement in Australia (Roe, 1986); in various manifestations in the educational system (Rodwell 1995, 1997, 1998a, 1998b); as well as in various recreational or leisure pursuits (Ramsland 2000; Rodwell 2000).

The Australian experience in the early decades of the twentieth century also offered a unique example to contemporary eugenic thought, the Australian Aboriginal. McGregor (1997) provides a complex and detailed account of the ‘doomed race theory’, by which it was held that the Aboriginal race, once having come into conflict with the superior white European race, was inevitably doomed to extinction. Aboriginal people had the dubious distinction at the time of being considered the ‘most primitive’ people on earth, hence Durkheim’s (1965) use of Aboriginal culture as the prime source for his The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. This was the necessary outcome of a Darwinian survival of the fittest, a battle which they were completely unequipped to win. Early unreliable demographics, together with the deductive logic generated by the certainty of European superiority, confirmed the theory for most of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. By the 1930s, however, more reliable census data was casting doubt on the inevitability of Aboriginal extinction. The theory nevertheless retained a strong legacy up until World War II, thus providing strong support for eugenic assumptions on the nature and eventual outcome of the struggle between races. The focus was shifting towards
a search for a solution to the growing number of Aboriginals of mixed descent in Australia (McGregor 1997:121-25). An environmentalist eugenic approach was one solution advocated and practised by Cecil Cook, Chief Medical Officer and Chief Protector of Aborigines in the Northern Territory from 1927. Cook’s approach encouraged the reproduction of half-caste children by half-caste mothers, the children to be brought up as whites; he would ‘breed out the colour’. Similar assumptions, of course, underlay the practices which resulted in the Stolen Generation, the attempt to de-culture a generation or more of Aboriginal children, by removing them from their natural parents, and bringing them up either in white families or in white-run institutions, effectively attempting to render them into pseudo-Europeans (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission 1997).

A combination of environmental socialisation and reproductive manipulation would thence result in an increase in the white population of Australia. Australian eugenics could thus point not only to a justification of its underlying assumptions in the supposed fate of the Aborigine, it could also point to practical experience in the application of environmentalist eugenic principles to problems of racial survival.

L.O. BAILEY, HOPEWOOD AND EUGENICS

Bailey clearly conceived of his program in eugenic terms. He agreed that there was a problem with the population of Australia, both in terms of quality and quantity, which needed to be arrested. He also subscribed to the view that there was a crisis in Western white civilisation, caused by this decline in the population. In Australia's case, he was also concerned by the vulnerability of Australia to attack from outside, a concern which was fully reinforced by the events of World War II.
Bailey believed that there was a need both to increase the population of Australia, and to make that population more fit for the task of defending Australia against any aggressors. His conception of Australia was as an Anglo-Saxon, white society.

![Figure 3-1: Bailey at Opening of Hopewood House, November 1944](image)

As the above photographs indicate, Bailey placed himself very clearly in the context of an Australian nationalism which saw itself as white, Anglo-Saxon, an outpost of the British Empire besieged by the dangerous hordes of the Far East. The patriotic juxtaposition of the Australian flag with the Union Jack aligns him both with a thoroughly Australian nationalism, and also with racial loyalty to the Mother Country, Great Britain. The introduction of the baby into the picture brings the Hopewood children, and Bailey’s entire project, within the legitimate sphere of Australian nationalism and Anglo-Saxon racial endurance. The baby is a symbol of hope for the vigorous perpetuation of these two ideals.
Health for Bailey was the key to Australia’s ability to improve the quality of its racial stock to a level where it would be able to successfully defend itself against aggression, and his own dietary solutions were the means by which this improved health would be developed. Bailey’s experiment at Hopewood had a two-fold aim - by the use of the children as a controlled scientific experiment; he would demonstrate the efficacy of his dietary program to the population at large. Secondly, the children were to form an elite group, scientifically improved by his dietary program, who would then be encouraged to interbreed, and pass these improvements on to subsequent generations. They were to be the basis of an Australian super-race. Bailey’s program is therefore entirely consistent with the wider aims and attitudes of the eugenics movement generally: he perceived a race-based struggle for survival, enacted in Darwinian terms of the survival of the fittest; he perceived the white races as in a crisis situation at the time in that struggle; and he saw modifications to the ‘germ plasm’ of society, and the control of reproductive behaviour, as a way to improve the racial stock in that struggle. His solution was one of positive eugenics, in that he sought to modify part of the environment of his subjects (their diet), in order to produce improvements which would pass on to the next generation.

Alexis Carrel

At this point it is prudent to make some more detailed reference to the man whose ideas, more perhaps than any others, influenced the formulation of Bailey’s eugenic ideas, Alexis Carrel. Biographical material on Carrel is drawn primarily from Warren (1999). Carrel (1873-1944) was a French physiologist and surgeon, whose professional life was divided between France and the United States, where he worked at the Rockefeller Institute in New York and the University of Chicago. His medical achievements included winning the Nobel Prize for Physiology in 1912 for work on
the suturing of vessels and the transplantation of organs; he developed during World War I, along with the English chemist, Henry Dakin, a solution used in the irrigation of wounds which is still a standard today; and with Charles Lindbergh of trans-Atlantic flight fame, developed a mechanical heart.

It was not Carrel’s medical exploits which enthused Bailey, however. In 1935 Carrel published *Man, the Unknown*, a philosophico-scientific treatise applying the benefits of contemporary scientific knowledge, and of the scientific method to knowledge about the nature of man. It became the best selling non-fiction book of the year. *Man, the Unknown* preached the contemporary gospel of the degeneration of Western civilisation, blaming such degeneration on the easy ways of modern Western culture, including medicine, which preserved the life of the unfit too easily, leading to a decay in the quality of the population. Carrel also ascribed to the ‘race suicide’ theory. The cure for Western civilisation was a return to a more natural way of living, including diet. Carrel preached a positive eugenic, urging the development of the strong to counterbalance the ‘democratic principle’ which brought everyone down to the weakest level. French eugenics had a peculiarly Lamarckian cast (Schneider 1990:103), and as we have already seen, Carrel believed that the germ plasm could be modified by environmental influences. Carrel therefore preached a eugenics which was positive, environmentalist, and based on the principles of ‘natural health’:

Modern civilisation, with the help of hygiene, comfort, good food, soft living, hospitals, physicians and nurses, has kept alive many human beings of poor quality. These weaklings and their descendants contribute, in a large measure, to the enfeeblement of the white races. We should perhaps renounce this artificial form of health and exclusively pursue natural health, which results from the excellence of the adaptive functions and from the inherent resistance to disease (Carrel 1935:201).

Eugenics is indispensable for the perpetuation of the strong. A great race must propagate its best elements...The free practice of eugenics could lead not only to the development of stronger individuals, but also of strains endowed with more endurance, intelligence, and courage...Modern society must promote, by all possible means, the formation of better human stock (Carrel 1935:279-82).
The ‘best stock’ would form a natural aristocracy who would freely perpetuate and improve their kind through eugenic unions.

Carrel’s theories were received coolly by the scientific and medical community, despite his popular success. He moved between France and the United States until 1941, when he returned to Vichy France. With the approval of the head of the Vichy government, Marshal Petain, Carrel set up an ‘Institute of Man’, to further research into the principles enunciated in *Man, the Unknown*. He suffered a severe heart attack in August 1943, from which he never fully recovered due to inadequate wartime food and medical care. Following the liberation of France and the fall of the Vichy government in 1944, Carrel was denounced as a collaborator, “a racist, a Nazi apologist and Nazi eugenist” (Warren 1999). Carrel did not live to answer these charges, dying from the effects of his ongoing heart condition on November 5, 1944.

According to Trop (1971:41), *Man, the Unknown* was the book which Bailey most frequently consulted. Bailey himself deferred to Carrel as an absolute authority on matters of health and diet: “Because of his wide experience, profound studies and eminence as a scientist at the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research we are bound to respect his observations” (YWAA Annual Report 1951:15). There is no evidence that Bailey ever met Carrel, gaining all his inspiration from his reading of *Man, the Unknown*. In fact, this could be said of all those who influenced the formation of Bailey’s ideas on diet and health and their relationship to society: Hay, McCoy, McCarrison, Shelton, Carroll as well as Carrel. Bailey was a voracious reader, and he took his reading in these areas as the main source of his inspiration, synthesising them within his own mind into that particular regime he was to implement in the Hopewood
Experiment. Carrel was attractive to Bailey precisely because of this preference for synthesising a diverse range of influences. He combined Bailey's commitment to natural forms of health and hygiene, with his ongoing concern with finding a solution to the problems of social degeneracy. He provided an authoritative template on which Bailey could base his thinking and practice. In this synthesis Bailey brought together the current discourse on the degeneracy of Western civilisation, the need for a eugenic solution to these problems, with the prescriptions of those purveyors of the natural remedies to both individual and social health problems. From Carrel he also inherited a Lamarckian approach to heredity and eugenics, a conviction that changes to the environment would produce changes in the current generation which would be reflected in subsequent generations. This was the core of Bailey's eugenic program at Hopewood.

It is perhaps interesting to note that many of the less publicly acceptable aspects of Carrel's thought have been sanitised in the later accounts of Bailey and the influence which Carrel had on him. In his public celebrations of Carrel's thought and his influence on him personally, Bailey only ever refers to him as a renowned physician, and recipient of the Nobel Prize. His later exploits in Vichy France, and the accusation of Nazi sympathies, are never mentioned. Bailey presents Carrel as an authority for his own ideas, and of course would not undermine this authority through such discredited associations. Similarly, neither Trop (1971) nor Raymond (1987) in their accounts of Bailey, provide such discrediting accounts. These are in the nature of what Goffman (1959:141) calls 'dark secrets', "facts about a team which it knows and conceals and which are incompatible with the image of self that the team attempts to maintain before its audience". Bailey the humanitarian benefactor of children is
clearly incompatible with any association with an individual with alleged, if unproven, Nazi sympathies. Those aspects of Carrel’s work which are inconsistent with the image of his own work which he wished to represent, have been excised by Bailey. Those aspects of Carrel which are consistent with Bailey’s work and vision, in particular his medical and scientific eminence, have been retained. The accounts of Trop (1971) and Raymond (1987) are both in intention thoroughly consistent with Bailey’s own representation of his work. They have therefore followed Bailey’s pattern in the ways in which they represent Bailey himself, and Bailey’s intellectual sources.

**Bailey’s Eugenics**

Bailey clearly conceived of Australian civilisation as under threat from a variety of sources. His statements, particularly those during and immediately following World War II, consistently refer to the nature of Australia’s struggle to preserve itself in a hostile environment. There remain significant gaps in the literature on the overall response of the world eugenics movement to World War II. Barkan (1992) for instance charts the changes in scientific concepts of race in the Britain and the United States in the 1930s, arguing that a changed concept was emerging well before Hitler’s racial experiments had discredited the entire discourse of scientific racism, including of course a race-based eugenics. According to Soloway (1995:312), “for more than two years after the outbreak of war in September 1939, the population question was pushed into the background of political, economic and social concern”. The prevailing opinion appears to be that whilst Nazi Germany became the main proving ground for eugenic assumptions during World War II, there was little ongoing eugenic debate within the Allied nation, who were of necessity more concerned with the exigencies of winning the war. Bailey’s response to the war casts
some doubt on this construction, certainly from an Australia context. For Bailey the war in fact provided proof of the underlying assumptions of the eugenic project: there was an ongoing conflict between the races, and, as Allied reverses early in the war could be used to demonstrate, the white races, especially the Anglo-Saxon race, was becoming enfeebled, unable to hold itself against more vigorous races. The historical context of World War II was in fact ripe for a continuation of the eugenic debate, and more work needs to be done by scholars to chart the progress of this debate. For the moment, Bailey does however appear as an exemplar of what may very well have been a broader eugenic response to World War II.

Bailey's rhetoric during this time combined the spectres of race suicide, racial enfeeblement, and the prospect of outside invasion of Australia. There is no doubt that in this case, World War II crystallised Bailey's thinking on eugenic issues, providing an absolute exemplar of both eugenic diagnosis of society's ills, and of eugenic solutions:

The future of our civilisation is menaced by two principle causes:

1. Extinction of our population through physical deterioration and falling birth rate.
2. Overthrow by invading forces


Even many years after the end of the War, Bailey was still thinking in the same terms:

Australia is a tempting prize to those who consistently work for the subjugation of the Western nations. The weight of numbers is against us...


Bailey agreed that the white races were becoming enfeebled, and there was a need for the formation of better human stock (YWAA Annual Report 1951:20-4). His views of the matter of the 'enfeeblement of the white races' were heavily influenced by his reading of Carrel (1935), quoting him at length in major speeches:

The democratic principle has contributed to the collapse of civilisation in opposing the development of an elite. Everywhere the weak are preferred to the strong. They are aided and
protected, often admired. Like the invalid, the criminal and the insane, they attract the sympathy of the public. As it was impossible to raise the inferior types the only means of producing democratic equality was to bring all to the lowest level. Modern civilisation, with the help of hygiene, comfort, good food, soft living, hospitals, physicians and nurses, has kept alive many human beings of poor quality. These weaklings and their descendants contribute in a large measure to the enfeeblement of the white races. We should perhaps renounce this artificial form of health and exclusively pursue natural health (Carrel cited in YWAA Annual Report 1951:20).

I will return later to the connection between Bailey's concepts of health and his eugenics ideals. However, it should be noted at this point that Bailey conceived of society in terms of a medical health model, drawing on eugenics as one of its measures of health. 'Natural health' principles were defined as the way in which health would be regained, or, in the terms of the eugenic debate itself, enfeeblement would be reversed. An unhealthy body could not defend itself against disease; an unhealthy nation could not defend itself against aggression.

Both quality and quantity of population were needed to increase if these population trends in Australia were to be reversed. Australia had a "desperate need of an increase in population" (YWAA Annual Report 1946: 10). However,

if Australia cannot have quantity, it should at least concentrate on the quality of the children who will inherit this Continent if we can hold it for them (italics added). The indications are that unless we admit aliens, we will find it very difficult to add appreciably to our small population. It is certain that the children which we save and rear are a better investment for Australia than will be the cost of settling desirable strangers. For this reason our work is of great national importance (YWAA Annual Report 1945:17).

Bailey's clear message was that in the fundamentally hostile world environment, as World War II had demonstrated it to be, Australia's survival would be determined by population issues. The Articles of Association of the Youth Welfare Association of Australia (Article 29) included the aim "To promote the increase of the population of Australia". These increases in population could only be achieved from within, as increases through the entry of 'acceptable' Anglo-Saxon immigrants had been ruled out:

Recent advice from England is to the effect that 'The Mother Country' will not part with her war orphans. England has her own population problem, and will need every baby she can
save. The indications are that unless we admit aliens, we will find it very difficult to add appreciably to our small population. It is certain that the children which we save and rear are a better investment for Australia than will be the cost of settling desirable strangers. For this reason our work is of great national importance (YWAA Annual Report 1945:17).

Although such quantity increases were impracticable in the short term, however utilising eugenic principles increases in quality could, and should, be attained. The first priority was, however, an increase in the quality of the Australian population. In the long term, a eugenically reproduced population would of itself prove more vigorous, thereby producing the desirable end result both in terms of quality and quantity.

Population then provided the key to national fitness and survival. As has already been noted in the discussion of the British and American background to eugenics thinking, the interplay between political and economic power of racially-political alignments provided a fundamental context for the population debate. Population, both quality and quantity, was the means by which continued dominance would be guaranteed in the world stage for its players. In the context of Bailey's time in Australia, this meant fundamentally that Australian population issues had to be determined in the light of Australia's place as a European outpost in an Asian geographic area. Japanese expansionism in World War II, although in the end able to be halted, was proof positive of the need for Australia to make positive progress in improving its population. In taking the line of quality over quantity, Bailey was in fact echoing the message of the eugenics movement from the time of Galton onwards. What was most important about a civilisation was not the quantity of the masses it was able to mobilise behind works of national importance. It was the quality of those contributing: whether this be the work ethic, stamina and discipline of the labouring and fighting masses, or the inventiveness and intelligence of the leaders of society.
In the context of the prevailing White Australia Policy, it was a more politically and socially acceptable alternative to develop from the basis of Australia's own white population rather than to import from overseas, particularly in view of the fact that, as noted previously, 'suitable' countries, such as Mother England, had their own population problems at the time and were not well placed to provide a large increase in population to Australia from their own resources (YWAA Annual Report 1945:17). As W.M.Hughes, said at the opening of the Belhaven Fete on 29 November 1947 (YWAA Annual Report 1947:20):

We Australians are a fortunate people; we have come through an era of abundance but we have no future unless we are able to increase our population to an extent which will allow us to make good our claim to hold this continent as a "white Australia". Unless we can do this some more virile nation will take over from us.

Bailey built his conception of quality around both physical, emotional and social qualities. Quality people were to be "sturdy and well trained", and "intelligent, capable and well-disposed" (YWAA Annual Report 1946: 3-10).

If we want to produce a race of super people, capable of holding Australia 50 years hence, we must start right now. We won't admit coloured people and whites won't come in sufficient numbers. Consequently, we will need to produce a population composed of supermen and women. Since we won't have sufficient numbers, we must have quality.

Definitions of desirable qualities were derived from functionalist views of appropriate citizenship. Bailey's defining characteristic of successful citizenship, and by extension of eugenic worth, was the capacity to contribute, in economic terms as part of the labour force, in military terms as part of the forces defending Australia from the inevitable foreign aggressors, and in reproductive terms as the progenitor of a continuing line of eugenically enhanced Australians.

Bailey's methods in establishing and developing the Hopewood organisation, and in particular his methods for the selection of children whom he would place under
his care, also betray his eugenic intentions. Bailey's selection process involved a careful screening of applicants in terms of the genetic potential of their parents, with only those who met his criteria being chosen.

In order to obtain 'subjects' for his experiment Bailey sent letters to Macquarie Street doctors requesting that they refer expectant single mothers to him. He detailed the diet regime to which the mothers could expect to comply. Mothers would be able to leave the babies with him so they could carry on with their lives. Expectant mothers could come to him after the third month of pregnancy (Trop 1971:18-19). Mothers arriving at the Belhaven Home for Mothers and Babies, were interviewed by Bailey, who ascertained if there was anyone else to support them. At this time it was also determined if the young women knew who the father of the unborn child was (Interview with Cockburn 1995). All this provided Bailey with some means of vetting the background of the mothers who brought their children to Belhaven.

More important than the background of the mother to Bailey, was that of the father. In reference to the fathers, Bailey states "in nearly every case the father of our infants was a member of one of the Armed Services" (Trop 1971:59). The army offered some guarantee that the fathers were physically fit and free from any sort of genetic deficiency, which would have interfered with the success of Bailey's experiment. In fact, Bailey could draw on a considerable amount of contemporary evidence to support the notion that enlistment in the armed forces was some form of guarantee of the physical and mental fitness of his charge's sires. Following Boer and First World Wars, there had been considerable concern expressed over the physical state of recruits to the forces. This had in fact been one of the major examples used
by the proponents of the ‘race suicide’ theory (Soloway 1995). In the years immediately preceding World War II, and during the war itself, considerable publicity was generated demonstrating that the Australian military forces indeed had a high standard of fitness. Parliamentary questions\(^2\) (24 November 1938) and a variety of newspaper and magazines confirmed the high standards of the military, with significant percentages being rejected during the recruitment process (up to 4%) for medical unfitness. This was to be maintained by high standards required by medical boards involved in the recruitment process. The fathers of the Hopewood children were invisible as far as participation in the process of placement at Belhaven and Hopewood went. They nevertheless were an important factor in Bailey’s overall scheme, ensuring that his children could be guaranteed a superior genetic inheritance, free from any hereditary taint or defect. In this way the war offered Bailey a number of opportunities, as Trop states (1971:12) “Had it not been for the war, Mr. Bailey would never have had the opportunity to put his plan into work on the large scale, which he actually set into operation.” The war provided Bailey with a prime opportunity of access to a group of genetically superior children.

Bailey’s eugenic model clearly presupposed the positive influence which environmental forces could bring to bear in improving the human stock. Whilst sharing the general eugenic concern over the impact of ‘defectives’ on the breeding stock of the nation, he nevertheless believed that “to a considerable extent a favourable environment can compensate for deficiencies at birth” (YWAA Annual Report 1945:3). Immediate ante natal and post natal conditions had the potential to

---

\(^2\) AG 7/SS DGMS 24/11/38
have far reaching effects on the overall development of the child (YWAA Annual Report 1954:6), as did the general conditions in which the child develops (YWAA Annual Report 1951:11). These prescriptions are not, of course, eugenic in themselves. They derive in particular from Bailey’s acceptance of the contemporary discourse regarding scientific parenting, which will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter. Bailey, however, took the general notion of the improving quality of a good environment to its logical extreme, with a eugenic intent. His was a program which intended to control the conditions of environment as closely as possible, with the aim of demonstrating the positive effect which such environmental control would have on health, vitality and, to some extent, behaviour. He hoped further to demonstrate that these positive improvements could be passed on to the progeny of the Hopewood children. The first stage of the process was the use of the children to demonstrate the efficacy of Bailey’s natural health regime: “The long term objective was to give the children the advantage of improved nutrition, thereby demonstrating the way by which our civilisation may regain its health and vitality” (YWAA Annual Report 1951:16).

Bailey’s response to the decline of Western civilisation, the enfeeblement of the white races, and the particular environment of threat in which Australia itself found itself, was to put them all on a diet. The virtues of this diet, as will be detailed in the next chapter, were such as to be able to restore their vigour and vitality. For Bailey however, even this objective was not sufficiently long term. He regularly spoke of his program as being conceived on a time frame of 50 years or more, for it was only over such timeframes that the true benefits of his regime could be fully manifested. Absolute fulfilment of his goals required a persistence of his regime.
across generations. It is at this point that Bailey's project moves from being another manifestation of the general contemporary discourse on national efficiency identified by Garton (1994), and becomes a truly eugenic project. Bailey hoped to reinvigorate society not just through a new diet, but by perpetuating the benefits of this diet into the next generation by influencing the future reproductive behaviour of the children under his control.

Once he had ensured the suitability of his genetic stock, and maintained and developed it through his program of health and diet, all that remained for the fulfilment of Bailey's eugenic ambitions was the perpetuation of the stock. It was undoubtedly Bailey's early intention that the children marry and continue on his work to subsequent generations. These were to be the progenitors of the race of 'super people' which Bailey spoke of in 1946. Article 21 of the YWAA Articles of Association specifies as one of its objectives:

To maintain contact with ex-inmates of the Association's homes by holding re-union gatherings or other means to invite their continued interest in the articles of the Association, and to encourage marriage between them by making loans to enable them to acquire and/or furnish their own homes.

and further

Prospects of ultimate success will be enhanced if later they marry amongst themselves and establish a community of like minded people...Perhaps a healthy community, such as we envisage at Hopewood, could serve as the leaven which will eventually uplift the Australian way of life" (YWAA Annual Report 1951:20).

Bailey states that he will favour "early marriages between the Hopewood children" (YWAA Annual Report 1953:10), and enunciates very clearly the expectation that the circumstances of the children's growing up together will in fact make it all the more natural that they will come to intermarry in the future, because

Every girl and boy will have an opportunity to share in matrimony with another who has been reared under similar circumstances which create a common bond. It will be our responsibility to provide industries and homes which will enable the young people who so desire to establish their families in this fertile area (YWAA Annual Report 1948:10).
Hopewood here emerges as more than the physical site for the institutional implementation of Bailey's natural health regime. Its future is very much envisaged as the site of an ideal community based on the principles of Bailey's natural health regime, populated by, at least for the next generation, the Hopewood children and the progeny of their intermarriages.

Contemporary media reports on Bailey's project confirm Bailey's intention to encourage intermarriage between the children as one of his long term intentions. An article on Bailey in Woman magazine in 1950 states:

He anticipates that some of these children will want to marry each other and he plans to help them do this, and establish themselves as parents of a new generation brought up as they were on a balanced diet. "What a big difference to the national health these children can make in time", he says, his eyes kindling (Lambert 1950:36).

The following photograph also appeared in Post Picture, with the caption "Four heirs of Hopewood. Each child is endowed with a portion of the estate, and Bailey hopes that they will intermarry when they grow up". There is

---

3 The source for this photograph and caption is a reproduction of the Post Picture article held in the author's collection. The reproduction does not indicate the date of publication, and the author has been unable to locate the original article. From the ages of the children, both in this and other photographs in the article, it would appear to date from c.1948-9.
very clear evidence, both from Bailey’s own statements and contemporary reportage of his activities, that the ultimate intention of Hopewood was for, in not all, at least the majority of the Hopewood children to intermarry and produce a second generation. Further evidence, drawn from the interviews with Hopewood children and others, will be discussed in later chapters.

Whilst Bailey was happy in these early years to discuss publicly this aspect of his plan, his later statements, and the sanctioned representations of his work, de-emphasise, or in most cases exclude, any reference to this particular objective. Early issues of the YWAA Annual Reports regularly reproduced copies of the YWAA Articles of Association, including the one relating to intermarriage of the Hopewood children. There was regular mention made there, and in his media interviews, of this objective. The last reference to this objective is made in 1953, whilst the last YWAA Annual Report to include the Articles of Association in full was in 1956. From that time on, the emphasis was on Bailey’s ‘Ten Point Plan for Health and Longevity’, despite the publication still being issued under the authority of the YWAA.

It appears that from the mid-1950s, Bailey chose not to make any reference to his intention for the children to intermarry and perpetuate his natural health regime eugenically to the next generation. That such an objective had been repudiated is further confirmed by Trop’s approach to the subject. Trop (1971:13-14) reproduces the YWAA Articles of Association. There is however no reference to any intention on Bailey’s part that the children should intermarry. History has clearly been rewritten in this case. Reproduction of an objective which was demonstrably not achieved is clearly inconsistent with the intended impression of Trop’s work, of a man
who successfully implemented a visionary project of natural health and child welfare. Changing attitudes to marriage, and to reproductive freedom, would also have made Bailey’s reproductive intentions anathema to the society of the later years of the YWAA. Again, the arts of representation have been used to manipulate the version of Bailey as publicly presented. His eugenic intentions now are a ‘dark secret’ which do not form a part of the sanctioned version of Bailey and Hopewood.

Bailey’s early statements in which he acknowledges the eugenic underpinnings of his project, emphasise both the biological and the social assumptions underlying Bailey’s Hopewood experiment. His intent is marked both by a desire to establish a social order based on his principles of healthy living, and to underlie that with the application of positive eugenic methods to ensure the continued viability of the genetic stock which would make up that social order for generations to come. Social progress is seen as consistent with and dependent on biological progress. The perpetuation of this social model required a set of interventions which were both social, in the ability to regulate behaviour within the institution of Hopewood and its successors, and also biological, in particular the need to ensure that the improvements gained in one generation were not lost in the next. This led to the need to encourage the early intermarriage and interbreeding of the Hopewood children. Hopewood represented to Bailey a nexus of biological, social and economic engineering, in which the values of good health and nutrition would be developed in the current and subsequent generations, to the point where his values would become accepted by, and the standard for, society as a whole.
CHAPTER 4 – NATURAL HEALTH AND DIET AS BAILEY’S EUGENIC ENABLERS

Although it is desirable to pay attention to all of the requirements to health, sound nutrition is the most important single factor. Discard denatured and refined foods and introduce more fresh and natural foods to your diet. If at all possible, grow vegetables in your own garden... Masticate thoroughly, overcome bad habits, keep your muscles in good order by walking and other regular exercise. Develop mental and physical poise... Be conscious of the recuperative powers of your body, your disabilities will pass away if you remove their causes. Health is natural. Disease is unnatural. Just as a cut will heal if kept clean, a bone will knit if held in position, so also will a body repair itself if it is properly nourished and afforded favourable opportunities to do so.

L.O. Bailey, Youth Welfare Association of Australia Annual Report, 1951

It is possible by means of proper diet and mode of living, to augment or diminish the stature of the individuals comprising a nation. Likewise, to modify the quality of their tissues and probably also of their mind.

Alexis Carrel, Man, the Unknown, 1935

INTRODUCTION

Bailey offered diet as a solution to the problems of modern civilisation. I have already discussed, in relation to Bailey’s eugenic conceptions, what the problems of
modern civilisation were perceived to be, the foremost of which was the 'decline of the white races'. Symptoms of this decline included deteriorating rates of fertility, reduced standards of health, reduced economic and industrial productivity, and declining standards of military capability. Bailey's conception of the current state of Western civilisation was clearly pessimistic:

Because we have concentrated on the invention and production of material aids to our comfort, leisure, entertainment and defence we are now suffering from physical, moral, and spiritual decay. Ours is a disunited, soft, sickly and pleasure seeking community... disease and demoralising influences are gaining momentum daily and will weaken us to an extent which will make it unnecessary for an enemy to use bombs against us (YWAA Annual Report 1951:9).

Modern civilisation was diseased, both actually and figuratively. The solution to the ills of modern society was good health:

If the masses in all nations enjoyed good health and were well disposed they would have the energy to produce an abundance for all; in such circumstances there would be no occasions for wars. If a big majority of our people were united and had the abounding energy resulting from good health no nation would dare to attack us, but whilst we are weakened by sickness and disunity we invite aggressors (YWAA Annual Report 1951:10).

Whilst many factors would contribute to good health, both of the individual and of the nation, "sound nutrition is the most important single factor" (YWAA Annual Report 1951:13). Good diet was then the guarantor of individual good health, of national good health, and of the health of the species being. If modern civilisation was indeed in decline, its decline could be arrested by the general application of proper dietary principles. If those who had received the benefit of these principles were to pass on their improvement to successive generations through eugenically desirable unions, then, as we have seen, the decline would be transformed into an ascent so much more readily. Diet then was the key enabler of Bailey's eugenic project: this generation would be strengthened by food, subsequent generations by the powerful combination of food, and stronger genetic stock nurtured on that food.
BAILEY’S DIETARY INFLUENCES

Bailey’s initial interest in dietary issues came as a result of private considerations, which he later came to apply to public questions. He suffered a health crisis in his middle years which he described as follows (Trop 1971:76) “By the time I was forty years old I could not stand without fainting, I was doubled up with sciatica and arthritis and I had completely lost the use of my right shoulder.” This account does not make it clear from a medical perspective exactly what condition Bailey was suffering from, and Bailey does not give any further illuminating details in any of his other writings. Whatever his exact medical condition, the experience, and more particularly the method by which he overcame the condition, became a defining one for him, and determined the basis of his future approach.

Bailey speaks of the “thrill of new life and hope...(l) experienced a re-birth, and such remarkably good results” (Trop, 1971:28-9) he felt when he began on the diet which he credited with turning his life around. The diet was based on the principles of American dietician Dr Frank McCoy, who recommended a combination of fasting, and the eating of foods as near to their natural state as possible. Whole fresh fruits, green salads and whole grains were the basis of the diet, although the eating of meat was allowed under McCoy’s scheme.

Bailey added to McCoy’s scheme the diet of William Howard Hay, the most widespread diet of the 1930s (Whorton 1989:116). Hay’s diet was based on the principle that carbohydrates and proteins should not be eaten together. The basis for the argument
was that the digestion of starch was initiated by an alkaline reaction in the saliva, whilst the digestion of protein was due to the acid action of pepsin in the stomach. Hay argued that if starches were eaten together with proteins, the alkali would be neutralised in the stomach, leading to indigested starch building up in the system. This would lead to a condition called acidosis, a build up of acidic material in the body, which would lead to a variety of diseases. Acidosis was a major popular health scare in the 1930s (Whorton 1989:116). Acidosis could be prevented by ‘compatible eating’, by the separation of carbohydrate based food from protein based food, and by the proper mastication of food prior to digestion. Hay presented his dietary regime as the solution to all of society’s ills: “compatible eating would eradicate disease-mental, moral and social, as well as physical-from the world” (Whorton 1989:116).

Bailey also took inspiration from the work of Sir Robert McCarrison, whose work with Hunzans of Northern India had indicated the benefits to be gained, both in terms of vigour and longevity, of a diet centred on raw vegetable and dairy products (Trop 1971:41); and from the ‘natural hygiene’ practices of Herbert Shelton, who urged a return to the natural principles of primitive man as the guarantee of health (Trop 1971:36). With the exception of the meat content, which Bailey disallowed from McCoy’s scheme, these were to be the basis of the dietary approach at Hopewood, the principles of which were enunciated in Bailey’s “Ten Point Plan for Health and Longevity” (YWAA Annual Report 1958:23) (see Appendix I to this chapter).
This was the dietary and health practice code which Bailey put into effect at Hopewood. For infants, the preferred food was mother’s milk (YWAA Annual Report 1945:10), however in the circumstances this was obviously not a practical solution. The next best food was fresh goat’s milk (a direct importation from McCarrison, who reported on the virtues of goat’s milk as part of the Hunzas diet) (Trop 1971:41), otherwise cow’s milk, and to this end a herd of each was established at Hopewood. Raw fruit and vegetable juices were to be added from the fourth month. Starchy foods were not introduced into the diet until 18 months or even 2 years, noting the misgivings with which the Hay diet saw the ingestion of starchy foods (Whorton 1989:116). Grated fruit, nuts, vegetables and a sprinkling of wheat germ were the major solid foods for infants (YWAA Annual Report 1954:9-10). Beyond infancy, an example of the daily diet is as follows: (YWAA Annual Report 1949:18-19):

| BREAKFAST | Milk flavoured with molasses  
|           | Cubes of raw pineapple sprinkled with wheat germ  
|           | Dessert spoon of emulsion  
|           | Several raw prunes  
| MID-MORNING | Milk  
| LUNCH | Half lettuce  
|       | Block cheese  
|       | Buttered wholemeal biscuits  
|       | 3oz almonds  
|       | Apple  
| AFTERNOON | Orange juice  
| DINNER | Wholemeal bread with assorted fillings (chopped parsley, grated carrot, egg yolk, vegemite, honey, sultanas, dates, kelp, sliced tomato or peanut butter)  
|       | Paw paw or banana  
|       | OR  
|       | Cooked spinach or peas and potato with butter and nut meat or egg yolk  
|       | Raw fruit  
|       | OR  
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Dinner continued
Junket with stone fruit lightly cooked in honey
OR (occasionally)
Meat meal with marrow and green vegetables
Fruit

Meat was occasionally incorporated into the diet early in the piece, to negate the objections of the Child Welfare Department and was quickly withdrawn (Trop 1971, Interview with Eric Storm 1997). In Bailey’s terms, the diet was to consist of “good health promoting foods” (YWAA Annual Report 1953:8). This was clearly a radical departure from the conventional Australian diet of the 1930s and 1940s described by Symons (1982:142-3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meal Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BREAKFAST:</td>
<td>Oatmeal porridge or commercial breakfast cereal with milk and white sugar AND Any combination of bacon, eggs, grilled or fried chops, steak, sausage, liver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORNING TEA:</td>
<td>Tea and biscuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNCH:</td>
<td>Cut lunch-Sandwiches, cake or biscuits, fruit OR Take away-fish and chips, pie with sauce OR Lunch at home-leftover corned beef with tomatoes OR omelette OR something on toast AND apple or banana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFTERNOON TEA:</td>
<td>Tea and biscuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DINNER:</td>
<td>Pea soup or broth AND Meat dish (beef or mutton), potatoes and at least two other vegetables, mint or horseradish sauce, possibly Yorkshire pudding AND Dessert-such as sago pudding, tapioca pudding, bread and butter pudding, roly poly pudding, apricot charlotte, fruit pie and baked custard, stewed prunes with custard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whilst the content of the diet, and its formalisation in the ‘Ten Point Plan’, relied heavily on the influence of the McCoy and Hay programs, Bailey was extremely catholic in developing his programs. The early years of the twentieth century, up until the Second World War, were fertile ground for dietary fads of one kind or another. Levenstein (1988) and Whorton (1989) provide detailed accounts of the development of a range of dietary regimes in the early twentieth century United States, whilst Symons (1982) describes the development of dietary practices over a similar period in Australia. The US model was clearly an inspiration to Bailey, and he drew on the wide variety of dietary theorists of the time. In particular, Bailey’s program can be seen to be a development of what later came to be described as the ‘new nutrition’ (Levenstein 1988:72-85, Whorton 1989:87) and the ‘newer nutrition’ (Levenstein 1988:150-6, Whorton 1989:88-9). The ‘newer nutrition’ of the 1920s and 1930s replaced the ‘new nutrition’ of the early 1900s in United States. The ‘new nutrition’ had been the result of late nineteenth and early twentieth century nutritional research which had:

established the physiological uses of fat, carbohydrates, proteins, and numerous minerals, (and)...had also devised and refined methods for determining the energy values for each type of nutrient, the rates of metabolism of people engaged in various activities, and so much similar data that they (nutritionists) were convinced they could now design ideal diets for all sexes, ages and occupations. With reason, they smugly referred to their science as the “new nutrition” (Whorton 1989:87).

The ‘new nutrition’ recommended that people select their food on the basis of its chemical composition rather than its taste (Levenstein 1988:46), and became the basis for a range of scientific interventions in public and domestic culinary activity, more of which will be discussed later. The ‘new nutrition’ was supplanted in the 1920s and 1930s following the discovery of the nutritional components we now know as vitamins. These discoveries were the basis of the ‘newer nutrition’, which also recommended a more scientific approach to the determination of the complexity body’s nutritional needs and
the foods which would best meet them. However, whilst the ‘new nutrition’ had concentrated on matching the body’s energy needs with the energy content of various foods, the ‘newer nutrition’ was concerned with more general issues of bodily and public health, in particular the intake of the so-called ‘protective foods’ (Whorton 1989:89). These were the foods high in vitamins and minerals that would combat disease and enhance health, rather than merely fuelling the machine of the body.

The ‘newer nutrition’s’ favourites were the fruits, vegetables and dairy products which were so generally lacking in typical diets of the time, and which of course we have seen were the basis for Bailey’s own dietary regime. Symons (1982:127-8) confirms parallel developments in Australia in the 1920s and 1930s of an interest in the vitamin content of food, and in particular traces the rise of that peculiar Australian addiction, Vegemite, in the period, in relation to its own specific claims to vitamin enriched virtue. The dietary literature generally, including that of Australia, provided substantial inspiration and support for Bailey in its promotion of the ‘newer nutrition’. Its program was entirely consistent with Bailey’s own preferences, in particular his preference for prevention rather than cure, and for natural over artificial health. Bailey was keen to locate his own program within the discourse of the ‘newer nutrition’ movement, describing his plan for a ‘Chic Salon Orphanage’ to Chic Salon staff in 1941 as a ‘Vitamin Home for Children’ (Trop 1971:10).

Bailey drew on a variety of influences in formulating his own dietary regime and child rearing practices. As Bailey put the case, there were:
psychologists, pathologists, dieters, dietarians, naturopaths, and several other modern sciences and cults... the general practitioner who is familiar with local conditions, and also the recommendations of practical people who have had much experience in the rearing of infants (YWAA Annual Report 1945:17-18).

and among the dieticians there were numerous schools of thought of which Bailey was cognisant. His approach to this variety of alternatives was that “Perhaps the best method would be to have regard to the views of all, and then to select the salient points from each, blending them into a plan which is appropriate for local conditions” (YWAA Annual Report 1945:18). Bailey’s approach was therefore both inclusive, in terms of the influences which he brought to bear in formulating his own approach; and contingent, in the sense that he was open to modifying his approach on the basis of individual conditions. While it is the purpose of this work to demonstrate an overall consistent intellectual program which underpinned Bailey’s practice at Hopewood, the consistency is perhaps one of degree, rather than demonstrating an absolute of intellectual rigour and consistency. We may expect contradictions and inconsistencies, and these are the contradictions and inconsistencies of an approach at once inclusive and contingent, with a variety of influences being subsumed, and regularly modified, within the milieu of Hopewood.

Whilst acknowledging the catholic nature of Bailey’s influences and accepting the inconsistency implicit in his wide ranging influences, a distinction needs to be drawn between Bailey’s practice, and that of the range of food faddists operating at the time, some of whom did he did draw on for influence. William Howard Hay was in fact widely derided as a faddist and quack, being described in 1937 as “the dietary hurricane with the most victims in recent years” (Whorton 1989:116). The 1920s and 1930s were a
fertile period for the faddists, who barraged the public with a range of cures, spurious or otherwise:

Ill equipped to distinguish between authorities sound and spurious, unable to separate the chaff from the whole wheat, the public of the 1920s and 1930s drew much of their understanding of diet from food faddists (Whorton 1989:95-6).

It is true that Bailey exhibited some of the characteristics of the food faddists, in particular his missionary zeal and conversion to the truth of the natural health gospel:

Almost universally proponents would tell of their own devastating health problems, miraculously cured by the proposed diet-mysterious or common physical or psychological ailments that had defied the greatest of modern medical minds had disappeared once certain foods were added or deleted from the diet (Levenstein 1988:86).

If Bailey took on aspects of the persona of the food faddist, he also modified the persona by his insistence on the scientific validation of his project. For the food faddists, their own experience was sufficient validation of the virtues of their regime. For Bailey, his own personal experience merely provided the springboard for the public demonstration of the virtues of his dietary regime. It should also be noted that the dietary formulations from which Bailey drew his influence were without exception prescriptions for a normative adult diet. Whilst Bailey’s ultimate aim was the adoption of his dietary principles by the population at large, his initial practice must necessarily have been directed towards the regulation of children’s dietary practices. The application of his dietary principles to the diet of the Hopewood children cannot therefore simply be accounted for in terms of the recommendations of the range of dietary and nutritional gurus he drew upon in the design of his regime. Specific application of such principles to children as subjects was also required.
BAILEY AND SCIENTIFIC PARENTING

I have already noted the rise, both throughout the world and specifically in Australia, of a range of individual movements deriving from a shared discourse of reversing the perceived trends towards national or racial degeneracy through programs covered by such terms as national efficiency or hygiene movements. These movements characteristically framed their questions in bio-political terms, questioning the virility, vitality, and long term health of the population of the nation-state or the race. I have noted not only a shared discourse between these groups, but further, as both Garton (1994) and Reiger (1985) have pointed out, they also shared, to a considerable extent, a common membership, drawn principally from the professional classes, both new and old. These classes offered their own particular solution, sanctioned by the authority of scientific method and evidence, to the perils which all agreed were facing contemporary Western civilisation. Scientific practice was in fact the panacea to most, if not all of society’s ills:

Throughout the first half of the twentieth century a consensus was constructed around the belief that the most effective way to manage a growing array of social and personal ‘pathologies’, including poverty, crime, juvenile delinquency, alcoholism, insanity, feeblemindedness, prostitution and venereal diseases, lay in the systematic development and application of scientific knowledge to their prevention and treatment (Dickinson 1993:387).

The manifestations of this movement were numerous: eugenicists, mental hygienists, kindergarten reformers and the scientific parenting movement all derived their inspiration and intended authority from within this broader bio-political discourse. The eugenics movement, as we have seen, sought to remodel reproductive behaviour along scientific lines in order to produce a more healthy, intelligent population. At the same time, reformers and professionals had been extending their influence to other aspects of family life. Women’s domestic labour and production, childbearing and child rearing, including
diet, were all now considered proper subjects for prescription and control by professional authorities (Donzelot 1997, Reiger 1985). Bailey's was a project enacted upon the bodies of children in the name of a scientifically authorised socialisation. It is therefore important to view Bailey within the context of the movement which has come to be known as 'scientific parenting', in addition to the already established context of the eugenics movement. Whilst Bailey's aims were primarily eugenic, his practice was most closely derived from the contemporary proponents of 'scientific parenting'.

The late nineteenth and early twentieth century have emerged as a period in which professional prescription and regulation of family life came to be extended. A new economic order made it necessary to supplement, or replace, the authority of the father within the home, whilst preserving mothers and children for the continuation of the species-being (Donzelot 1997). In Australia, concern with the growth of the Australian population, health, and intelligence, which as I have already identified, manifested itself in the growth of the eugenics movement, also manifested itself in a number of programs aimed at modifying child bearing and child rearing practices. A similar set of concerns and solutions has been identified in Canada (Dickinson 1993), and the United States (Richardson 1989). Like eugenics, these new movements developed a discourse based on efficiency and scientific practices, aimed at making the production and care of children proceed from the principles of scientific rationality:

Women were being confronted by a new group of middle-class child care professionals who were decrying and undermining the traditional mothering patterns, arguing that mothering should be taught along rational, scientific principles (Reiger 1985:128).

Reiger (1985) places this scientific approach to parenting within a broader context of the appropriation of women's role within the home by an:
ideology of technical rationality, the attempt to represent the family as governed by the same principles of means-end relationship, calculation and rational control, which are essential features of commercial and industrial activity (Reiger 1985:210).

In Reiger's account, the ideology of technical rationality was applied not just to child bearing and child birth, but also to areas such as women's domestic labour. Taylorist efficiency programs, codification and regulation were extended to domestic management (Deacon 1985:161-171), and the management of sexual relations and sex education within the family was prescribed on the basis of the pronouncements of professional experts. The key characteristic of all these movements was their replacement of traditional feminine knowledge with a new set of knowledge and practices owned by professional elites, on whom women would now be dependent for expert advice. The emphasis on technical rationality was in accord with the outlook of Bailey the businessman, as was the privileged status given to scientifically derived and codified knowledge, especially in view of his own intentions to demonstrate and promote his own program on a scientific basis.

The single most important influence on Bailey's application of the principles of scientific parenting was the work of Dr Alan Carroll. Carroll was a medical man and anthropologist, educated in London, who settled in Australia in the early 1890s after having conducted anthropological studies of the Maoris in New Zealand. He died in 1911, reputedly aged 110 (Trop 1971:38). He formed the Anthropological Institute of Australasia in 1893, edited an anthropological journal called Science of Man, and, most importantly for Bailey's interest in the scientific rearing of children, formed the Child Study Association of Australia (CSA) in 1901 (Izett 1915:10). According to Trop (1971:38-9), Carroll's ideas were more influential on Bailey's program at Hopewood
than any others, and the Child Study Association was the model on which he based the Youth Welfare Association of Australia. Refer Appendix 2 to this chapter - Objects of the CSA).

Like Bailey, Carroll was concerned with the overall health of the nation, like so many of his contemporaries diagnosing a degeneration in the levels of health and vigour. Health was the natural state of the human being, with disease being an unnatural state (Izett 1915:2). For Carroll, the solution lay in diet and nutrition, and in particular the diet and nutrition of infants and children: "One of the greatest causes for lack of physical fitness in a country such as this is the want of knowledge of parents as to the proper feeding of themselves and their infants" (Izett 1915:6). It was, like Bailey's, a gospel of 'Natural Health':

A healthy body is dependent on healthy, good living, which will give healthy blood and healthy germ-life in the blood....The way to prevent disease is to pay attention to the food we eat, and so keep the machinery of the body in perfect order. Once the body is unhealthy, the proper treatment, if health is to be recovered, is to abandon all unsuitable foods, and, instead of treating by means of harmful drugs the particular symptoms that appear, to endeavour to bring back the whole body and every part of it to a healthy condition (Izett 1915:81-2).

The nutrition of children was of critical importance in this equation, because "The foundation of the medical and physical constitution of a human being is built up during the first three years of life" (Izett 1915:8). The aims of the CSA were to scientifically study the nutritional and hygiene needs of infants and children, and to promote the results of this knowledge to parents for the benefit of themselves, their children, and ultimately, the nation (Izett 1915:9). Carroll's dietary prescriptions included a wide range of prohibitions, including red meat; a wider variety of prohibitions on food for children; as well as a concern with the eating of compatible foods to avoid acidosis which pre-dates the popularisation of such a program by William Howard Hay.
He provided detailed instructions on the pre-natal care of mothers, confinement itself, and on the feeding and care of infants, which included recommendations on sleeping patterns, and recommended weights for babies and children up to the age of four years. The work of the CSA was ‘socialised science’, (Izett 1915:4), and was enthusiastically accepted throughout the medical community (Gandevia 1978:133) and Sydney society generally. Carroll’s work and principles anticipated many of the later developments in the infant welfare movements of the 1920s and 1930s.

Bailey became aware of Carroll’s work around 1940 (Trop 1971:38). By his concentration on the dietary and health needs of infants and children, Carroll’s work provided a missing link in Bailey’s program: it linked his ideas on national degeneration, and regeneration through health, with a scientifically derived and regulated program for the growth and development of children, who by this time were to be the major focus of activities. Carroll had died long before Bailey had even begun his interest in child health and welfare issues, and the CSA had folded, the result of internal divisions, before his death. Nevertheless his influence, derived from Bailey’s reading of Carroll’s writings in
Science of Man, and from Izett’s 1915 account of Carroll and the Child Study Association, formed an important component of Bailey’s final program at Hopewood.

As Reiger (1985) demonstrates, even though Carroll and the CSA had ceased to be active operators in the child health and welfare movement by the late 1920s and 1930s, individuals and movements with similar aims and methods were in operation at that time. Programs such as the ‘Plunket System’, advocated by the Society for the Health of Women and Children in Victoria and New South Wales, applied the scientific ‘mothercraft’ principles of the New Zealander Frederick Truby King. The broad thrust of all such programs was similar:

This redefinition of maternal common sense as something which had to be taught, and by professionals, was the ongoing theme of the infant welfare movement...The very naturulness of mothering became redefined in the light of discussions about the need for mothercraft, and for the application of rational, scientific knowledge to the process of childbearing (Reiger 1995:132-9). Public health programs too became redefined towards the rational direction, supervision and control of the “care and culture of the body of the infant and the school child” (Gillespie 1991:52). The development of the kindergarten movement (Brennan 1998:14-15), and the Lady Gowrie Childhood Centres (Brennan 1998:40-1), who like Bailey practiced detailed measurement of children’s physical characteristics and progress, were other manifestations of the same tendency. Nature, as embodied in the maternal field, was being supplanted and directed by culture, by the rational demands of scientific method. This, as we have seen was one of the prime principles of Bailey’s own program, and he was clear in identifying that his own dietary principles were to be applied on a rational basis in the rearing of children:

Mother love is only good when guided by wisdom. It is our purpose to join with others in showing mothers and prospective mothers how to rear babies which will be a credit to them and the nation...Every girl who has worked at Hopewood for even a few weeks has learned much she
will be able to apply if and when she becomes a mother, thus quite apart from the direct benefit to
our own children a considerable amount of knowledge has been imparted to others (YWAA

Bailey thus saw his project as being in sympathy with the wider contemporary
approaches to the application of scientific principles to the rearing of children.

Bailey's project at Hopewood can thus also be seen in the context of a wider
program of intervention in and control of the family by professional elites over the 1920s
and 1930s. The rearing of children, and parent-child relationships over this period, were
being redefined by a wide group of professionals with "a series of connected strategies
directed towards a more complete control of the production of the individual" (Reiger
1985:153). These derived from the broader concern with national hygiene and efficiency
which lay behind the eugenics movement at the same time, and reflected similar bio-
political concerns with the ongoing vigour and survivability of the species-being,
manifested as the race and/ or the nation-state. The eugenics movement prescribed
regulation at the level of human reproductive behaviour as the solution to these ills.
What we have termed the ‘scientific parenting’ movement prescribed a different set of regulations, in the area of child bearing and child rearing practices. Health and eugenics were however closely linked in both official and unofficial thought, with medical supervision at all stages of life aiming to produce:

a race of strong, virile, stalwart individuals who would provide an invincible bulwark for defence in times of crisis or emergency...(Whilst accepting that physical fitness is) primarily an individual responsibility, but since it is an essential quality of soundly efficient citizenship it is obviously a matter of direct concern to the state (National Health and Medical Research Council, 1938, cited in Gillespie 1991:55).

For Bailey, scientific principle could be applied most importantly to the feeding of children and infants, as well as to other aspects of the child rearing and socialisation. Bailey’s models of infant welfare drew on recent and contemporary models of scientific study and prescription in the area of child rearing. Diet was a subject to which Bailey readily applied the principles of scientific parenting, in designing a regime which was thoroughly modern and rational.

THE SOCIAL MEANING OF BAILEY’S DIET

Diet was formulated by Bailey as the basis of good health. While such a formulation appears as the most basic common sense today, in Bailey’s time the connection between health and diet had only recently gained a degree of currency, and was far from a universal construction (Lupton 1993:73-85). The requirements of health included “harmony, reasonable nutrition and mastication, fresh air and correct breathing, exercise, sunshine, recreation and elimination. It is necessary to give attention to all of these factors more or less simultaneously” (YWAA Annual Report 1951:22). However “although it is desirable to pay attention to all the requirements of health, sound nutrition is the most important single factor” (YWAA Annual Report 1951:13), “the greatest
single factor in the acquisition and maintenance of good health is perfectly constituted food” (YWAA Annual Report 1951:15). Bailey attached a primacy to diet as a determinant of health, supported in no small way by his own personal experience.

Diet is, among other things, a set of social practices enacted upon the body of the recipient. When the bodies on which the practice is enacted upon are children’s bodies, the imposition of a diet takes on to itself the character of socialisation, along with its utilitarian purposes of nourishment of the body, and the emotional practice of developing the bond between the nurturing parent and child. In the context of the parent/child relationship, “it is also the imposition of a mode of living (a regimen) on a subordinate” (Turner 1996:176). If, as Turner (1996:177) argues, the achievement of personal control over diet is both a victory of the personal will over desire, while at the same time an imposition from without and a denial of will, the ability of the powerful adult to impose on the powerless child its own preferred version of diet is even more unequivocally the victory of the (adult’s) will over the (child’s) desire. It is a model of the process of socialisation, in which nature (the desire of the child), has form and order imposed on it by the rational will (Bailey’s dietary model). The body of the child in Bailey’s program is a site where social power relations are able to impose themselves through the discipline of diet. Diet is therefore not merely a neutral means to ‘good health’, it is a social value to be imposed as part of the process of creating the citizen.

Following the arguments of Turner (1996:199-200) further, disease itself also emerges as a social construction, rather than being endowed with a value neutral
connotation contained in the discourses of medical science. Turner critiques the distinction between 'disease' as a fact of nature not subject to cultural processes, and 'illness', a category derived from socially imposed notions of deviance and conformity. For Turner, disease is just as much contested as illness, with all concepts such as 'illness', 'disease' and 'health' resting on a fictitious statistical notion or an ideal state which is open to cultural determinism. Bailey's concern is with 'disease' rather than 'illness' and he thus at first glance appears to be operating within a model of medical science rather than within a social system. A close examination of Bailey's writings reveals that his concerns are derived from social values, particularly of a functionalist cast. His conception of the social consequences of poor health has already been dealt with in greater detail in earlier sections, dealing with Bailey's relation to the eugenics debates of the 1930s and 1940s. It is sufficient to state at this stage that Bailey saw poor health manifesting itself in the inability of the nation to defend itself adequately in war time, in the nation's poor industrial productivity, and in the decline in fertility in the Western world. Bailey promised that his dietary solution would improve the health of the individual, and through this it would improve the vitality of civilisation as a whole.

Turner (1996) presents the dialectic between the body and society as being grounded in the wider social dialectic between nature and culture, with the body being a symbol of nature which is subjected to the domination of society through the medium of diet. In Bailey's case, this opposition is made more complex by his location of his practices in what Lupton (1996:86) calls the "powerful discourse around the notion of 'healthy' and 'unhealthy' food...privileging 'nature' and rural living over 'culture' and
urban living.". Studies of many alternative food lifestyles have regularly shown this nature/culture opposition (Mennell, Murcott and van Otterloo 1994:45).

Bailey identifies his practices in a moral sense with the virtues of nature and simplicity, which are preferable from both a utilitarian and a moral standpoint to the complex refinements of modern dietary culture. In the end, however, Bailey's argument is still conducted within the discourse of scientific rationality. He has appropriated the moral purity of the romantic notion of 'nature', and used it instead to justify a set of practices which reinforce the dominance of culture, manifested through his dietary practices, over the nature of the body.

Figure 4-3: Healthy Children in a State of Nature, Bowral

Health was equivalent to a state of nature for Bailey, with disease an aberration, the result of failure to properly observe the principles of Natural Health:
Natural health is the health which our Creator intended as to enjoy when He fashioned us so wonderfully in His own likeness. The type of health which prompts the birds to give expression to their happiness in song, the dog to wag its tail and the foal to gallop around the paddock...surely God intended that we should have full enjoyment of natural health for the whole span of life. Disease is the penalty of departure from his plans for humanity (YWAA Annual Report 1959:3).

Similar programs such as the Nature Cure Clinic took this approach to the ‘unnaturalness’ of disease (Spencer 1993:311). Bailey’s dietary program operated within these principles, by purporting to offer a ‘natural’ method of ensuring that the body remained in its disease-free natural state, a state which would not require medical intervention through drugs or surgery. He called his system a system of ‘Natural Health’. Naturopathy, which he nevertheless acknowledged as one of his many influences, was a healing system only, a set of practices to be used when the body had already fallen into decay. Natural Health was a way of life (Trop 1971:33), a mode of maintaining the body in its natural state of health, a state in which disease was not to be admitted.

Poor health, as we have touched on previously, was not merely an individual problem, but a social problem, according to Bailey. Poor health was contributing to the decline of western civilisation, and it therefore followed that the principles of Natural Health were not just the solution to the health problems of individuals, but to the more pressing problems pressing Western civilisation. Bailey quotes from Carrel as follows (YWAA Annual Report 1951:20):

Modern civilisation, with the help of hygiene, comfort, good food, soft living, hospitals, physicians and nurses, has kept alive many human beings of poor quality. These weaklings and their descendants contribute in a large measure to the enfeeblement of the white races. We should perhaps renounce this artificial form of health and exclusively pursue natural health.
Bailey follows this by stating “We are striving to reverse these tragic trends by developing natural health and immunity from disease amongst the Hopewood children”. Bailey therefore locates his program within the discourse between nature and culture, in which nature is associated with virtue, and morality, and culture with corruption and decay. Man in a state of nature is portrayed as being free from any sort of discomfort or disease (in fact the archetypal Eden); and Bailey's naturally virtuous dietary program is presented as the method by which this modern Eden can be attained.

Bailey’s ‘nature’, however, is not a raw, uncontrolled nature. It is nature which has been transformed and controlled by the rational mind of man, nature that has been codified into a product, a dietary regimen. The intention of the application of reason is to dominate nature, and through that domination to dominate other men: “What men want to learn from nature is how to use it in order wholly to dominate it and other men” (Adorno and Horkheimer 1992:4). Through this application, Bailey's use of the discourses around ‘natural’ and ‘unnatural’ food become the instruments of rational domination of his subjects, the bodies of the Hopewood children, which are the true representatives of uncontrolled nature in this scenario. Diet, whatever the meanings which are given it by characterising it as ‘natural’, is a socially constructed regime of dominance and control which is enacted on the body of the child in order to transform that body into an object of social utility.

Diet had been for Bailey originally the solution to a private struggle. It took on more importance for him as he came to see it as the solution to a set of social issues with
which he was concerned. He transformed his private issue into the solution of a public problem. Even though Bailey's approach was characterised by a remarkable diversity in the sources of influence, it is nevertheless possible to identify an underlying consistency in his approach. Bailey sought a model of social control which drew on the positive power of the image of nature as a beneficent, virtuous power, while still retaining the power of the control of the rational mind over nature. Personal truth (the triumph of the codified regimen of diet over the chaos of disease) became public truth (a healthy lifestyle lived according to his rules would mean a healthy, robust civilisation, able to withstand whatever challenges were thrown at it).
Appendix 1 – Bailey’s Ten Point Plan for Health and Longevity

(1) FOOD SELECTION - The major proportion of intake should consist of uncooked natural foods in their unprocessed state-fresh fruit salads, vegetables, wheat germ, unpolished rice, nuts, honey, etc. The balance may consist of dairy products, lightly cooked vegetables, eggs, lentils, dried fruit and wholemeal bread, porridge and unsweetened biscuits; meat, fish and poultry if desired, but limited to once daily. Avoid refined denatured products such as sugar, white bread, or food made with white flour, confectionary, condiments, salt, cakes, pastry and dried food. Restrict tea, coffee and alcohol. A dessertspoon of molasses daily is recommended, also some pasteurised yeast powder.

(2) To assist digestion simplify meals by selecting compatible foods at each meal. See footnote.

(3) Do not eat whilst exhausted or emotionally disturbed. Eat slowly and masticate thoroughly.

(4) Maintain healthy appetite by restricting intake to intervals of four hours or longer. Do not eat or drink to excess. Restrict liquids at meals to a minimum. Better still, drink half hour before meal.

(5) At the onset of sickness refrain from all food or limit intake to raw fruit or vegetable juices. A short fast will prove to be beneficial. Study your mode of living and reactions to remove causes of indisposition rather than rely on habit-forming remedies. Most sickness is self-caused and avoidable. A healthy system which receives intelligent care and nutrition will function naturally without stimulation by purgatives or remedies.

(6) Avoid tension by accepting troubles and frustrations philosophically. Greater achievements are possible when the mind is normal, i.e maintain composure, have sufficient rest and relaxation, think constructively.

(7) Surface breathing is inadequate. Form deep breathing habits by conscious exercises each day.

(8) Take advantage of opportunities to absorb sunshine and fresh air. Exercise daily and regularly engage in some out of door activities.

(9) Maintain personal hygiene and posture, live intelligently, avoid extremes and bad habits, cultivate good friendships. Take a pride in personal health, efficiency and achievement.

(10) Occasionally consult professional men concerning preservation of teeth and general health rather than delay until restorative action is indicated.

Footnote-

Milk should be sipped slowly, taken alone or with fruit. Milk, junket and custard do not combine well with meat or starchy foods. The latter do not combine well with acid fruits or meat. Have salads and sweet fruits with starch
foods, such as bread, porridge, rice, potatoes and similar. With your meat meal you should take salads and lightly cooked vegetables, any fruit, excepting bananas.

(YWAA Annual Report 1958:23-4)
Appendix 2-Child Study Association of Australia-Objects of the Association

(1) The Saving of Child Life-and Suffering

(2) To Develop the Brain of Deficient Children

(3) To Instruct Parents as to the cause and treatment of all forms of Infantile Disease
   Including Infantile Paralysis, Convulsions, Epilepsy, Wasting from Malnutrition (wrong feeding), Adenoids, Tonsillitis, and diseases of the Internal Organs, Blood and Skin

(4) To advise as to the rearing of Children upon right foods

(5) The establishment of Municipal Milk Depots, for supplying milk of pure quality for infants and children attending city and suburban schools.

(6) To make known to all parents that pure milk is the one and only substance to sustain infant life.

(7) To educate the people to a knowledge of the injurious effects of the use of white bread, and the necessity to health of whole wheaten meal bread; the use of wheat flour, and wheat flour foods.

(8) That all patent foods and medicines sold to the public shall be analysed and, if found to contain an undue proportion of sugar or starch or any injurious adulteration, the sale of such foods shall be stopped in order that the enormous death rate of infants under six years of age shall no longer be a reproach to the State.

(9) To train medical students and others in such specialised subjects as will lessen the number of operations (mutilations) and the present enormous death-rate and suffering attending thereon.

(Izett 1915:viii)
CHAPTER 5 – CONSTRUCTIONS OF CHILDHOOD AND THE
UTILITY OF CHILDREN IN BAILEY’S PROJECT

As young animals can be trained, how much more readily training can be imparted to intelligent infants. All too often parents defer the job until personalities have been formed without intelligent guidance. Attention and co-operativeness by the pupil are basic qualities for all training; these can be cultivated almost from birth.

An outstanding need of society, is for people who will have greater regard for the general welfare; consequently parents and guardians should encourage infants to give and to serve rather than expect to be on the receiving end of the time. If this idea is not implanted in the child before seven years of age, an unbalanced character will result. Children are like young trees, in that if they get a crooked start their blemishes tend to become permanent with the passage of time.

L.O. Bailey, Youth Welfare Association of Australia Annual Report, 1961

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I will discuss the importance of a set of social constructions of the nature of children and childhood in Bailey’s project. Consistent with the bio-political dimensions already explored in relation to Bailey’s notions of eugenics, health and diet, I will explore the ways in which the social construction of childhood acts to reinforce the bio-political imperative for perpetuation of the species-being which is the dominant
theme of Bailey's project. Two aspects of the social construction of childhood will be singled out in particular: on the one hand, the embodied nature of the child as being; on the other, the child as becoming, in the process of socialisation. These will be seen as contributing to a set of practices in relation to children which legitimise the application of institutional forms of dominance and control in the name of two related ends of protection and social education. The particular application of such discourse and practice in terms of a welfare debate, especially in relation to the 'illegitimate' child, is also explored.

The Hopewood Experiment was an experiment conducted with children as subjects, who were selected by Bailey primarily for the purposes of his experiment. The children were sought out for their inherent eugenic utility, which Bailey's project intended to enhance. He controlled the life of these children in ways intended to further his experimental aims; and he regularly used these children in demonstrations as exemplars of the efficacy of the theories underpinning his avowedly scientific work. His experiment was conducted with the full knowledge, if not always with the full approval, of the State through the relevant child welfare authorities. His work was publicised, and even lauded, as a great contribution to child welfare, to the study of children, and to the future nation in which the children would eventually take their place as effective, contributing citizens.

The ethos of the Hopewood Experiment reveals a great deal about the ways in which children and childhood are and were viewed at that time. It reveals the historical
discourse about the perceived role of children in society, and the way these discourses define the proper uses to which society can put children. It can reveal notions of what a proper childhood should consist, and conversely the antithesis of a proper childhood. I identify the purposes to which these discourses regarding childhood and children have been put, with a view to identifying the critical structures of power and knowledge which generate, and are perpetuated and supported by, such discourses. These discourses are still prevalent today: current debates on children's rights, child protection, and the function of the educational system for instance, can all be seen as participating in the same discourses regarding the nature and function of childhood which informed Bailey's own program. Whilst there is nothing particularly unusual about Bailey's views regarding the importance of proper socialisation of children as the future of society, Bailey put these views to unusual uses. A eugenic experiment intended to use diet and health practices to breed a super race is an unusual way to put into place the commonplace that 'children are our future'. These issues will all be discussed below.

I also identify, primarily through the evidence provided through interviews with surviving Hopewood children, the ways in which these discourses are embedded in day-to-day institutional practices. The Hopewood Experiment provides an opportunity therefore to identify the ways in which discourse which is deeply embedded in social organisation is manifested in the praxis of everyday life, and of the ways in which individual responses are generated and presented in the context of that praxis. It is also hoped that the representation of these individuals' accounts can provide a vehicle for the
validation of their narratives, which may have been denied them by the structure and conduct of institutional praxis within the Hopewood environment.

I argue from the viewpoint that childhood is a social construct. Childhood will be viewed as a concept generated by certain social arrangements within society, and perpetuated by a range of other institutional arrangements, of which the total institution, as defined by Goffman (1973) provides the most relevant model within Bailey’s schema. Institutional practices of discipline, punishment and surveillance as identified in Foucault (1991) define the means by which social power/knowledge is imposed on the child in such arrangements. The constructions of childhood which are most relevant to Bailey’s derive from a set of nineteenth century discourses, perpetuated and to a large degree modified in the early twentieth century. Jamrozik and Sweeney (1996), using a schema developed by La Rossa (1986), identify a nineteenth century, Victorian notion of childhood as characterised by innocence, vulnerability, and submissiveness. Complementing this is a notion of the family, and especially of motherhood, as the prime provider of that nurturing, which shares the same degree of social contingency (Badinter 1981). This model of childhood, as constructed and validated by dominant discourses, provides the justification for institutional arrangements which these discourses characterise as protective, nurturing, and developmental. Works such as that of Bowlby (1980) have reinforced this notion by identifying the supposed negative consequences attendant on the removal of the nurturing, protective role of the mother. The twentieth century, according to Jamrozik and Sweeney’s (1996:26-31) schema, views children as developing beings. The emphasis here is on socialisation, with institutional arrangements
directed towards the education of the child towards effective citizenship. Whilst the historical emergence of these concepts can be identified, it is nevertheless the case that, particularly in the period in which Bailey developed his ideas and implemented his project, the two concepts existed side-by-side in contemporary discourses on children and childhood. Bailey's conceptual apparatus will be located within these discourses. Using Bailey as an exemplar, it will be argued that far from acting to protect, maintain, and nurture children, the concept of childhood as it has been constructed in the modern and post modern world, has in fact the potential to give rise to institutional arrangements which act to exploit, or even deny, those very qualities which it intends to uphold. In this way the concept of childhood will emerge as a fundamental dialectic, generating from within itself the seeds of its own downfall.

Sociological approaches to the study of childhood have, up until comparatively recently, focused upon childhood in the context of the sociology of the family and from the viewpoint of the adult. These primarily focus on the developmental aspect of childhood, with most attention being devoted to the socialisation process, and the impact of agents of socialisation on the child during the developmental process. Sociology has to a great extent, at least until fairly recently, borrowed from and in doing so implicitly accepted, psychological models of child development. More will be said on the concept of socialisation, and its conceptual basis later. More recent accounts (James and Prout 1997; Jenks 1982; Qvortrup, Bardy, Sgritta and Wintersberger 1994), have stressed the contingent nature of the concept of childhood, and have argued that childhood is a social construct, whose content varies dependent upon social circumstance. Ethnographic
accounts have been used to demonstrate the ways in which the concept of childhood various across geographic space and time. As Jensen and Suryani’s (1992) critique of Bateson and Mead’s (1942) classic study of Balinese childrearing demonstrates, concepts of childhood not only vary cross-culturally, they cannot necessarily be understood from a cultural framework derived from Western concepts. The work of Ariès (1962), Pollock (1996), Stone (1977) and de Mause (1995) trace development and variation in the concept of childhood over time, describing similar relativities derived from their particular social settings.

If childhood is to be understood then as a social construct, we need firstly to address and identify those elements of social structures which determine the manifestation of the concept in any particular social time and space. An appropriate point of departure here are the comments of Jenks (1982), in his introduction to one of the first major works exploring the idea of childhood as a social construct. According to Jenks (1982:12):

Childhood is to be understood as a social construct, it makes reference to a social status delineated by boundaries incorporated within the social structure and manifested through certain typical forms of conduct, all of which are related to a particular cultural setting.

Childhood can then be defined along two dimensions. It is a particular type of socially defined status, and as such can be understood by an analysis of the discourses which define that status. It is also manifested and perpetuated by a set of cultural practices both defining what is appropriate behaviour for those who are ‘children’, and also appropriate behaviour for those who are ‘adults’. I shall begin by developing a
broad appreciation of the nature of these discourses and practices as they apply generally to modern and post-modern concepts of childhood. This will then proceed into an investigation of how Bailey’s project can be placed within this framework, and of how an analysis of Bailey’s own discursive framework on childhood and his practice in relation to the children under his care. The implications of Bailey’s project can then be used to critique the constructed foundations of both the discourses which define the categorisation of childhood, and the behaviours which manifest and perpetuate childhood as a social category.

Membership of social categories is based on their members meeting a set of defined (either explicit or implicit) characteristics or criteria. Membership of these groups then becomes the basis by which power and authority are apportioned and enacted within particular sets of social circumstances. Gender (defined in terms of possessing the embodied characteristic of masculinity or femininity); and ethnicity (defined in terms of familial membership of the particular ethnic category) are two sets of social categories which derive from the same type of biological basis as does childhood. Childhood can be seen as a social category of the same order as these categories (James and Prout 1997:3), with the exception that category membership is not immutable to the same degree as the other two categories. Biology determines the fact that everyone passes through the stage of child, whilst also ensuring that everyone stops being a child at some time.

Childhood can therefore be defined as a social category which is age-based. Social constructions of the criteria for membership vary as to the physical age which is
used as the defining criteria, and these criteria are often the product of a range of social, cultural and legal constructions which are not necessarily consistent, even in a single social context. For instance, in the current Australian socio-legal framework, the following ages can all be defined as the being the criteria for membership of the category ‘child’, dependent on the purposes for which the categorisation is made: 10 years is the age at which children are first considered able to be tried as a criminally responsible actor; 14 years is the age at which children may be tried criminally without the burden of proving that the child was aware that their act was criminal in nature; 16 years is the age of sexual consent; and 18 years is the age a person is first able to legally purchase and consume alcohol, and the age at which the full benefits and responsibilities of citizenship, including the ability to participate in elections to choose the government of the day, is conferred (Cuneen and White 1995).

While these constructions of the criteria for membership of the category ‘child’ vary even within a single context, they nevertheless clearly identify that the prime signifier of the category is age, however expressed. Membership of certain age ranges defines one as a child. Behavioural indicators are also important in this context, for instance an adult can be said to be acting ‘childishly’, that is, either in a way which indicates he has not been properly socialised, or in a way which indicates he requires protection from the implications of his own actions. These are however signifiers of deviance, rather than indicating a reassignment of social category. There is no question that an adult who behaves ‘like a child’, will be treated as a member of the category ‘child’. From this definition of category, certain characteristics are ascribed to its
members (the discourse on the category of children), and certain behaviours are both expected of it, and are expected to be enacted towards it (Brown 1998:1-12).

THE DISCOURSE ON THE CATEGORY OF CHILDHOOD

Childhood can therefore be defined as an age based social category. While the specific ages at which an individual can be defined as a child are clearly socially constructed, and subject to some internal social variation dependent on the purposes for which the categorisation is being made; youth is the clear determinant. Childhood is that period of life between birth (primarily an aspect of the embodied individual, but also an actual, if not necessarily formal, entry into society), and adulthood (primarily a social status, but reinforced, if not necessarily formally defined by, the attainment of the characteristics of the embodied adult). Childhood is therefore an aspect both of the embodied individual in society; and of the process of socialisation. These two concepts form the basis for the prevailing discourses on the category of childhood.

The Embodied Child

The most obvious defining characteristic of the child from the day of its birth is its physical vulnerability in comparison to the members of the adult world who surround it. This physical inferiority is an absolute fact for the infant and very young child, diminishing in relative status as the child grows. The child is dependent on adults for food, shelter, hygiene and for emotional support and nurturing. Adult praxis towards the helpless embodied child is primarily that of protection, care-giving and nurturance: “Crucial to the definition and position of children in society, is their total helplessness and thus dependence on others for care and protection” (Gittins 1998:52). The child is
defined as the rightful receiver of this care, protection and nurturance because of its physical state of dependence, because of the clear facts of its embodied nature.

It is a clear characteristic of the discourse surrounding childhood that its meanings are constructed not just around its physical state of dependence, but are extended to cover areas of emotional and spiritual dependence. ‘Innocence’ is here the primary quality of childhood. While the argument is in many ways circular (to be 'innocent' is necessarily to be 'childlike', whilst the 'child' is of necessity 'innocent'), the primary content of the concept of innocence can be derived from the embodied nature of the child. Innocence is an emotional or spiritual state which requires protection, care and nurturance just as the dependent physical body of the child requires this same support. In literature and the visual arts, the clearest representations of innocence are those in which the child is at its most physically vulnerable, most in need of care. The younger the subject, the more powerful the representation of innocence.

Figure 5.1: Hovepwood Children at prayers. The caption for this picture, which appeared in 1948 in Picture Post, read “The children kneel together to say their prayers. Johnny, at left in the front row, weighed only three and a half pounds when born prematurely.”
This picture is typical of the ways in which Bailey developed representations of the Hopewood children as worthy innocents, derived from a vulnerable physicality based on those Victorian constructions of childhood innocence (Jamrozik and Sweeney, 1996:24-6) which persisted into twentieth century discourses. Acceptance of the ‘innocence’ of children was the necessary precondition for the child-saving movements of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and Bailey used such imagery as that depicted above to locate his program within that discourse, ensuring both government and popular acquiescence or support for his program.

The key point to consider, is that the embodied status of the child, and in particular the vulnerability generated by its lack of physical power and its absolute dependence on adults for the satisfaction of its physical wants, is a primary determinant of social conceptions of what childhood is, and what it represents. A child is by definition a physically incapable body which must have its physical capabilities supplemented by society. The concept of innocence, as applied to childhood, extends this by arguing, that a child is also an emotionally and morally incapable entity, requiring a similar degree of protection from the emotional and spiritual rigours of adult social life as they do from its physical rigours.

Alongside this notion of the innocent child derived from the inescapable fact of their embodiment, is an associated potential for evil, particularly derived from concerns over indulgence in precocious sexuality. The body of the child as a sexual being is incompatible with the child as innocent. In Bailey’s time, precocious sexuality of any
sort was viewed as a key link in a chain reaction leading through mental abnormality to a life of crime and dissipation (Kociumbas 1997:157). The 'precocious masturbator', whether it be male or female, "was now considered to be in danger of psychological breakdown as well as physical and moral degeneration", and could be identified as one of the factors contributing to 'race suicide' (Rodwell 1998:90). 'Innocence' could only be guaranteed by restricting children's access to knowledge: "Protection suggests keeping children 'innocent' by keeping them ignorant, rather than offering them the necessary information and knowledge to protect themselves" (Gittins 1998:151).

The concept of innocence therefore plays an additional role within the overall discourse on childhood. It embodies an image of sexual ignorance, which reinforces an ideal of social docility and compliance, legitimising further adult control of social knowledge, and adult dominance in the socialisation process. Certain types of knowledge are defined as socially dangerous, and children are to be kept innocent (read ignorant), until adult sanction is given to the passing on of that knowledge.

Children have a unique embodied status within society. As such, this unique embodiment resulted in the creation of children as a unique social category, with childhood as a unique social status. Children are 'unfinished' adults, both physically and mentally/emotionally. Their physicality defines their prime social category membership, and legitimises a range of social practices which constrain their social action, power, and access to social knowledge.
The Socialising Child

The discourses surrounding the embodied child focus on the child as being. The second set of powerful discourses which conceptualise the modern and postmodern child focus on the child as becoming. These can be broadly characterised as proceeding from a concept of socialisation, in which the child is conceived not in terms of what it is in current physical embodiment, but in what it may become. It may be argued that this is a universal construction of childhood. Whilst what follows is based on a set of historical Western constructions of the nature of childhood, the vast body of ethnographic literature on rites of passage and initiation (for example, Allen 1967; Read 1966; Herdt 1982; Bateson and Mead 1942), indicate that the need to define, and signify, movement from adult-in-the-making to adult-in-fact, is a universal social preoccupation. This problem can be seen to be derived both from the complications already noted in relation to the physicality of the child, and also from the need to signify the completion of the socialisation process, a move from non-citizen to citizen.

Alongside the concept of the child as embodied innocence, the concept of the child as adult-in-the-making is perhaps the next most powerful socially constructed definition of the nature of the childhood. While there are many statements of this concept, that by Durkheim will define the essence of the concept as well as any other:

This essential function of this age (childhood), the role and purpose assigned to it by nature, may be summed up in a single word: it is the period of growth: the period in which the individual, in both the physical and moral sense, does not yet exist (emphasis added), the period in which he is made, developed, formed... (The child is) a becoming, an incipient being, a person in the process of formation (Durkheim 1982:146-7).

As has already been alluded to, this emotionally and spiritually charged construction of childhood is of itself a modern phenomenon constructed out of particular social
circumstances. Both Boyden (1997:192) and Cunningham (1995:177) note a modern shift from the attachment of an instrumental value to childhood to an expressive value. Labour market developments, economic growth, the welfare state, and the development of a professional and semi-professional class dedicated to the care of the non-labouring child, have all helped reduce the dependence of the family on the labour of children. They have therefore removed the previous instrumental value attached to the child, and of course particularly that attached to the healthy male. The value of the child is now an expressive issue, tied to sets of emotional discourses about love in a familial setting, and to representational discourses which define the value of the child as an adult-in-the-making.

The emphasis on the child as adult-in-the-making can be derived from the very discourses which society uses to construct its definitions of citizenship and adult membership of society. If the adult world of effective social citizens is defined by rationality over irrationality, by the social over the pre-social, by mentality over embodiment, and by complexity over simplicity (James and Prout 1997:10), then it must necessarily follow that the only definition which can simultaneously value the mores of the adult world, whilst simultaneously ascribing the expressive value of the child, is one which values the child not in terms of what it is, but what it will be, and what/who its parents are. The child is in fact not valued at all for itself, and is socially marginalised: “Within such a conceptual scheme children are marginalised beings awaiting temporal passage, through the acquisition of cognitive skills, into the social world of adults” (James and Prout 1997:11). Social competence is defined in terms of adult praxis
(Qvortrup 1994: 4), and therefore the critical instrumental value of childhood is in the ability of the child to develop this competence, and to internalise the values and praxis of adult society. Childhood then becomes a period of cross-cultural assimilation (James and Prout 1997:15), in which the dominant adult culture seeks to impose its cultural values on the subordinate culture of childhood. This is called the process of socialisation.

Functionalist accounts of childhood have been perhaps the most prevalent accounts of childhood proffered by the social sciences. Derived from broader traditions of Western social thought, emphasising 'progress' (the growth of the child); the triumph of reason over nature, particularly identified by Adorno and Horkheimer (1992), (the child 'learns'); and the control over the self and separation from others, socialisation discourse underpins most sociological thought on the nature of children and childhood. Socialisation accounts of childhood focus on "the learning of any orientations of functional significance to the operation of a system of complementary role expectations" (Parsons 1982: 139). Socialisation accounts dismiss the embodied aspect of the child, concentrating instead on its behavioural patterns, and in particular the process of acquisition of adult modes of behaviour: "along with the lack of biological maturity, the conspicuous fact about the child is that he has it to learn the patterns of behaviour expected of persons of his status in his society" (Parsons 1982: 139). The process of childhood, according to functionalist accounts, is then the acquisition of the cognitive and behavioural orientations which define the characteristics of citizenship in a society.
The child is therefore represented by functionalist accounts as being engaged in a process of becoming, teleologically being transformed (Jenks 1982:14) into its intended object, the fully socialised and functioning citizen. The motive force for socialisation is not its present state, but its desired future state. In such accounts, the essence of the child, and the value of the child, is not in its present state of embodiment, but in the proposed future state into which it is being transformed by the process of socialisation. Functionalist accounts of childhood are therefore inherently concerned with the future, rather than the present, of the child. Childhood becomes theoretically defined then as the period in which social futures are constructed, and thus is a critical, if not in fact the most critical, stage for the development and continuation of the values and mores of society. The definition of the social category of childhood becomes then a key facet in the development and continuation of a society's definition of itself. The category of childhood provides for the formal segregation of a group of potential members, for the purpose of inculcating them with the values of society. This perpetuates those values and allows those potential members to develop the appropriate modes of thought and behaviour which will enable them to gain the status of citizenship.

From a socialisation account, childhood has the social function of guaranteeing the continuity of agreed social structures. This can be extended to the concept of the nation and the race generally: “the nation and the race were conceptualised as living, evolving organisms whose physical and mental health was linked to that of the children who, themselves in a state of flux, were its most crucial component” (Kociumbas 1997:131). The ‘health of the nation’ can be directly related to the ‘health of children’
(Gittins 1998:75-6), with a particular emphasis in this case on the health of the national race, rather than any particular concept of the nation-state. Children are a vital component in the bio-political machinery, providing the physical guarantee of perpetuation of the species-being. There is however a clear relation between the development of childhood as a concept, and the issue of race survival:

childhood 'was invented' in order to enable the (bureaucratic state) society to assure the best social replacement according to the value judgement of the powers of the moment.

The 'production of best replacement' is a two-step process that is often dealt with, both on the theoretical level and in practice, as two separate processes. The first step is the production of the right quantity and desired quality of children. This process is usually referred to in theory as 'patterns of fertility', and in practice as 'family planning' or 'fertility policy', and is considered to lie in the domain of expertise of demographers or practitioners of social medicine. The second step is the attempt to transform the children into desirable future citizens. This aspect of social replacement is usually dealt with by experts in areas of education, religion, philosophy etc. (Shanagar-Handelman 1994:255).

We can then clearly place the generation of the childhood concept, as defined by functionalist accounts, within a framework of eugenics. Socially defined structures develop strategies for their own reproduction. These strategies are enacted in sites of physical reproduction, where the aim is the production of children whose physical and mental capabilities meet the society's criteria for effective citizenship; and at sites of moral and behavioural reproduction, where members of the category 'children' are socialised into the modes of thought and behaviour which will enable them to move into the category 'citizen'. All of these criteria-physical, intellectual, moral and behavioural make up the complex of what it means to be a citizen. Eugenics seeks to influence both these sites, by controlling physical reproductive behaviour to enhance the production of children who meet the desired criteria, and who will be most able to be effectively socialised; and by influencing the sites of moral and behavioural reproduction, to ensure that eugenics principles are included as part of the curriculum at these sites. The eugenics model can clearly be derived from, and is in fact dependent on, an interpretation
of childhood from a socialisation perspective. Historically, eugenics has been as much about socialisation as it has been about heredity. The prime aim of eugenic reproductive control has been the continued dominance of groups pre-disposed to certain forms of socialisation. The feeble-minded are dysgenic precisely because they cannot be socialised in accordance with the dominant paradigm. It is further supported in this by being a future-oriented approach, which derives the value of the child from its potential to meet, in the future, the defining characteristics of the eugenically reproduced social group.

The Childhood Concept

The conceptual basis of the concept of childhood can be seen to be socially generated. Whilst childhood has primarily been discussed as a concept, i.e. the product of a set of discourses, it is more appropriately described as a social category. Membership of the social category is primarily ascribed by age, although a version of membership may be putatively assigned to those who meet the criteria of the category in other ways (for example the mentally handicapped who may be categorised as child-like and/or child-minded). The construction of the concept of childhood derives both from its embodied status within society, and from a class, or functionalist society's constructions of the best ways for society to ensure its own reproduction and replacement. The embodied nature of the child defines it as helpless, needy and innocent. Children both come to be represented as, and are representations of, the quality of innocence. They are also seen, both practically and ideologically, as the carriers of the future potential of society. They are seen as adults-in-the-making, with a consequent emphasis on the
propagation of acceptable modes of thought and behaviour. The question then needs to be asked, what are the consequences of these socially constructed models of childhood for social practice in relation to children?

Childhood Practice

Frønes (1994:148) identifies what he calls four dimensions in the study of childhood: relations among generations, which consists in the social and cultural relations between adults and children; the study of childhood as an age group, involving the social position of children as a class in relation to power structures; the institutional arrangements relating to children, their upbringing and education, particularly those agencies and institutions which have been created for the performance of some activities in relation to children; and relations among children, which includes peer relations, child culture, children’s activities and their use of time.

For my purposes, these ‘dimensions’ relate primarily to what has been defined as the practice of childhood, and provide a set of useful categories for the examination of these practices. Whilst they are informed by, and derive from, the set of discourses which construct the social category of childhood, these dimensions focus primarily on social practices in relation to those belonging to that particular social category. The first three ‘dimensions’, focusing on inter-generational relations, institutional factors, and childhood as an age-based social class, relate primarily to the practices of adults in various manifestations, on children. If there is a role or a voice for children in these dimensions, it is generally a passive one. This is the social dimension inhabited by Bailey and the institution of Hopewood, which will be explored from Bailey’s point of
view in this chapter, and, from the children's point of view in the next two chapters. The fourth dimension, covering the relations between children and the social structures created by them, will be the second focus in the children's accounts covered by the next chapter.

**Adult's Praxis on Children**

I have already identified, following the lead of Qvortrup (1994:4) that social competence is defined as adult praxis. We can identify the source of this definition of competence in both sets of major discourses regarding the category of childhood which have been discussed. The helpless embodied child clearly requires adults to act on the child, and on its behalf on the child's environment, as it does not possess the physical capabilities nor skills to be able to effectively operate on its behalf. Additionally, if we conceive of children as being the physical embodiments of the ideal of innocence, the interactions between the child and its environment should be on terms defined by adult praxis, lest the innocence and purity of the child be besmirched by unfettered access to potentially polluting influences. A functionalist perspective overtly defines the primacy of adult praxis in relation to children's. Learning, socialisation and education are adult-generated practices imposed on children for the purpose of generating socially acceptable sets of behaviours from the children. Children cannot be accepted as fully socially competent citizens until they can demonstrate their acceptance and application of the rules of the adult world.
Adult praxis on children can be manifested in each of the three dimensions identified by Frønes (1994) which relate specifically to adult-child relations.

*Relations Between Generations*

This is primarily the site of the sociology of family. Intergenerational relationships are primarily defined and played out in the context of familial relationships. Clearly, in most instances the category of childhood is most explicitly relevant within a familial setting, and the family is one of the major sites at which adult praxis on children is enacted: "The fusion of childhood into the family institution becomes the main frame of reference when dealing with children, both formally and informally" (Makrinioti 1994:268).

It is not intended to pursue in detail issues relating to intergenerational relations in a familial context at this point, due to a limited relevance of family concepts to the Hopewood Experiment as a whole. While Hopewood was represented as a family, through familial nomenclature ('Daddy' Bailey, ‘Aunty’ Madge), and reinforced in variety of references (the Annual Reports in particular are full of references to the ‘Hopewood Family’), this was merely representation. Though represented as a family, Hopewood’s praxis was institutional rather than familial. As such, issues of relations between generations as such become less important than the issues of power and control inherent within an institutional setting.
*Children as an Age-Based Social Class*

Whilst definition of children as a true class may be problematic, definition of childhood as a proto-class provides the opportunity to bring in a set of interesting perspectives which will add to our understanding of the nature of adult praxis towards children. In taking a contingent class perspective towards children, I will adopt a classical Marxian standpoint that class relations are determined by relationships to the ownership of the means of production. In taking such a view, it in fact emerges that children's class being has a unique feature. Children have particular relations with the means of production (in modern and postmodern Western societies on which this work is based, the relation is either potential, given the advent of child labour laws; or inherited, based on their parents' class). As well, children are in many ways the objects of production, with a 'child industry' being focused on the performance of work on children, and professional, semi-professional, skilled and unskilled workers all directly dependent for their livelihood on this work.

Children work. Whatever the status of child labour laws, children still work, primarily in the home. Much of the work is unpaid, and consists of menial household chores. Task selection, allocation and overall goal setting is by adults: "Not only do children not control their own lives, but they are asked and/or persuaded (and many times even forced) to invest their own resources-physical strength, intellectual capacity, and emotional power-in goals not of their own choice" (Shamgar-Handelman 1994:252).

Children's work is surrounded by alternative discourses, being defined as 'chores', any wages being defined as 'pocket money', to distinguish itself from the real work of
competent adult production. Nonetheless, within a socialisation framework children’s work has a definite function, beyond the actual mechanics of achieving the overt goal of the work activity itself. Capitalist modes of production are socially reproduced in children’s work (James and Prout 1997:240). Where work is performed in exchange for ‘pocket money’, this clearly replicates capitalist modes of wage payment. In instances where no formal payment is made, the intent is still very clearly to introduce the principles of labouring and its rewards, including hopefully the development of appropriate work ethics and attitudes, in the child. In fact, its very exploitative nature may mirror more accurately capitalist modes of production than the parents who allocate the work may care to admit:

> the work children do is neither appreciated nor recognised as proper work. Instead it tends to get marked as “development” or “learning” and by this means translated into activities that are the natural province of children of effects of the work that others (parents, teachers) do for children. (Alanen 1994:39)

As such, children’s work acts both to enforce the denial of children’s competence in terms of adult praxis, whilst at the same time reinforcing their status as adults-in-the-making, their value principally resides in their success at gaining competence in this important aspect of adults praxis. Work then is imposed on children, not only for the sake of completing a particular job, but as part of a program to ensure that the child has the orientations and the skills necessary to take up its place in the workforce at the appropriate time. In this sense children may be seen as a proto-class, class members in the making.

Alanen’s (1994) comments above also point to the second major way in which children participate in production relations, and that is in the important role that children
play in being work for others. Children play a significant economic role in modern and postmodern societies as objects of production itself, and also as consumers of products specifically designed for children: toys, games, clothes and so on. The concept of childhood has made available the labour category of ‘childwork’, which then has become an economic means of subsistence for a significant proportion of the population (Oldham 1994:45). ‘Childwork’ is a legitimate occupational grouping which ranges from child care work through to teaching and the highly professionalised medical and extra-medical groups who support the modern process of child rearing.

The professionalisation and medicalisation of child care is a process which occurred concurrently with the formulation of Bailey’s own ideas which led him to the formulation of the Hopewood Experiment. By 1918 ‘childhood’ had been defined ‘professionally’: ‘it was increasingly defined in relation to educational, medical, welfarist and psychological jurisdictions, and it was clearly separate from adulthood’ (Hendricks 1997:51). Babyhood was now clearly defined as a medical phenomenon (Cunningham 1995:153), with the medical professions attempting to define the exclusivity of their power/knowledge paradigm over childbirth and child rearing practices. This was despite the pressures of the ‘new professions’, particularly the rising body of knowledge of psychology, especially child or developmental psychology (Kocimtubas 1997:148). These scientific principles were then passed on to, and expected to be implemented by, lower status labourers in the area of childcare, such as nurses, teachers and child care workers.
‘Childwork’ also produces the child as a cultural product, an object of consumption. As Bourdieu (1986:231) states,

A cultural product...is a constituted taste, a taste which has been raised from the vague semi-existence of half-formulated or unformulated experience, implicit or even unconscious desire, to the full reality of the finished product, by a process of objectification which, in present circumstances, is almost always the work of professionals.

Childwork produces a particular product, the compliant, educated, healthy child, the bourgeois child, in a process analogous to that which Bourdieu (1986) identifies for the production of cultural consumer goods. The ideal bourgeois child is an object of class distinction in the same way that other cultural goods are, a signifier of taste and a property. The Hopwood child was a cultural product, created by a professional process of childwork, offered to the public for limited ownership and access. For Bailey the businessman, the Hopwood child was just another product to be marketed and sold in a marketplace, and manipulation of the marketplace to define children as desirable cultural products was an integral part of his practice.

I have noted previously the debate over the application of scientific principles to child rearing as an ideological issue, locating it within the broad framework of early twentieth century scientific rationality. This has pointed to the ways in which the scientific/rational model provided a means of dominance and control for man over nature, in this case over the unruly nature of the unsocialised child. The scientific model of child rearing offered a powerful tool to the social agents of authority who sought the continuation of currently validated models of social structure through a socialisation process. This analysis can be enriched by understanding the class implications for the promotion of this approach. Ownership of scientific power/knowledge regarding
children is primarily vested in the medical and associated professions. Primacy of a scientific/rational discourse in relation to child rearing privileges the owners of that discourse as the legitimate providers of what I have called ‘child work’. I have already discussed the extension of scientific modes of work and surveillance in the family in relation to the notion of ‘scientific parenting’, with regard to the work particularly of Donzelot (1997) and Reiger (1985). ‘Child work’ therefore emerges as a particular form of production, whose practices have been formulated in modern and post modern times within a rational/scientific discourse. The owners of this discourse have a privileged position in either the direct provision of child work by their own professional labour; or by the establishment of principles for child work which are to be followed by other lower status workers within the field.

Childhood can be seen in economic terms, then, not merely as a site at which capitalist modes of production are reproduced. It is also an object and site of production itself, at which modes of discourse regarding child rearing practice compete for primacy. The praxis of child work is defined by the dominant mode/s of discourse, which then guarantees the occupational status and economic survival of the owners and users of that discourse. Childhood is, among other things, about labour: about who does it, where it is done, and how it is done.

_Institutional Arrangements Related to Children_

Childhood, almost without exception, takes place within the context of institutions. The family, of course, takes the prime place here. I have, as discussed
above, chosen to limit discussion of children within the sociology of the family, as the social model of the family is not a particularly useful one to apply to Hopewood, despite the representational surface. Institutions which replace the family, have been developed as part of the provision of social welfare within modern post-industrial states, either through charitable provision or the development of the modern welfare state. Bailey’s project was conducted during a time when the provisions of the welfare state, particularly towards family support in terms of the extension of child endowment, were being extended in Australia. However, as both Roe (1976:104) and Watts (1987) point out, the extension of welfare state provisions in Australia in the late 1930s and early 1940s were primarily determined by political and economic concerns, rather than a considered desire to extend government action into the sphere of welfare provision per se.

Intervention in Australia in the area of child welfare can take place in three modes (Picton and Boss 1987:8): the residualist mode, the economic-industrial achievement mode, and the institutional-universalist mode. The residualist mode defines intervention only when primary and secondary resources of the family or neighbourhood have broken down or been found to be lacking. Under the economic-industrial achievement approach, welfare provision is only made in the overall interests of the economy. As noted above, Roe (1976) and Watts (1987) have demonstrated that this was the primary mode of intervention by Australian governments in Bailey’s time. The institutional-universalist argues that access to welfare service provision should be open to all as a right. With the exception of the first moves towards the establishment of welfare state provision identified by Watts (1987), the primary mode of welfare provision in Australia in the
1930s and 1940s was still a residualist one. The application of residualist modes of provision have been most prevalent in the child welfare area, where the historical emphasis has been on child rescue or saving (Mason and Noble-Spruell 1993). Rescue or saving is of course dependent on an assessment of the breakdown of the safety net of familial or neighbourhood structures which is the prime determinant of the residualist mode of intervention, and derives from those constructions of childhood in terms of innocence and socialisation:

Children are vulnerable to adult power not only because of innate biological factors but also because of the very structure of child-adult relationships within the family and the wider society. Child welfare policies have traditionally focused on protecting children in their vulnerability through paternalistic interventions aimed at rescuing them from inadequate or deficient parents (Mason and Noble-Spruell 1993:30).

Within this consensus that children in positions of vulnerability required welfare intervention, there was a significant debate on modes of substitute care which could provide alternatives to residential, institutionalised care, such as foster care or adoption, and voluminous data on the dysfunctionality of large-scale residential care (Picton and Boss 1987:77; Mowbray and Mason 1993:113). Despite the successful implementation of large scale ‘boarding-out’ or foster care systems in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century (Ramsland 1974), institutional care remained a solution to service provision for children without other means of support in the inter-war years and beyond. These years were accompanied by a drop in the provision of ‘boarding out’ provision (Dickey 1987:120). In his extensive enquiry into the formation of Australian child welfare, Van Krieken (1992:145) also identifies the “historical persistence” of institutional interventions.
The consequences of institutional care on individual emotional development has been most thoroughly documented by Bowlby (1980). Bowlby's central thesis is that 'maternal deprivation', or the absence of a "complex, rich, and rewarding relationship with the mother in early years, varied in countless ways by relations with the father and with the brothers and sisters" (Bowlby 1980:13), is the cause of a variety of mental health problems. One of Bowlby's particular concerns was the prevalence of problems deriving from 'maternal deprivation' in children raised in institutions. Bowlby's thesis has been criticised, particularly from a feminist perspective, for its stereotypical view of motherhood and failure to recognise the importance of a hierarchy of attachment figures in the child's development (Holmes 1993:45-9). However, his recognition that early emotional attachment of some kind plays a critical role in later social development remains valid. Institutional care has consistently failed to provide those kinds of attachment, and this was equally the case with Hopewood. Experiencing love at Hopewood was, as the children's experiences, recounted in subsequent chapters demonstrate, a fortuitous accident rather than an emotional guarantee. Those lucky enough to catch Bailey's eye, or another Bailey staff member, were able to develop those bonds. Most, however, experienced the negative consequences observed by Bowlby in similar institutional circumstances. It is of course of further significance that one of Bowlby's particular subject groups were 'illegitimate' children, where his approach argued for better support to mothers, and better adoption services, as alternatives to large scale institutional care (Bowlby 1980:122).
'Illegitimate' children have been one of the groups of children most subject to institutional intervention. Separation of the child from the mother and placement in an institution was normal practice (Teichman 1982:109), at least until recent years when single parenthood began to be supported by more institutionalist-universalist welfare interventions. These provided financial options, which increased the level of choice for single mothers with otherwise limited options for supporting their children. As Reckie (1998) has demonstrated, illegitimacy has been constructed in a variety of social discourses. Late eighteenth and nineteenth century approaches to illegitimacy derived from Malthusian notions of the dangers of unrestrained population growth (Reckie 1998:50). By the early twentieth century, a set of alternate discourses had arisen. Of particular interest within the context of Bailey's project, are those discourses on illegitimacy deriving from eugenic, racial and mental hygiene discourses. In the context of the ongoing population debate already discussed in Chapter 3, illegitimate children were seen as having a positive social value. They provided a solution to the problem of race suicide and of re-population, after the devastation of World War I (Reckie 1998:75-8), if they could be physically and culturally integrated into the life of the species-being. Preserving and enhancing the health of illegitimate children became a priority. Measurement of assessment of the intelligence of both illegitimate children and their mothers was also intensified, based on eugenic concerns of a link between feeblemindedness and illegitimacy (Reckie 1998:120-3). In the years between the wars, welfare interventions for illegitimate children were thus conducted within a bio-political discourse, which sought to establish the position of such children in relation to the race or
nation-state, and to establish measures which would allow the species-being to be strengthened by the integration of the illegitimate children as functional citizens.

Illegitimate children thus presented a special welfare case, in which notions of the rescue or saving of innocent beings merged with wider bio-political issues of socialisation, and survival of the species being. Homes which provided pre-natal, birthing and ante-natal care for unmarried mothers and their children had been established in the United Kingdom after World War I (Reckie 1998:76), and may have provided additional inspiration for Bailey’s own project. This is exactly the approach which Bailey took in developing and promoting his own project. He regularly referred to his charges as ‘fatherless children’, his own position was to “stand in the place of a father to our 86 dependent children” (YWAA Annual Report 1954:2). He clearly viewed his project as utilising a resource of children which would have otherwise have been lost to the nation, notwithstanding their illegitimacy:

The fact that we make provision for these innocent children does not mean that the Association condones infidelity. Being realistic we hold that in view of Australia’s desperate need of an increase in population it is better that these infants be born than that they add to the forty thousand babies who are lost to Australia each year because of interference before birth. It is for society to provide for them in such a way that they will become self respecting and useful citizens. As we see it, intelligent, capable and well disposed young people will constitute the real wealth of nations in the future (YWAA Annual Report 1946:10).

The protection of ‘innocent children’, socialisation and the perpetuation of the nation state, combined to justify welfare interventions which would utilise the potentiality of illegitimate children. Institutional philanthropy of the type proposed by Bailey thus provided an acceptable solution which once met could be integrated into these prevailing discourses without official investment, but which still provided a mechanism for the operation of official systems of power/ knowledge. As Donzelot (1997:55) argues,
philanthropy acts to: "ensure the development of practices of preservation and formation of the population while at the same time detaching it from any political role and yet applying to it a mission of domination, pacification and social integration." Philanthropy could act as an agent of the state for the protection and the socialisation of the child, and philanthropic intervention could perhaps best be understood and accepted by the state if executed through institutional means. It remained for Bailey to develop the type of institution which Hopewood would become.

Even though the family is the primary social institution which impacts on the lives of children, it has limited utility as an account of Hopewood experience. School is perhaps the second most important institution encountered by most children during their socialisation. Educational and developmental psychology has a well-developed literature describing how things do occur, or how they should occur, in school. Bailey was certainly aware of contemporary thought on these matters, and drew on them in his own eclectic way. The institutional structure of school, with its assigned time span, structured daily timetable, and specified educational objectives is not that of Hopewood. Hopewood was intended, as far as possible, to be that total institutional and socialisation experience for the children until they reached the age at which they chose to leave. It must be remembered too that Bailey actively opposed the children’s attendance at public school, and sought instead to establish a school within the grounds of Hopewood, run according to his own principles. Institutional analysis from the point of view of educational sociology are therefore likely to offer limited opportunities for analysis of the Hopewood Experiment.
If we are looking for models that can enlighten the praxis of adults on children, and the practical application of dominant modes of discourse about childhood, there are two sets of institutional models which appear at face value to offer the closest parallels in structural terms to that of Hopewood. These are, firstly, the orphanage; and secondly other total institutions such as prisons. Goffman (1973:15-17) defines the characteristics of the modern total institution:

Their encompassing or total character is symbolized by the barrier to social intercourse with the outside and to departure that is often built into the physical plant, such as locked doors, high walls, barbed wire, cliffs, water, forests, or moors...The central feature of total institutions can be described as the breakdown of the barriers between...(the) three spheres of life (of sleep, play, and work). First, all aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the same single authority. Second, each phase of the members' daily activity is carried on in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and required to do the same thing together. Third, all phases of the day's activity are tightly scheduled, with one activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole sequence of activities being imposed from above by a system of explicit formal rulings and a body of officials. Finally, the various enforced activities are brought together into a single rational plan designed to fulfill the official aims of the institution.

Further, total institutions share other common features with Hopewood. Membership is more or less involuntary; all daily activities are regulated by the institution, even though the physical location of some (for instance schooling or work) may take place outside the institution; and the production and reproduction of particular modes of behaviour is one of their major objectives. Murcott et al (1994:113) also point to the significance of food (its quality, quantity, regimentation of mealtime) as a defining characteristic of total institution, and this was certainly a critically defining characteristic of Hopewood in the children's experience. The orphanage has the additional advantage that its praxis relates directly to children. The prison inmate, whilst analogous to the child in its non-citizen status, is still an adult, which changes the dynamic of social control and socialisation to which he is subject within the institutional context.
Whilst there is a significant academic literature on the operation of total institutions for adults, including such recognised classics as Goffman (1973) and Foucault (1991, 1994), there is a much less well-developed literature on total institutions for children. There are a variety of biographical or historical accounts of individual institutional life. These cover such areas as the Aboriginal stolen generation (Hegarty 1999; Edwards and Read 1989); orphan asylums and children's homes (Jaggs 1989; Smith 1982); state wards (Barbalet 1983); English child migrants (Bean and Melville, 1989; Gill 1997; Humphreys 1995); Barnardo's children's homes (Moore 1990); and the Christian Brothers homes in Western Australia (Davies 1994). There is however no thoroughgoing attempt to synthesise these and similar accounts into a more generalised account of institutional practice within the specific milieu of the 'total institution' for children.

These institutions have been primarily designed for the purposes of segregation and socialisation of children who have been defined as deviant or whose lack of social resources has left them marginalised. Deviance may be racial, behavioural or moral; marginalisation can result from the removal, or non-availability of resources, such as those provided by the traditional nuclear family, for their care, protection and upbringing. In the case of illegitimate children, including those in Bailey's case, they are both deviant, being the product of morally and legally unsanctioned unions, and marginalised, given the lack of social support and resources available at the time to provide real choices of care for their mothers.
The institution in such cases thus necessarily takes on its total character in its application to all aspects of the child’s socialisation. Control and domination are exercised by the institution in the interests of combating deviance, which becomes the primary concern of the institution. Care and protection are defined by those physical arrangements of the total institution identified above by Goffman (1973), and which operate as a given in the background of institutional practice. The foreground of institutional practice in these institutions is not that of care and protection, but of the techniques of discipline and punishment of which Foucault (1991) provides such a detailed account. Whilst Foucault’s primary concern is with the development of penal and carceral networks from the eighteenth century onwards, his treatment is applicable in the broader sense to the examination of the application of social power/ knowledge in other institutional frameworks (Caputo and Yount 1993:5). From all of the accounts above, the punitive character of the institutions in questions emerges as their strongest common characteristic.

For Foucault, institutional power exists to guarantee the docility of the human body with the intention of enhancing its utility as a subject (Foucault 1991:136-8). This is achieved through the codification of regulation, the enforcement of regulation through disciplinary punishment, all of which are reinforced by a constancy of supervision and surveillance (Foucault 1991:134-5). Constancy of surveillance acts to interiorise the inspecting gaze, to define the inmate as the source of its own surveillance (Foucault 1980:155). Institutional practice as characterised by Foucault, therefore consists of a series of technologies: technologies of discipline, which define the bounds of institutional
behaviour; technologies of punishment, which define the sanctions for transgressing institutional regulations; and technologies of surveillance. If we accept that childhood is constructed in such a way that legitimises institutional interventions, this is also to accept the practice of institutional discipline, punishment, and surveillance. Children have limited resources of social power, which is only emphasised when they are removed to institutional settings, for their own ‘protection’ or ‘education’.

The Practice of Socialisation

Socialisation is a function of all societies. It passes on those modes of thought and behaviour which express the values, and define the nature of, the society. Socialisation is also, primarily, a function practiced by adults on children. Children do not choose to be socialised, rather the decision to be socialised is made for them, either implicitly or explicitly, by the adults who control their lives. Familial practices, the organisation of labour of and on children, and the structure and practice of the social institutions which deal with children, all reflect the centrality of these modes of social control in adult practices on children.

BAILEY AND CHILDREN

The discussions above are intended to develop, primarily from a theoretical standpoint, a notion of what childhood means socially, the kinds of values and ideas regarding childhood that exist socially, and social intentions about childhood. The remainder of this chapter will attempt to place Bailey within the framework established.
Bailey's ideologies will be placed within this framework, with the intent of identifying both the intellectual and social origins of the notion of childhood which Bailey was able to exploit in order to develop his project. The conception of Bailey's project was derived from a particular social conception of the nature of childhood. Bailey fully subscribed to the current dominant social constructions of childhood. His project emerges as a natural extension of these dominant social constructions. Further, Bailey was able to utilise these dominant discourses to legitimise his undertaking.

Taken at its most basic level, Bailey worked on the assumed notion of children as 'adults-in-the-making', extending this notion into a fully developed eugenics experiment, aimed at producing social improvements not in these children, but through them into future generations. These children were very clearly 'the future'-they were valued not primarily in an expressive role, or even in the traditional instrumental role as present or future labourers. They were valued for their bodily and reproductive instrumentality, for their ability to demonstrate the efficacy of a particular dietary regime in producing effective citizens, and for their ability to pass these characteristics on to subsequent generations. While this represents an extension of the dominant construction, there is also a clear congruence with the central precepts of the functionalist model of childhood which has been argued above to be the dominant modern and post-modern social construction of the nature of childhood. Bailey was able to legitimise his project by appealing both to social appreciations of this dominant construction, and also through appealing to that other dominant construction of childhood, that of the embodied, helpless child. By exploiting this set of discourses, Bailey was able to justify, and indeed defend,
the institutional practices of Hopewood as being required, 'for the good of the children', 'for their own protection'. The construction of children as helpless, passive objects of necessity invokes the use of institutions of protection, to ensure that the child is protected from the corrupting influences of adult society. It also invokes the necessity for the institution of surveillance, which can both further ensure the success of the modes of protection, but also act as a check that the objectives of the program of socialisation are being achieved. In the social setting of the family, these practices may have potentially positive outcomes. For dispossessed and socially unvalued children such as were the Hopewood children, another set of potential outcomes were opened up. Control, supervision and direction under the dictates of a social experiment were their social experiences, with individual value replaced by eugenic value.

**Innocence and the Hopewood Children**

Bailey took on all of his children from very soon after their birth. In fact, his preferred method was to bring the mother into the institution prior to the child's birth, and for the mother to leave the child under his care as soon as practicable after the birth. Of course, where this was not possible and other circumstances proved suitable, he took on babies direct from the mother or through other channels, again as soon as possible after the birth of the child. What this means is that from its inception, the Hopewood Experiment was conducted on children who were the absolute epitome of the helpless, passive nature of the innocent embodied child.
Bailey clearly identified his children within this construction. The children were identified at this early stage as fully participating in this model of childhood:

Society has an inescapable obligation to provide for every one of its dependent children; this is especially true of its innocent babes who have not the protection of a father or the security of a home. Justice, mercy and national necessity demand that we do our utmost to compensate them for the loss of these fundamental conditions to their lives (YWAA Annual Report 1945:19).

Children are characterised here as ‘dependent’, and ‘innocent’. ‘Protection’ and ‘security’ are seen as the natural birthright of the innocent child, who because of the facts of his or her physical embodiment does not have the capacity to exercise these abilities in its own right.

What is of further interest in this statement is that the construction of the child as embodied innocence is extended into a social context which incorporates notions of social obligation and the interests of ongoing social reproduction. The socially constructed fact of the child’s physical helplessness is used here to justify a social responsibility towards the individual. Because the child is helpless, it is argued, society is obliged to make provision for its protection and care. If the family unit, the normal means by which this care and protection is usually provided, is not available, then there is a social responsibility that this care and protection be provided by other means. This in itself is of course perfectly reasonable. Bailey is clearly identifying here his project as a socially acceptable method by which this care and protection can be made available, drawing from the available options of state or philanthropic intervention to take the place of the absent father. He therefore guarantees the perpetuation of patriarchal control in the family as identified by Connell (1987:121-5), thereby legitimising his project further within the contemporary frameworks of patriarchal power. In keeping with his eugenic
purpose, this is presented not merely in these terms of mutual obligation and responsibility. Bailey also presents the issue as one of ‘national necessity’. These innocents are not merely the deserving recipients of care and protection on moral grounds, deriving from their own helpless and dependent embodiment. They are also the embodied future of the race and of society, and as such worthy of society’s protection from motives of self-preservation as well. Bailey presents his children as worthy innocents, participating in a socially recognisable and acceptable model of what it means to be a child. Beyond this, however, the innocent embodies those eugenically desirable qualities as well, which only serve to reinforce and reiterate the fact that Bailey’s act in offering them protection is worthy, socially responsible, and legitimate.

These representations are very much the public face of Hopewood: they were used for promotional purposes, in the Annual Reports, as well as providing a pictorial record of the growth and development of the Hopewood children themselves. Their function is very much to emphasise the role of Hopewood in protecting and maintaining the quality of innocence in these children. These representations legitimise the arrangements at Hopewood, by acting as a demonstration of the capabilities of the institution to provide care and protection for the innocent.

While children are represented as the embodiments of innocence, their physicality also constitutes one of the prime dangers to that innocence. As we have already seen, childhood sexuality is the antithesis of childhood innocence, yet it derives from the same site, the body, that innocence does. From these inherent contradictions derive the
complementary needs for protection and control of the child. While his public representations of the children of Hopewood take advantage of the traditional representations of innocence, Bailey's own conception of the nature of children owed a considerable deal more to a concern with the inherent bad nature of children. There are "potentialities for both good and evil in the unborn baby" (YWAA Annual Report 1954:6), however "As infants have not yet developed an adult code of honour they can be ruthless, merciless and cannibalistic in their attitudes" (YWAA Annual Report 1954:12). The concern is particularly that without the exercise of appropriate socialisation, these inherent traits of children will eventually result in delinquency: "As these children had very poor prospects in life it is almost certain that a big proportion would have drifted into delinquency" (YWAA Annual Report 1944:4). This statement was made at such an early stage in the project that it is clearly being made on the basis of some assumed potentialities in the children rather than with any reference to the individual characters or personalities of the children.

Children then may appear as innocent, and may be represented as such, but from Bailey's perspective the tendency of the child was more towards evil than good. Delinquency was the end state of childhood evil, and its origins were clearly sexual: "Delinquency is manifested by young people who have not yet brought their perverted instincts under control" (YWAA Annual Report 1958:4), echoing the observation of Kocimubas (1997:157) that "precocious sexuality was now considered as a key link in a chain reaction leading to mental abnormality and thence to crime".
Childhood embodiment can be conceptualised as being both innocent or anti-innocent. Bailey, in his own typically eclectic fashion, took parts of both these constructs, and used them to fashion the theory and practice of the Hopewood Experiment. He represented his charges as worthy innocents, requiring the care and protection which he was able to give them, and legitimising his project in both public and official perceptions. He also, both publicly and privately, saw children as potential sources of evil who needed to be pointed in the right directions both for their own and for society’s good. Both these conceptions could be used with good effect to justify the institutional arrangements of the Hopewood Experiment. Innocence needs to be protected, and the best protection for innocence is walls, be they physical or social. Society needs to be protected from potential evil, and those walls again offer the best possible protection. Potential evil needs to be directed into actual good, which requires rules and the surveillance to ensure adherence to the rules. If the source of evil is in the bodies, and particularly the latent sexual instincts of children, then bodies must be subject to particularly strict control, through medical and dietary techniques. By exploiting the discourses surrounding the innocence of children in this way, Bailey was then able to develop a justification for the set of social practices which made the Hopewood Experiment possible. He was able to justify the separation of the Hopewood children from society at large, which he pursued actively. He was able to justify strictly codified, and often intrusive, medico-dietary set of practices. The prevailing discourses surrounding the concept of childhood made what Bailey was doing seem not only socially acceptable, but socially desirable.
Bailey and Socialisation

I have already briefly touched on Bailey's views on the proper socialisation of children, having seen his view of the importance of directing children away from delinquency towards more socially productive modes of behaviour. This gives of itself a strong indication that Bailey's concept of childhood was heavily influenced by a functionalist perspective on childhood. What follows will more clearly place Bailey's thought within that framework. Bailey conceived of childhood in quite conventional ways. He appreciated the expressive value of children, with his biographer Trop (1971) regularly referring to his 'deep love of children'. Beyond this, Bailey believed that the importance of childhood was in its role of preparing the child for future life, learning the attitudes and skills which would allow it to take its place as a solid future citizen. Children were there to learn how to be adults, they were what I have referred to elsewhere as 'adults-in-the-making'. What is unusual about this is not that Bailey held these views, but the uses to which these views were put. Bailey's intention was to take a particular group of children, socialise them in a very particular way, making them not just adults-in-the-making, but generations-in-the-making: "When I look at Carol, Marcia, Richard and our other babies I am thinking not so much of them but of their children and their grandchildren" (Trop 1971:22). Bailey extended the dominant concept of a future-oriented childhood into new territory.

Socialisation, in the absolute sense in which we have used the term, that is a process of developing the modes of thought and behaviour which are the marks of the fully integrated citizen, was what Bailey conceived as the prime function of childhood.
Hopewood aimed to produce men and women who were “kindly, tolerant, capable, dependable, co-operative and able to make substantial contributions towards the welfare of humanity” (YWAA Annual Report 1948:14). His statements in the YWAA Annual Reports abound in references to the need for childhood to be a time of character development (1957:2), a time of learning to submit to authority (1949:11), and of identifying the role of those which he considered important agents of socialisation (1958:5), and in particular the role of the school in producing “good citizens” (1956:10). Bailey likened the teaching of children to the training of animals (1961:3), although the former was a much easier task given the intelligence of the infants under his care.

From these statements we can very clearly place Bailey’s thought as coming from the core of a functionalist model of childhood. The value of the child for Bailey comes not from any intrinsic value of the child itself, with only passing reference made to the expressive value of the child. The child’s primary value is what it will become: an effective citizen, in line with Bailey’s eugenic project. The objectives of socialisation within a functionalist orientation are, as we have seen, essentially congruent with the aims and objectives of eugenics. The value of the child here is, however, extended further along the temporal axis, with their primary value being not just what they will become, but their capacity to produce further generations in the future who will also become effective citizens. Far from being a project which valued and loved children for themselves, the Hopewood children’s prime value was removed from the site of their temporal being, from themselves as individuals.
Bailey’s project also exemplified the emphasis in the functionalist model of the superiority of adult praxis over child’s practice, and in particular of the rational world of the adult over the pre-rational world of the child. Children who can be defined as slightly more sophisticated animals in need of training, as Bailey did, cannot have any claim to any authoritative rationality. I argued in my Honours thesis (Ambery 1995) that Bailey’s method, and in particular his application of the rational/scientific method to the development of the Hopewood Experiment, represents a facet of post-enlightenment modernity’s attempts to impose control and order over the chaotic forces of nature. The natural world has come to be viewed as an object, something to be utilised, rational knowledge or instrumental reasoning becomes the method by which men seek to attain domination over both nature and other men. Instrumental reasoning, or the rational scientific method, thus becomes the prime tool in the domination of the natural world. Within the context of childhood, the Hopewood children emerge as emblematic of that pre-rational state onto which adult praxes attempt to impose its own code of order and authority. Bailey consistently presents himself as the ultimate source of this authority at Hopewood. There is no room within such a structure for the voices of the children to be heard, something which will further be demonstrated through the accounts of the children’s experience in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 6 – INSIDE LIFE AND THE HOPEWOOD REGIME

I think the most vivid and exciting moment was the Christmases we had. The ones where we had it under the big pine tree, the down house section, and we had fairies and Santa and all the kids were running round. It was really wonderful. There was a few of them. We had quite a few there. I left there when I was six, at Bowral, and they were going for quite a while. I think we were the only people who ever had fairies.

Hopewood child

Daddy Bailey said, “I’ve got one vacancy at Bowral, who’d like to go?” I said, “Oh I would! I would!” I considered myself a big girl now. I was getting periods. From Canberra I went to the Good Shepherd Convent and I’ll always remember it. They were in retreat. I grew up a Catholic and I knew what a retreat was. And there were Hopewood girls already with the Good Shepherd nuns... We weren’t allowed to speak for a week because we were in retreat. But also why I can’t forget it was, there were a lot of adults there... I could see they were institutionalised adults with some sort of intellectual impairment. And it was really, I was only thirteen, if I was, and I was really quite frightened. And I couldn’t talk to anyone for the rest of the week. I was really frightened. I had never seen, personally face to face, anyone at that age, with an intellectual impairment. These were adult women and it was really a frightening experience.

Hopewood child

INTRODUCTION

This thesis has so far dealt with the more general themes associated with Hopewood: with some of the intellectual background which Bailey brought to his project, with the ways in which Hopewood demonstrates the application of a set of widespread
discourses on the nature of childhood and children, and with the broad historical narrative of the progress of Bailey's project. With the exception of some illuminating comments on these issues, the voices of the children of Hopewood have not been heard. Hopewood was the critical defining experience in the life of each one of the 86 children who were part of this unique social experiment. Having developed an historical and theoretical framework through which these experiences can be explicated, I now intend to investigate, using the testimony of the now-adult members of the 'Hopewood family', what life was like in Hopewood, how the children felt at the time in confronting the daily issues of life there, and how as adults they reflect on their early experiences.

A more detailed account of my methodology may be found in Chapter Two. The accounts of Hopewood have been given a twofold structure. Firstly, it is intended to reconstruct, as far as is possible, Hopewood as a social institution. It is intended here to investigate the principles of the organisation of Hopewood, covering such matters as daily organisation, interactions between the Hopewood children themselves, and between them and the significant others in the Hopewood environment. From this it is hoped that the children's accounts will contribute to the reconstruction of what it was like to actually live in Hopewood.

In the second part of the structure I return to the concept of Hopewood as a social experiment, and cover more closely the ways in which Bailey's intentions for the children, as a social experiment and exemplar, were both manifested in the social practices of Hopewood, and were reflected on by the children themselves, both at the
time, and as adults. I have used The Articles of Association of the YWAA as a broad framework for this analysis, covering as they do the major outcomes which Bailey sought from his project, and also on a more general level, expressing issues which are critical for the study of childhood, such as education, religion, health and discipline.

One further caveat needs to be made before entering into these accounts. While I have used the term ‘Hopewood’, the term is used to describe all the institution/s run by Bailey through the YWAA and the children were of course placed in a number of establishments throughout NSW. Besides the main centre of Hopewood House at Bowral, there were also Hopewood institutions at Canberra, Moree, Forbes, Manly, Centennial Park and Narrabeen. Whilst I have constructed a generic account of life growing up in ‘Hopewood’, there were differences between each location. These differences were a combination of geography, the number of children present and their individual characteristics, and the personality and preferences of those in charge at that particular time. As well as geographic variations, practices also obviously varied over time: what might have been considered appropriate for a group of five-year-olds was clearly not appropriate for a group of fifteen-year-olds. Whilst I have attempted to provide a generic account of the Hopewood experience, where variations occur, these will be noted and explored themselves.
ENTERING HOPEWOOD – REFLECTIONS ON ISSUES OF IDENTITY AND CONTROL

The processes by which Bailey attracted mothers willing to give up their babies have been dealt with in some detail at another point in this thesis. By a combination of general advertising, specific targeting of doctors likely to come into account with young women unwilling or unable to care for their babies after their birth, and word of mouth, a total of 206 mothers passed through the walls of Bailey’s institutions. Of these, for whatever reason, 86 were kept under the auspices of the YWAA at the Hopewood homes. While it is obviously not possible for the children’s testimony to shed any further light on the circumstances under which they came to be part of the Hopewood family, their testimony can identify how their presence at Hopewood was represented to them during their formative years, and how they have reflected on this aspect of their social status. It can thus provide some initial clues to the ways in which the Hopewood experience has acted to construct the social identities of those who participated in that experience. A limited range of records kept by the YWAA were made available on request to the children, for example copies of admission forms (figures 6-1 and 6-2). However beyond a few minor biographical details, these have been of little assistance in the reconstruction of their genealogy.

For most of the Hopewood children, knowledge of their parents’ situations has been something gained in later life. In practically all of these cases, given the circumstances of their conception and birth, only knowledge of their mothers has been possible. With one exception (Rowena), whose parents in fact married subsequent to her
placement in her Hopewood without reclaiming her, their fathers do not figure largely in their later relationships with their natural parents. In most instances it is clear that the natural family of the Hopewood children were actively discouraged from any form of meaningful contact which they may have desired with the children whilst growing up.

Naomi recounts the incident of this aunt and uncle, it was my father’s brother and his wife. They used to send me presents, dresses and books for Christmas and birthdays and vice versa. When we were living in Canberra they sent me a beautiful dress with a petticoat and pants and a handbag and gloves. Being a girl I used to love all of those things...After a while we never heard from them again and it wasn’t until later on I found out why. Bailey stopped them sending stuff to me because he told them it was upsetting for me.

This interference in the participation of the natural family in Naomi’s life was later extended, so that when her grandmother offered to take her from Hopewood, she was presented with a bill for the costs of Naomi’s care up until that point. Needless to say the bill could not be paid and Naomi remained at Hopewood. Other interviewees’ experiences are broadly similar, ranging from the direct interference in contact between blood relatives and families recounted by Naomi, to a more indirect discouragement of contacts with their blood family. In some cases, this may have been facilitated by the children’s own construction of their circumstances, as recounted by Ingrid: “We were just called the ‘Home Kids’ and that was fine. We were from an orphanage...We all (thought we were orphans). We all assumed our parents were dead”. In this case, it is noteworthy that such a convenient construction was not dispelled by anyone from Hopewood.

That this was the official policy of Hopewood is confirmed by the accounts of both Eric Storm (former director of the YWAA), and Jesse (former Hopewood staff member). Storm states categorically “The conditions were that the mothers brought these
children to Mr Bailey and the children were officially adopted and the conditions were that the mother was not to have anything more to do with it". There is no evidence, either in the available Hopewood documentation or from official government sources that the children were officially adopted by Bailey, notwithstanding Storm's insistence on this point, which was reiterated at a later point in the interview. What does emerge is that there was, in most instances, a very clear policy of excluding the access of the natural family to the children while they were in Hopewood, and to ensure that the children remained in Hopewood. Some exceptions to the rule did occur, and these exceptions were observed and commented on as noteworthy by the interview participants. One child in particular is mentioned in a number of accounts as being in the unique position of receiving regular, sanctioned visits from his natural mother. From the accounts available, there is no firm evidence to justify what was an exception rather than the rule for Hopewood, beyond a number of casual observations that this child's family was of a higher social class than the majority. The inference is that this may have made access by them more acceptable to the Hopewood hierarchy.
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NO. 26

ADMITTED: March 21st, 1943.


Denomination: Anglican.

Birth Date: 4/6/43.

Birth Weight: 6lbs 9ozs.

Admission Weight: 6lbs 6ozs.

Admission Age: 5 days.

Place of Birth: Royal Hospital for Women, London.

Feeding Method: Human.

Condition When Received: Good but small.

Admission Temperature: 

Discharged: Transferred to "Hopewood," 32.3.43.

MOTHER:

Name (all Christian Names in full): Audrey Mary Whitmore.

Married, Single, Divorced: Single.

Address of Mother: 7th Ave, St. Neots.

Occupation of Mother: Housewife.

FATHER:

Name (all Christian Names in full): Not given.

Address of Father: 

Occupation: 

Name of Person from whom Child was Received: Mother.

Address: 7th Ave, St. Neots.

REMARKS: Mother returned to London 21.4.43.

Hopewood Admission Form (Child)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MOTHER</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMITTED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Commerford, Mary Wilson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellvue St., Armada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HISTORY OF PATIENT.</strong></th>
<th><strong>No. of Pregnancy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Miscarriages</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blood Test.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abnormalities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Practitioner before admission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, single or divorced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HOSPITAL.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and hour when sent to hospital.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and hour when child was born.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complications in hospital.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment ordered.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and hour of return to Bellaven.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condition of patient on return from hospital.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lactation.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FATHER.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full name.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **REMARKS.** | Audrey states, when returning from a dance an arm fell upon her down; this was not a party of the affair. |

Hepewood Admission Form (Mother)
Jesse gives another perspective on the issue. According to her account, mothers had been allowed in the early stages to remove children from Hopewood if they so wished. Perhaps unfortunately, many of these children were then returned to Hopewood relatively quickly, as the mothers, most of whom it must be remembered were young, inexperienced and with limited resources, were unable to cope and returned the children to Hopewood. This caused Bailey some difficulties, particularly as the children had to be reintegrated into the Hopewood dietary regime, and so the policy of exclusion was introduced.

The consequences of this policy for the Hopewood children themselves has been to deny them access to their own stories, their own history, at least as it pertains to the circumstances of their birth and how they came to enter Hopewood in the first instance. While in some cases there has been either a lesser or greater degree of awareness of their origins, in general the accounts indicate that the primary construction of social identity has been within the Hopewood institution, without any reference to their origins outside that institution. In fact all the accounts uphold the fact that, in accordance with the policy of exclusion adopted by Bailey, very little reference at all was made to either the natural family of the children, or of the circumstances in which they entered Hopewood, during their growing up. Where references were made to their origins, the source was from outside Hopewood, for instance from school teachers, and these are invariably negative comments, either disparaging the morals of their mothers, or, by extension the children themselves:

There was all sorts of mothers that produced these children. There were good time girls, girls who just wanted to drop the baby and go out and smoke and drink and go out with the next boy down
the street. There were girls who went out with boys while they were pregnant. There were rough girls, I suppose is a better way to put it (Jesse).

During the time of their growing up, then, the Hopewood children were given very little access, either on a personal or informational level, to their natural family. No doubt, given Bailey’s early experiences, this policy was justified as being in the ‘best interests’ of the child. This could also no doubt justify circumstances where more ‘worthy’ mothers were granted access. Without any alternatives, Hopewood became their ‘family’ identity. The ways in which the children actually constructed this notion of the ‘Hopewood Family’ will be dealt with at a later point. It was only later in life, after the Hopewood identity was already formed, that attempts to contact their natural family could be made. In cases where the grown up children expressed an interest in contacting their natural family, the YWAA provided names and last known contact details (which of course could be up to 20 years out of date), but beyond that did not provide any further assistance. Of the ten Hopewood children interviewed, seven indicated that they had successfully traced their parent/s (generally their mothers) after leaving Hopewood. Success in these endeavours seems to have been a combination of persistence and a great deal of serendipity, given the time elapsed since the children were placed in Hopewood, the lack of contact over that period, and the lack of direct assistance from the YWAA. None reported any particularly positive outcomes, with reactions from the mothers ranging from not wanting anything to do with their children (Ingrid) to, at the best, a fairly lukewarm reception which did not result in any long term relationship (Hugh). It appears that the issue of making contact with their natural families was regularly discussed between the adult Hopewoods, as both Ingrid and Hugh report their initial
misgivings over attempting to find their parents, based on the negative experiences which had been reported to them by a number of other Hopewoods.

The issue of natural family identity has been a significant one for the Hopewood children. Despite Bailey's policy of discouraging or denying contact between members of the natural family and the children while at Hopewood, a significant majority of those interviewed have, in their adult life, made contact with members of their natural family. Whilst Hopewood has become a very significant part of the social identity for all those who passed through it, there is very clear evidence that for many of the Hopewoods, part of the story is missing, and many have sought to fill in the missing part of that story, however satisfactorily. Social identity is not formed merely by the institutional arrangements in which socialisation takes place, but is also formed by the processes by which the individual is placed in those arrangements, whether it be by birth or, as is the case with the Hopewood children, through the establishment of an institutional structure designed to cater for a specific social phenomenon.

The denial of access to the natural family was, from Bailey's perspective, clearly a process of social control. I have written elsewhere (Ambery 1995) of the ways in which Bailey constructed the social organisation of Hopewood on the lines of a scientific experiment. One of the strategies which Bailey implemented to ensure the scientific purity of his experimental approach was to minimise the impact that confounding variables may have on the conduct of the experiment. One such potentially confounding variable was the influence of the natural family. If Hopewood was an experiment
intended to demonstrate the eugenic benefits of the natural health way of life, then it was obviously important to ensure that the influences of those who did not fully support these objectives was minimised. This was obviously most crucial in instances where children were taken away from Hopewood and then returned, as Jesse attests, as this had the potential to completely invalidate any scientific conclusions which could be drawn as to the efficacy our otherwise of Bailey's dietary regime. Beyond this, however, the presence of the natural family, unless its compliance with Bailey's program could be assured, only had the potential to introduce values which may have questioned the conduct of the institution under Bailey's terms. It was made very clear to me (interviews with Madge Cockburn and Eric Storm) that the natural health diet was a critical, non-negotiable fact of the children's upbringing. Under such circumstances, anything which could undermine this needed to be eliminated.

**Daily Routine at Hopewood**

Hopewood was structured as a 'total institution' (Goffman 1973). As far as possible, all the needs of the children were met from the resources of the Bailey organisation, which either provided funds directly from the Chic Salon organisation, or by publicly sought donations provided to the YWAA. Only in areas where government intervention was strong, especially education and health, was Bailey forced to accept support provided by external agencies. Bailey's initial intention was to establish a school within the grounds of Hopewood, however this was not supported by the Department of Education and he was forced to send the children to the local public schools (Top 1971).
With these exceptions, all the significant activities in the children's developing years occurred within the confines of the Hopewood institution.

The daily practices of the Hopewood organisation were defined by that organisation’s hierarchy, primarily by Bailey and Cockburn, and were expected to be implemented by the staff members under their control. Daily practice therefore represents a nexus between the explicit and implicit aims of the Hopewood institution, produced within a context of individual application of that policy by Bailey’s agents, with all the potential possibility of individual discretion in that context, and the ways in which those practices are accepted, or resisted, by the objects of these actions. Daily practice is also derived from what we have already discussed in relation to social constructions of the nature of children and childhood, and is able to illuminate the ways in which these particular social constructions were applied within the context of Hopewood as an institution. From the Hopewood children’s point of view, the memories of their daily life are the most significant set of events in the construction of their adult social identity.

It is obviously a difficult task to reconstruct a 'typical' day at Hopewood. 'Hopewood' as it has been referred to in this work is a generic amalgam of a number of specific sites including Hopewood House, Bowral, but also other institutions at Canberra, Manly, Narrabeen, Centennial Park and Moree. Each had its unique milieu which had its effect on daily routine. As the children grew, the construction of their days also varied, with additional freedoms being granted as they grew older. The majority of my respondents were from the younger group of girls. From their accounts, there is evidence
that the older groups were subject to a much more rigidly controlled social order, with much higher levels of discipline. Without direct support from the accounts of these other groups, and with only limited evidence from the two male respondents, it has not been possible to incorporate the full scale of variations in daily practice which occurred over age and gender cohorts. This account is therefore necessarily a composite picture, focused primarily on the social organisation of Hopewood House at Bowral, but illuminated where appropriate with accounts from other Hopewood establishments. In terms of time, the focus is on the early to middle school years of the children, as it as at that time that the mechanisms of social control were applied most strictly in their upbringing. Again, where relevant, examples from other life stages may be drawn upon.

The children were socially segmented in terms of age and gender groupings. As a subset of their overall Hopewood identity, social identity is defined by membership of a particular age grade. The significance of age as a major element in defining the social structure of childhood has been identified by James and Prout (1997:235):

concepts of age are the main scaffolding around which Western conceptions of childhood are built and it is through reference to concepts of age that the daily life experiences of children are produced and controlled.

Within the Hopewood group, individuals speak of themselves as belonging to 'the older group of girls' and so on; and some individuals themselves have a degree of status, and certainly of identification, applied to them in terms of age: Richard is 'the eldest'; Charlie Howe is 'the youngest'. The children's lives at Hopewood were organised on the basis of these age grades, with sleeping arrangements, work assignments, and of course school classes all organised on this basis. This principle of social organisation in their formative years has therefore become an important component of their social identity,
both in the ways in which they reflect on their early experiences and in the informal groupings which persist in the ongoing social milieu of the Hopewood family.

Days at Hopewood began early. Consistent with its country setting and the rural activities which were taking place there, the day began at dawn if not before, sometimes as early as 4 a.m., dependent on the behaviour of the local alarm clocks, the dairy cows kept at Hopewood (Rowena). After a Hopewood approved breakfast, all the children had chores to do before leaving for school. These varied from cleaning, helping in the kitchen or the laundry for the girls (Rowena) to work outside on the farm (Warren). The children, from as young an age as possible, were also responsible for making up their own beds (Rowena, Jesse). During this time the staff members would also be cleaning, supervising the children in their chores, and preparing the children’s school clothes.

After the chores were completed, the children then changed into their school uniforms and were transported to school by the Hopewood bus. Schooling was conducted on denominational lines, with Catholic children being educated at the local Catholic school, and Protestant children at the local government public school. A special bus was necessitated by the number of children involved and by Hopewood House being somewhat removed from Bowral proper, and it also served the important purpose of reinforcing the segregation of the Hopewood children from the influences of the other children at school. Bailey had been forced, much against his inclination, to have the children educated in the mainstream system. If this was to be the case, he was
determined to minimise the interactions that the children had outside of the strictly controlled Hopewood environment.

This segregation was also enforced within the school. The Hopewood children were segregated in class at the back of the classroom (Heidi, Peggy). This practice appears to have no other justification beyond the desire to emphasise, both to the children and the outside world, the separate status of this group of children. In the playground, too, the segregation persisted:

at morning tea time, and this was my experience, from my group's, at morning tea time or at play lunch time we had to be in a separate yard than the rest of the kids in the school because we weren't allowed to mix (Heidi).

Whilst the segregation of the children appears to serve little purpose except as a signifier of social difference, the segregation in the playground serves an important purpose in the perpetuation of Bailey’s experimental model. Playtime at school of course equates to eating time, and it was thus important to Bailey that the children be segregated then, to ensure that they adhered to the natural health diet, and did not partake of any of the temptations which may have been offered in the schoolyard. Naomi does not recall any of the more general incidents of segregation noted by other interviewees, but she is very clear in identifying the critical relationship between food and segregation in the Hopewood experience: “We were never segregated from the other children. The only time you were segregated from the other children was when there was anything that involved food”.

These practices of segregation are reported both by children who attended the public, and those who attended the Catholic schools at Bowral. Despite the victory of
officialdom over the issue of a school at Hopewood, Bailey was still able to muster enough influence with the local schools to ensure that conditions were created which would support the key objective of the maintenance of the natural health diet. While it is unclear how Bailey achieved this end, it is nevertheless clear that there was high degree of cooperation between the local community and Hopewood in ensuring that Bailey's aims and plans for the children were not compromised.

Despite what was constructed as a rigid model of social control aimed at ensuring conformity to Bailey's dietary schema, patterns of resistance to this control were apparent, even from the youngest of the Hopewood children. The children still found opportunities to swap lunches, with the Hopewood children able to gain access to otherwise forbidden foods such as lollies or other sweet foods. The food brought in by the Hopewoods (nuts, fruits in particular - sandwiches with marmite or raw peanut butter did not prove popular) proved a popular swap with children whose families would otherwise have been unable to afford such luxuries. Michelle also reports instances of stealing food from the servants' quarters, who were not constrained by Bailey's dietary regime. This led to midnight feasts including such luxuries as sugar, cocoa, cakes, lamb and chicken. Despite then a daily routine which was consciously structured to ensure the maintenance of Bailey's dietary regime, opportunities for resistance, and for exploration of alternatives to the Bailey-imposed social order, were actively purposed by some of the children.
The children were returned by the Hopewood bus every afternoon after school. There was no opportunity to socialise with school friends after school at Hopewood, although this rule appears to have been relaxed as the children grew older, particularly at some of the smaller homes at Canberra, Narrabeen and Manly (Peggy, Ingrid, Naomi). At Hopewood itself there was little opportunity for social contacts outside of school hours. Most of the time after school was spent performing more chores. Again, these were variations on the chores undertaken before school, including cleaning (Naomi, Rowena), as well as some activities which seem to have been designed for the purpose of taking up the children’s time rather than for anything more meaningful, and certainly was physically quite demanding for a group of school age children:

when you got back to the Home, there was absolutely no opportunity to do homework and all of the kids were in the same boat. You know, like, we were out moving rocks or digging thistles out or doing some stupid exercise thing (Heidi).

The place was very rocky when we took it over and we spent a lot of time picking up rocks and branches, some trees being felled and when they died they were burned off (Warren).

The priority was clearly on the assignment of physical activities which would keep the children occupied, ensuring that the opportunities for mischief were minimised. This is clearly consistent with a model of child training which arose in the early years of the century. This model, perpetuated by, among others, one of Bailey’s intellectual heroes Alan Carroll, recommended physical rather than mental training for boys to keep their hands busy to avoid the dangers of masturbation; and for girls instruction in domestic skills (Kociumbas 1997:135-6). Busyness was the order of the day at Hopewood, with every potential idle minute to be filled in with physical activity, whether it be meaningful or not. Despite the intense formal structuring of their time, there were still opportunities for small acts of resistance:
The thing I liked doing most there was keeping away from Mr Zammadvoraff who was the farm manager because farming and me did not go together so I spent a lot of time finding hidey-holes and hiding to keep away from him (Warren).

Mealtimes were of course dominated by the Hopewood diet, on which significant comment has been made elsewhere in this work. The evening meal was quickly followed by brushing of the teeth, a significant event in itself given the importance attached by Bailey to teeth as a sign of a healthy body. Again, the timing and structure of these activities was such as to ensure that nothing was left to chance, with supervised control of all those activities which related directly to Bailey’s central purpose. This was then followed by bath time, which given the numbers of children involved, had all the characteristics of a factory production line:

![Figure 6-3: Bathtime at Hopewood](image)

they used to run us through, we’ have a bath, there’d be a dozen of us, all boys no girls. Anyway and away we’d go, up the ladder in the bath there’d be two women soaping it up, it was like an assembly line and as you come out they’d wash your hair and scrub you out and another lady she’d be there with a towel and you’d go and towel yourself off (Hugh).

There was again little opportunity for social activities in the evenings following dinner.

After completion of the above sets of ablutions, bedtime was not too far away. Sleeping accommodation was of dormitory style, segregated by gender and denomination: one dorm for the Catholics, one for the Protestants (Rowena, Heidi,
Peggy, Warren). Bedtime was very early, often as early as 6 p.m. (Rowena) and certainly in summer time the children were going to bed while it was still light (Heidi). Obviously the long days with early rises contributed to the need to go to bed early, however the evidence from the interviews suggests that such an early bedtime was unwelcome, and that they certainly were not so completely exhausted by the end of the day that their beds were a welcome retreat. In fact, given the incidents discussed earlier of stealing food from the servants' quarters and the resultant midnight feasts, the evidence does point to a degree of resistance to this aspect of daily structure which is inconsistent with the notion that the children had merely worked so long and hard during the day that they needed to be in their beds early. It is however consistent with the practices of a Hopewood regime which valued structure and order in the control of the children's time, with a consistent intention for either direct or indirect surveillance of the children's activities, supported by an enforceable program of physical activity. Time that could not either be surveilled, or filled up with useful work, was time where the children could potentially be engaged in activities contrary to the design of Hopewood. Early to bed and early to rise meant not just being healthy and wise, it guaranteed the elimination of outside influence and, in theory at least, resistance to the Hopewood way of life.

The daily routine at Hopewood was an exercise in the social control of time. Obviously with 86 children to care for, limited staff and other resources, as well as a degree of oversight from officialdom, there were organisational and logistical difficulties which would require a degree of regimentation in the daily lives of the children. The power differential between children and adults discussed elsewhere is critical in this
context. Adults have the power to control children's time without question, and, with the exception of a limited repertoire of resistance from the children, this power is generally able to impose its dominance on the lives and time of children. It is however the particular emphases in the way in which time was controlled on a daily basis at Hopewood which are significant. Time was most rigidly controlled, social behaviour was most rigidly structured, where the consumption of food was involved. It was vitally important to the success of Hopewood as an exemplar of the eugenic properties of Bailey's recipe for natural health that the children only eat the approved Hopewood diet. Outside influence could not be tolerated. In particular, Bailey made the effort to ensure that the children's time outside the Hopewood institution was structured in accordance with his principles, by ensuring the segregation of the children during recess and lunchtime at school. The rest of the day was similarly structured where meals were involved.

Beyond the centrally important acts, from Bailey's point of view, of eating and cleaning the teeth, the remainder of the day was structured into a series of physical tasks. These varied from productive, if unskilled, work such as cleaning, to more physically demanding tasks on the farm. These tasks fulfilled the objective of keeping the children's minds and bodies occupied, and provided either a direct or indirect method of surveillance for the Hopewood authorities. They left little time for active socialisation, either inside or outside Hopewood.
Such modes of control are, in the final analysis, anti-individualistic. As Qvortrup (1994:10) points out:

entering any of the institutions designed for children presupposes an individualization—children are in this respect regarded as individuals, as representatives of themselves rather than of their family...this individualization process...paves the way for...a process of individuation, because both from a democratic and a rational-administrative point of view the as different regarded individuals must be dealt with in the same way...in other words, with the aim of gaining bureaucratic and controlling insight, any standardization of the format of individuality enhances the possibilities of existing authority.

This has been exactly the consequence in the development of the Hopewood social order. Time has been controlled and standardised to the extent that the individual Hopewood child has been written out of the equation. The only significant factors in the equation are the time which is available to be controlled, and the desired end point in terms of the success of the eugenic experiment. Social practices at Hopewood were designed with this in mind, rather than individuals. Naomi seems to speak for all when she says “They never considered the fact that you could have an opinion or anything like that. That’s my overall impression. I honestly don’t believe that they considered us as individuals”. Whilst the Hopewood experience has nurtured very strong group identities and identifications, individual identity was, inevitably perhaps given its peculiar social environment, neglected.

**THE NOTION OF ‘THE HOPEWOOD FAMILY’**

Hopewood constituted the sole group affiliation for all my respondents whilst growing up, and is still one of the major group affiliations in their adult years. In conversation most of them refer to themselves as a family, and to each other as sisters and brothers. Being aware of these outward indications, it was part of my research’s intentions to identify the particular nature of how this notion of family was constructed,
and to try to identify the social practices in Hopewood which may have fostered the development of this concept.

This is a subject on which nearly all of my respondents had something to say:

we regard each other as brothers and sisters. We didn’t in one case but in another because we were all so closely together you were regarding them more a sibling, can you say sibling in a sense not being brother or sister, it was more a sibling (Winona).

Some of them I think of as family. It think what it boils down to is how well you know them. I guess overall I think of them as my family, they’re my brothers and sisters (Naomi).

I always thought of them as my family. As I grew older they were my brothers and sisters, once I understood what those notions were. But they were my mob. They’re my tribe. I think I saw them more in terms of ‘they’re my tribe’ (Heidi).

we were just like family, a bigger family than anybody else...we were the Hopewood family but we were individuals we weren’t brothers and sisters as such (Warren).

I don’t think I thought of them as brothers and sisters...I never classed myself as that was my sister or he was my brother. I classed myself as one of the Hopewoods (Peggy).

I suppose they are my brothers and sisters but we really didn’t get a chance to have a closeness because we were all separated (Ingrid).

All of these responses carry a similar message. Hopewood is defined for its members as a primary group affiliation and source of identity, without necessarily representing any sort of emotional bond or connection between those who describe themselves as brothers
and sisters. It is in fact extraordinary the extent to which the members of the Hopewood group on the one hand are so insistent on defining themselves as a family, whilst on the other hand being very clear to point out the lack of depth of emotional bond which they feel for members of their self-described 'family': "being raised as Hopewood kids didn't give the person that feeling of togetherness of emotional bonding" (Hugh).

There is no doubt that all those interviewed feel a strong primary identification with Hopewood and those associated with it, as the source and site of their earliest experiences. For some it has also provided the most stable and enduring relationships in their lives. It is primarily this sense of shared experience, of shared identity, and particularly of unique identity that has led them to define the Hopewood group as their family, and thus to define the other members of the group as brothers and sisters. For those interviewed, however, this definition of the Hopewood group as their 'family' is problematic, in the sense that whilst it is one of their primary sources of social affiliation and identity, there is also an appreciation by the group that the group is not a 'real' family, and that there are very real features missing from the 'Hopewood family' which, in their own terms, mark it off as different from what they define as the 'normal' family. Examining this debate over the nature of the family within the Hopewood group has therefore the potential to illuminate issues of the general social construction of the nature of family and the role of childhood and children within that construct. It can also illuminate the ways in which the application of those concepts has impacted on the individual lives of a group whose experience of the nature of family has been outside the traditional norm of family life.
There is a powerful sense among all the Hopewood children of a profound difference in their upbringing to that of children brought up in conventional families. This is a difference which was felt by them at the time as children, and which has been reinforced to them in their adult lives, as they have reflected on the facts of their upbringing. This awareness of difference has both a positive and a negative aspect, hence the problematic nature of the children’s assessment of Hopewood and their relationships with each other.

Growing up, many of the children report a strong sense of stigma from their identity as Hopewood children. We have already discussed the potential stigmatisation which derives from the policy and practice of segregation of the children, and which was most overtly practiced in the school system. This stigmatisation was on occasions emphasised by authority figures, such as the nuns at the school described by Naomi, who made it very clear that the children were worthless, the illegitimate spawn of un sanctioned unions who would never amount to anything, in this life or the next.

We were constantly threatened that it could get worse, you could go to Parramatta Girls’ Home. Or we were constantly told we should be grateful...or worse still you could have been adopted privately and you would never know who you would have got. We were constantly referred to as the ‘Hopewood bastards’ (Heidi).

“You should be grateful”, still hurts today. God Almighty did we hear that a lot from strangers, total strangers. If it wasn’t for Mr. Bailey, you could be in the gutter by now (Naomi).

This stigma was also extended to at least one of the Hopewood establishments themselves, where at Moree the children were forced to wear uniforms with large red letter ‘H’ on them at all times (Heidi).
Given the isolation of Moree from Bailey's immediate control, it is not possible to confirm that these practices were condoned by the Hopewood establishment as such. What it does however confirm is the existence of a range of practices, both explicit and implicit, which emphasised that the children were different, that their family background was different, and that this difference was not a benefit in dealing with the wider society. Being a Hopewood child was to bear a very real social stigma.

Beyond this stigmatisation imposed by the powers present in the children's lives, their was also a stigma internalised by the children, and which derived from the unusual nature of their family circumstances. Hugh describes the situation eloquently:

People would say "Oh, what about your mum and dad?", and I would say "I got no mum or dad". "Oh, brothers and sisters?", and I would say No. Who wanted to tell the general public that I had forty brothers and sisters?

This stigma was more keenly felt in the children's later years, particularly when they were moved out of Hopewood to join the smaller groups at Canberra, Bowral and so on. At Bowral, as is stated by a number of the interviewees, there were a number of other orphanages or children's homes. Their circumstances and experiences were then not very
much different from those of other members of their local community. Moving outside of Hopewood and Bowral, the differences became more emphatic, as did the children’s appreciation of the differences, and the nature of their responses. The children developed strategies ranging from avoidance or denial of the subject (Hugh, as described above, or Naomi), to the deliberate creation of a fictional family history which would appear more ‘normal’ than the Hopewood life would (Warren would say that he had a family on a farm just outside of Moree). The children internalised those values of mainstream society, and its particular model of what a family is, have compared themselves to that model, and have found themselves wanting. They have enacted the model of the stigmatised individual as described by Goffman (1968:18):

the standards he (the stigmatised individual) has incorporated from the wider society equip him to be intimately alive to what others see as his failing, inevitably causing him, if only for moments, to agree that he does indeed fall short of what he really ought to be. Shame becomes a central possibility, arising from the individual’s perception of one of his own attributes as being a defiling thing to possess, and one he can readily see himself as not possessing. Their lack of a ‘normal’ family life is perceived as a failing which does fall short of the ideal to which they aspire. Clearly the concept of shame can be applied here, as members of the family have taken steps to hide the truth of their origins.

What is perhaps most interesting about the ways in which the Hopewoods have reacted to their family stigma is not how they have sought to rid themselves of their family stigma as defined by Goffman (1973), but the ways in which they have in fact internalised the source of their stigma. Despite their appreciation that they do not represent the ideal of family life, from the testimonies of the Hopewood children, there is no way that they could ‘readily see themselves as not possessing’ their Hopewood identity. Hopewood, even into the adult years of those who experienced it, is a
problematic experience: parts of what occurred there clearly had a negative effect on the children, but just as clearly a range of positive experiences has emerged, and it is those positive experiences which have acted as the basis for their continuing identification as a family, notwithstanding the difficulties in terms of social stigmatisation which their membership of this unique group caused them during their younger years.

The most powerful positive influence which has emerged for the children of Hopewood has been that intense sense of belonging to a cohesive group, a sense which has remained for them through to their adult years. I have already indicated the barriers which were placed between the children and the wider community, and the ways in which the Hopewood children were denied the opportunity of external contacts, that the social practices of Hopewood clearly directing their lives to the internal purposes of life within the confines of the Hopewood institution. If being a member of Hopewood was stigmatised in the eyes of the external, it led internally to the development of a powerful group cohesion which remains to this day as one of the most obvious characteristics of the Hopewood group. In particular, the children define the group in terms of ‘us and them’, the group’s power consisting in its ability to exclude outsiders, and to defend insiders against outsiders:

The experience of walking into town with my mob, and the power and the numbers that brings is phenomenal. Try walking into town as a lone kid. That’s a lonely experience. The power that the mob brought, and the more the community became scared of those Hopewood kids, the more powerful we became (Heidi).

We were the Home kids. And no one bothered to tangle with us, there were too many of us. We didn’t fight or anything but no one bothered because they knew there was always another one there to back us up (Ingrid).

Clearly, a deliberately imposed isolation from the community, coupled with that community’s own negative practices towards them, has had the consequence of creating a
very powerful group identity for the Hopewood children, which is perceived as highly liberating and empowering for the group members, whose lives were otherwise subject to an inflexible mode of social control. This identity was expressed at the time, and still expresses itself, in a defensive stance, a closing of ranks, against outsiders.

It is this sense of group community, of standing united against an at best unsympathetic, and at worst hostile, world, which is at the root of the concept of the Hopewood ‘family’. As will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter, the prime means of social support for the Hopewood children were, with few exceptions, themselves. There was little direct support from either the Hopewood hierarchy (Bailey and Cockburn) or Hopewood staff, and of course support from their natural families was, in all but a few exceptional cases, denied. Support was only available from those in their own situation, from those who they would come to call their brothers and sisters. Most of those interviewed made their own qualifications that in most cases they did not have the degree of emotional attachment within Hopewood that they would have experienced in a ‘normal’ family. Their definition of family is modified to account for the peculiar circumstances of their birth and upbringing, whilst at the same time recognising the inadequacy of the term to fully encompass their experience:

Our form of family is not a biological, I think it is more, I can’t think of the words. I think it is because we have over the years, we grew up knowing the best and the worst of each other and being able to accept it. I think overall we were regarded as a family but some of them a distance thing, but there is a core, these groups of cores where some people are more important to you. They are more what you consider as family because you’ve grown together, you’ve been there for one another’s support. You’re totally accepting of what the person does and you’re ready to give them support at any time whether it be marriage breakdown or things like that. There is the core that you are closer to for one reason or another. Yes, you really do think of them as family. They’re the only family you’ve ever really had...You’ve got to remember that we didn’t know the true meaning of family, we didn’t know the whole concept, especially as youngsters. I don’t ever remember family being a word that was in our life (Naomi).
They nevertheless persist in the use of the term ‘Hopewood family’, which carries for them a significant set of values in terms of defining their own identity in relation to the rest of society which has not experienced, and cannot adequately comprehend, their years at Hopewood. Despite Naomi’s conviction that there is a ‘concept of family’ that can be known, and that the Hopewood group presumably does not fit in with this concept, the Hopewood experience provides a strong argument for the ability of individuals and groups within society to redefine those concepts for their own purposes, and to seek a set of meanings for themselves which can adequately define their own relation to society, whilst still retaining for themselves the integrity of their unique experience.

I have already discussed how the social order of Hopewood contributed to the development of the ‘Hopewood family’ concept among the children. This development was implicit in its derivation from the broader social practices of Hopewood, and was in this sense beyond the explicit control of the Hopewood hierarchy. There were however other explicit practices at Hopewood which were aimed specifically at establishing a concept of the Hopewood group as a family. In projecting that Hopewood concept to the broader community, Bailey was always careful to show it in as positive a light as possible (these issues will be more fully developed in the section dealing with Representations of Hopewood). Part of this strategy was to present Hopewood as not just another children’s home, which would then have to compete on an equal basis with other such homes for the charitable dollar. Bailey the astute businessman understood the importance of differentiating the product he was selling to consumers, and one of the ways in which he
sought to do this was by the presentation of Hopewood as a family. As Goffman (1959:15) points out:

> it will be in his interests to control the conduct of the others, especially their responsive treatment of him. This control is achieved largely by influencing the definition of the situation which the others come to formulate, and he can influence this definition by expressing himself in such a way as to give them the kind of impression that will lead them to act voluntarily in accordance with his own plan.

If Bailey was able to create the impression that he was running a family, and influence potential donors, government authorities and the general public to act towards Hopewood as they would to a large, if unconventional, family, rather than to a children’s home or orphanage, so much the better for him.

Thus was born the fiction of ‘Daddy Bailey’ and ‘Aunty Madge’. These were the terms by which Bailey and Cockburn came to be referred to by the children, terms which are still used as a regular part of the Hopewood parlance to this day.

There is no direct evidence to indicate the origin of these terms, whether there was a decision that these were the titles which would be used in referring to Bailey and
Cockburn, or whether the terms grew up out of the daily interactions, such as they were, between children and adults. What is certain is that from an early age, all the children were aware of the currency of the term Daddy Bailey:

That was the only thing I ever called him...I don't think we were ever told, it was just the way it was (Hugh).

I just grew up calling him Daddy Bailey and Aunty Madge and Miss Waters (Peggy). Even though the terms were clearly accepted in their currency within Hopewood, there were those who still resisted, even from a very early age:

I never thought of him as Daddy Bailey. Never...I guess by the time we came along that was what he was known as. Everybody called him that. I know I never did. I didn't give him a title, certainly not Daddy Bailey. No way, no way was he a Daddy (Naomi).

He looked too old to be a Daddy to me...I wouldn't call him Daddy. I was confused because he was supposed to be our Daddy but then everybody looked different to him (Rowena).

Despite the widespread currency of the term 'Daddy Bailey', then, it appears that some of the children were able to critically evaluate what they understood as the meaning of 'Daddy', compare it with their experience of Bailey, and reach conclusions that Bailey was not a 'Daddy'. Even at this early stage, the children had developed a concept of the components of family, and, as we have seen earlier in examining their responses to the emotional life of the Hopewood family, they have found Hopewood not to measure up to their concept of the family.

Bailey's interactions with the children on an individual level do not, as a whole, support the notion of him as a credible father figure for the children as a group. Overall, he emerges as an aloof figure, who had little to do with the immediate child rearing of the group, and whose time was spent more on business in Sydney than interacting on a personal level with the children growing up at Bowral or elsewhere. Photographic
evidence of Bailey's interactions with the children indicate a degree of physical and emotional distance which confirms the testimony of the children to his detachment from the scene. In these photos, Bailey appears as an detached observer, or surveyor, of the scene.

Figure 6-7: 'Pick Me Up Daddy' and the 'Loving Hands' of Bailey. Both photos emphasize a distance, both physically and emotionally, between Bailey and the children.

Figure 6-8: Playtime at Bowral 1951.

It appears that, not unsurprisingly in a group of 86 children, Bailey had his favourites, spending what we would now call 'quality time' with these, whilst making very little effort to interact with other members of his 'family':
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we saw him a lot. I mean we dealt with each other. But in the terms of a 'father' and a 'child' sitting down, I don't ever recall having a conversation with him. And I would be very surprised if many Hopewoods did. I think a chosen few did (Heidi).

For most of the children their prime interactions with Bailey were either ceremonial, such as forming an honour guard when he came to visit Hopewood (Heidi), or letting him win at tennis (Heidi, Winona); or disciplinary, as Bailey was the prime dispenser of discipline at Hopewood. Beyond these, there appears to have been little widespread individual interaction or personal affection for Bailey as a father among the Hopewood children. A similar pattern emerges where comments are made about 'Aunty Madge' (Winona, Peggy). What this was replaced by, and which persists to this day in the attitudes of many of the Hopewood children to Bailey, was a reverential sense of awe and adoration expressed on a group, rather than an individual basis, by the children to Bailey: "You've got no idea how popular that man was. He'd be walking from the house to the pavilion and he'd have a trail of kids behind him" (Jesse).
Other 'significant others' took on roles for the Hopewood children which placed them in the role of pseudo-parents within the Hopewood family. Ena Waters, as Secretary of the YWAA, undertook a great deal of the administrative work on behalf of the children, and is generally spoken of with affection (Rowena, Peggy).

Other staff members are spoken of by the children in varying terms, however the relationships of most of the Hopewood staff with the children were constrained by Bailey's policy that the staff were not to show any affection for the children (Rowena). This is consistent with Bailey's strict intent to ensure that the children were not subjected to any influences which might deflect them from their natural health diet. After all, if the children would break their diet by stealing forbidden food from staff who they had little emotional interaction with, how much more likely would they be to break it if they could regularly beg treats from friendly staff?

Of particular interest in illuminating this point is the case of 'Nan' McLeod, who acted as house mother to the girls who lived in the Canberra house, most of whom were teenagers at the time. These smaller homes (Canberra, Manly, Narrabeen) had been established by Bailey with the express intent of creating a more 'normal' family atmosphere, away from what we have already noted as the unique environment of Hopewood itself (Winona, Jesse). She is spoken of with unvarying affection by those who came under her care (Naomi, Peggy). It appears that this affection was ultimately her undoing. McLeod appears to have had more flexibility than was acceptable to Bailey over a number of issues to do with the girl's upbringing, especially in the application of
the natural health diet. The girls report a number of major arguments between the two, which culminated in Nan McLeod’s resignation. Clearly Bailey’s prime consideration was that the girls should persist with the Hopewood diet. Any influence which worked against this needed to be neutralised, even if it would have a negative effect on the emotional side of his ‘family’s’ upbringing.

The ‘Hopewood Family’ is an ongoing reality for those who grew up in it. It is the only family that they knew, and despite its obvious peculiar features, it has been a source of identity and strength throughout their lives. Hopewood is the prime source of social identity and affiliation for the children, certainly as they were growing up, and also into their adult lives. For some, this adult affiliation has take on some ambivalent meaning, as they attempt to resolve the positive and negative outcomes of their lives within this unusual group. Whilst some recognise that in terms of emotional development and contact there is something missing in their ‘family’ experience, this is supplemented by the powerful sense of belonging which was developed and reinforced in them throughout their young lives. It would be fair to say that even the most critical of those interviewed, those who felt that they had missed out on the most by not having a normal childhood, still regard Hopewood as their ‘tribe’, their ‘mob’. Strong links of identity and affiliation have been developed, and it is perhaps for this reason that their desire for their hurts to be heard and acknowledged by their family is so intense, and conversely why their current rejection from the fold is also so painfully felt.
CHAPTER 7 – HOPEWOOD EXPERIENCE AND THE HOPEWOOD EXPERIMENT

I am confident that it can be demonstrated that when children are nourished by an adequate supply of natural foods, eaten in correct order, and properly masticated, that they will escape most of the ailments suffered by the majority. If, in addition, they have the benefits to be derived from exercise, physical culture, fresh air, sunshine, recreation, suitable companionship and guardianship, hygiene, suitable housing, clothes and instruction, plus the affectionate attention of the people who will be carefully selected for that purpose, will it not be strange, if they do not emerge from such a home with qualifications much above average?

L.O. Bailey, Chic Salon Bulletin, September 2 1941

INTRODUCTION

In creating the Hopewood Experiment, Bailey intended to have a permanent effect on the lives of the children who were part of it. He intended to prove, using the model of a scientific experiment, that his particular form of diet had the potential to positively change the health of those who partook of it, and that these health benefits could be passed on as an inheritance for generations to come. For this to succeed, Bailey needed to produce children who would conform to the ideals of good citizenship which he wished to reproduce, children who would continue to follow the Hopewood diet, and children who, when the time was right, would be prepared to marry among themselves in order to perpetuate his eugenic ideal. The facts speak for themselves. None of the children married among themselves. Whilst the ideals of a vegetarian diet are now more accepted amongst the wider community than they were in Bailey’s time, there is little of Bailey’s hand in this. The Hopewood Health Centre at Wallacia is a lucrative financial concern (http://www.hopewood.com.au/), and was maintained as such by Madge
Cockburn after Bailey’s death. Its clientele is primarily a small, wealthy elite, not the universal acceptance of Bailey’s diet that he had hoped for in his lifetime.

The question then raised is twofold. What did Bailey do within Hopewood to try to ensure the success of his plans and, why did his plans not succeed? In the previous chapter, the children’s testimony was used as an entry point to identify the broader social practices of Hopewood, and the ways in which social control was enacted at Hopewood, particularly through the social control of time and the control of the body. This has identified a number of critical issues, including the centrality of diet and eating as a principle of social control at Hopewood; the role of stigma in defining the relationship between the Hopewood group and society as a whole; and the Hopewood group’s construction of itself as an extraordinary kind of ‘family’, beyond the traditional notions of what it means to be a member of a family. In examining the more specific issues relating to the conduct of Hopewood, these broader trends will form a significant backdrop against which the account of the achievement of Bailey’s objectives must be seen.

Bailey’s official objectives for the Hopewood project are set out in the Articles of Association of the Youth Welfare Association of Australia. The earlier chapters of this work offered a critique of the objectives of the YWAA, and of Bailey’s program, in terms of the application of dietary principles within a racially-based eugenic framework. The substance of the argument of this critique is implicit in the Articles of Association, although of course the rhetoric of the Articles does not make these connections explicit.
The Articles will therefore be used, in the light of the issues raised by children's testimony, to assess the relationship between intention and results in Bailey's program.

In the analysis of the children's testimony, a set of issues has emerged which can be aligned with the Articles of Association of the YWAA. To provide the full context, the Articles are reproduced in full at Appendix 1, omitting, in accordance with Bailey's own practice in the Annual Reports, clauses related to the machinery of operation of the YWAA. The Articles can be divided along the following lines, which will be used as the structure for the balance of this chapter:

**Building the perfect person**: Article 1: to perfect Australian youth physically, mentally, morally and spiritually; Article 2: to demonstrate the improvement gained from Bailey's principles; Article 3: to conduct a suitable home for mothers and babies; Article 6: to conduct an ideal home for the permanent care of the children.

**Natural Health and its principles**: Article 2: application of rational care, training and diet; Article 7: promotion of robust health among the children; Article 29: to promote the increase of Australia's population; Article 30: to promote the virility of Australian life.

**Discipline**: Article 8: to apply psychology during the training of the children in order to ensure obedience and self-discipline;

**Education**: Article 9: to develop handcrafts among the children; Article 10: to develop self-expression and good English; Article 11: to provide a good general education; Article 12: to develop an appreciation of nature; Article 13: development of the children's talents; Article 17: where suitable, to provide access to university education for the children;
Sex and Gender: Article 12: appropriate education on the facts of life;

Preparation for Adult Life: Article 14: to develop good citizenship among the children;
Article 17: to assist the children to find suitable employment;

Perpetuating the Ideal: Article 21: to maintain contact through reunions, and to encourage marriage between the children.

The children’s stories provide the basis for the validation of Bailey’s methods and the consequences of his project.

**WE HAVE BUILT A PERFECT PERSON**

Bailey conceived of Hopewood as an ideal environment. As we have seen previously, Bailey believed in the importance of the environment in developing the character and personality of children. As such, the ideal environment would of necessity create the ideal person. Part of Bailey’s project was therefore to demonstrate the outcomes of his approach to the world at large.

The physical environment of Hopewood itself was structured to provide an ideal environment in which Bailey’s activities could take place. Hopewood itself was a “luxurious façade” (Helen), “the walls of our beautiful Hopewood home were hung with paintings, and they were not cheap imitations or prints. They were expensive paintings by fine artists. He surrounded us with beauty” (David cited in Trop 1971:123). The staff’s sole function was to ensure that the needs and wants (within the confines set by Bailey in terms of diet, daily routine and discipline) of the children were met:
The children had to be treated quite at the top of the list. The best attention, the best love and care, the best home. It all had to be done for the children. Everything was for the children. We (the staff) were nothing. It was their home and their life (Jesse).

Bailey took pains, and went to considerable expense, to provide an environment in which his charges could thrive. His efforts were concentrated on ensuring that the results of his project would adequately demonstrate the efficacy of his 'design for better living'.

This demonstration was achieved in part through the gathering and presentation of scientific evidence showing the results, particularly in terms of the impact on dental health, the results of which were quantified and published as indicated previously. Beyond this, there was also the attempt at improvement in the overall general health of the children. The uses to which Bailey put this data have been discussed in an earlier chapter. What has not been made clear until now is the children's perceptions of this process, and the ways in which they responded to living as the subjects of a social experiment.

The regular visits of the van from the Sydney Dental Hospital, which provided the dental services to Hopewood, including the recording of the various measurements required by the study, are remembered as part of the Hopewood routine. The children's accounts do not reveal that the visit of the dental van was viewed by the children with any great degree of either trepidation or anticipation, it appears to be merely another aspect of the Hopewood routine with which the children complied:

The dentist truck used to come up...I couldn’t say exactly. It would be once a year or once every six months. They had that pink stuff. They treated me alright, the dentist. Then they put that pink stuff in the gaps of your teeth line. I didn’t get any fillings from that. I didn’t have any fillings until I left the Home...We all had to line up outside the van but I’m not sure about that but I know that when they used to come down to Bowral we had to go into the van (Rowena).
As with a number of the other children, Rowena is clearly proud of her dental record, of the fact that she never had fillings until she left Hopewood. That their teeth were special was emphasised to the outside world by Bailey in a number of ways. The medical and dental researchers to whom he gave access to Hopewood reported the results of their research in the professional journals of the day. These results, together with selected casts and other physical material demonstrating their superior teeth, was on display at the National Academy of Science in Canberra. A number of the children referred to this exhibition during the interviews, displaying an obvious pride in the fact that ‘their teeth’ had been part of a national display of this sort. From the mid-1950s onwards Bailey organised, in conjunction with the Australian Dental Association as part of Dental Health Week, an annual Dental Health Competition. The intention of the Competition was to promote dental health in children, and gave cash prizes to those children who were judged superior models of dental health. Not surprisingly, given the already documented superior state of their teeth, the Hopewood children were always prominent in the list of winners, runners-up and consolation prizes. The results of the longitudinal study on the children’s teeth, together with Bailey’s own promotional activities, gave the certain impression that the teeth of the Hopewood children were uniformly perfect, a tribute to the effects that good diet and a healthy lifestyle could have.

For the children, the status of being presented and regarded as exemplars in the field of dental hygiene was a paradoxical experience. For those like Winona, who had “perfect teeth” (Naomi’s words), there is clearly a sense of pride when she recalls those times when she was the centre of attention. For those who were able to exemplify
Bailey's ideal and demonstrate the efficacy of his dietary regime, there was not just a financial reward associated with success in the Dental Competition, but far more importantly, the reward of attention. I have already identified the emotional distance and lack of close emotional bonds felt by many of the Hopewood children during their growing up. The attention provided by their status as models of dental health was relished by those who were the centre of attention, providing as it did a relief from the general lack of emotional contact which many of them have commented on as a characteristic of their Hopewood life.

It is important to note, in regard to the issue of dental health, that the Hopewood population was not homogeneous in its standards of dental health. A hierarchy appears to have developed among the children, with those who exemplified the ideal having access to a range of privileges, even apart from the rewards of Dental Competitions and so on, from which those less fortunate in their dental endowments were excluded. Children who most explicitly exemplified the ideal were those who were selected for the more public demonstrations of their dental prowess:

Robyn and Shirley and a couple of the others used to go up to the Dental Hospital...for check ups and to be admired because they had good teeth. So they were very selective about whose teeth were being studied. About who they were using as guinea pigs. So it's a false front. It was false. It was not accurate because it did not involve those who had bad teeth (Naomi).

For promotional purposes, Bailey appears then to have been quite selective in choosing which Hopewood children he would use in representing the Hopewood ideal. Those specimens who did not match up to his ideal, whilst still being present in the aggregated scientific data, were thus made invisible and absent in the process of the promotion of Bailey's successes.
The dental van used to come and check you out but different ones used to go up to the Dental Hospital. I worked it out later, as much as I couldn’t understand it when I was younger. I didn’t have a good set of teeth so I was ignored...If you had a good looking set of teeth you would go to the Hospital because you would then be recorded. I didn’t realise it at the time but as an adult I certainly do. So Robyn got plenty of attention because she had a lovely set of teeth. She used to go to Sydney to the Dental Hospital (Naomi).

The children were aware early in their lives that part of the role which they were to play involved acting as demonstrations of the efficacy of Bailey’s schemes. They were also very much aware that this imposed on them a particular hierarchy, headed by those most useful to Bailey in exemplifying the success of his dietary model, with the remainder of the group relegated to an inferior status. In this context, it is important to note that this selective use of the children as exemplars did not just extend to those who displayed ideal dental characteristics, although this was used by Bailey as the prime signifier of physical health. Peggy for instance reports a similar policy of exclusion of herself from Hopewood demonstrations or photo opportunities on the basis of her poor eyesight.

From an early age, the children were raised in the knowledge that they would be used by Bailey as prime examples of the efficacy of his health regime. To reach the scientific and medical community, Bailey used the medium of the medical and dental studies of the Hopewood children. To reach the wider community, which included of course potential donors, regular Open Days were held at Bowral.
On these days, the general public was able to inspect the 'good works' being carried out at Hopewood, and were given the opportunity to interact with the children. They were also invited to write comments in the Hopewood Visitor's Book, expressing their views on Bailey's work:

- A great work!
- Splendid work! Congratulations to all concerned.
- Deserving of every support!
- A marvellous establishment worthy of every patronage!
- Worthy foundation for future citizenship! Would feel proud to have my child brought up at Hopewood.
- Beautiful children, very happy!
- All the angels are not in heaven!
- The health and intelligence of the children are a credit to Hopewood House.

(YWAA Annual Report 1947:9)

The structure of this day is consistent with what I have already argued to be the dominant themes underlying the conduct of Bailey's project: the use of formal modes of ceremony as methods of social control of the children and of the event itself; the celebration of Bailey as the charismatic leader of this unique social experiment; and the emphasis on the
achievements of Hopewood through the bodies of the children, by their achievement and performance of a range of physical acts:

The form that it would take, my recollection is that there would be some formal ceremony that happened, that the kids would have to stand in line at attention and do something. I think Bailey would make some speeches or something. We might have to sing a song or something. I think that also some of us might have to have brought out some of our school work or something. We certainly had to do some sport thing to show them about our sports prowess (Heidi).

The Hopewood Open Days were, to use Goffman’s (1959) term, exercises in ‘impression management’. They were the products of a coordinated team (Bailey and Cockburn, with the children in supporting functions acting a rigidly disciplined set of roles). The intention of this performance was to focus the audience’s attention on what Bailey had achieved through Hopewood, and in particular, his ability to produce peak physical specimens from material which, at least initially, must not have demonstrated a great potential. Hopefully, the audience would respond positively to the performance of Open Day, either in the form of donations to the cause, or in providing other means of support, such as publicity or word-of-mouth promotion. The focus, as has been so often revealed by the children’s accounts of their life at Hopewood, was not on them as individuals, but on their generalised status as the perfected products of a process designed, overseen, and sanctioned by Bailey.

There is also one further account, by Heidi, that following the Open Day, selected visitors were able to take children away with them for the weekend. Again, her response to this was one of being depersonalised, rather than any particular delight or pleasure at being removed from the confines of Hopewood for a time: “it was a bit like, ‘there’s a whole bowl of lollies, which one will I have?’ I always found it very demeaning and very pretentious”. In this sense, as already indicated, the children were cultural products
for the consumption of a market targeted by Bailey in order to gain support for his project. Even though in this case the child appears to have been singled out for special attention, the overall practices of Hopewood have merely supported that process of individualization over individualisation (Qvortrup 1994:10) which is a characteristic of institutional practice in relation to children. The children were presented to the world as an overall package, having value as exemplars of a particular social form. As individuals, they had no value in themselves beyond their contribution to the demonstration of Bailey’s overarching ideal.

The children’s comments on the Open Days reveal a stark aversion to the whole process. Rowena would hide in a tree for the whole time while the visitors were there. Naomi would endure what she perceived as patronising comments from the visitors that she ‘should be grateful’ for the chance in life that Bailey had given her, a chance that she obviously would not otherwise have been given. From the children’s testimonies, it appears that there was nothing other than such a superficial and patronising interaction between the visitors and the children, either on the ‘you should be grateful’ lines, or a sentimental lamentation as to “how could a mother let such a pretty girl go?” (Heidi). There is no evidence of any attempt by the visitors at Open Day to interact on a more intimate level with the children. Clearly, this was neither the purpose nor the practice of the ceremony.
The children also demonstrate an early awareness that this process presented them as specimens, as component parts of a scientific experiment and that even at that young age they were uneasy with this process:

I remember a day when the world came and had a look at us. I always felt like we were specimens. I mean you always felt like that. You had the big dental truck that came in and did nothing but peer at you... We were never presented as human beings, we were always presented as the results of this particular thing. Either the beautiful specimen teeth or you know, like our physical capacity. But nobody ever asked us to open our mouth and talk about us (Heidi).

The children were aware from the time that they were in Hopewood, and have clarified this in their adult reflections, that they were part of a social experiment, and that their role in that experiment was to be exemplars of this to ensure the experiment worked successfully. Even an account as laudatory of Bailey’s work as A Gift of Love (Trop 1971:123), provides testimony of the wider awareness within the Hopewood community of their status:

I have heard some of those who grew up with me say that Daddy was trying to prove a point to the world, that raising us on a vegetarian diet and natural foods would result in better health, and that he was kind of conducting a big experiment, and that was one of his main reasons for setting up Hopewood (David).

Bailey’s intent, as he consistently stated throughout all his publications, and as explicitly stated in the Articles of Association of the YWAA, was to demonstrate the capacity of his particular regime of diet and natural health to provide physical perfection to those who lived by these principles. His was an interest in the perfection of the body, not of the mind. To this end, Bailey developed numerous strategies by which he could demonstrate to the wider community his success in achieving this physical perfection through the medium of the Hopewood children. From his own point of view, Bailey was spectacularly successful in achieving this end. He enlisted the support of the medical and dental communities in documenting and publishing, in a scientifically legitimate manner,
the results of his experiment. He opened the doors of Hopewood to the public, and gave them a controlled glimpse of the physical benefits that his regime had on those under his care. To this day, the Hopewood Health Centre at Wallacia remains a commercially successful application of his dietary principles.

For the children involved, however, the consequences of being part of an experimental group have been rather more mixed. Bailey manipulated his experimental population. He only presented for further validations and demonstrations those children who most explicitly demonstrated those physical attributes which he saw as the primary indicators of good health, in particular good teeth but also other physical characteristics. Participation in these activities was viewed as a privilege by the Hopewood children, involving as it usually did trips away from their normal residence at Bowral to the Dental Hospital at Sydney. Whilst those who met the criteria for worthiness clearly benefited from their participation, those excluded were marginalised and disenchanted by the process. Further disenchancement was then provided during Bailey’s Open Days at Hopewood, where attention was directed at the children not on an individual level, but only for their property of demonstrating the efficacy of Bailey’s dietary and natural health principles. The children’s experience of these days confirmed for them that they were being used as the subjects in a social experiment, and that their primary value for Bailey was in their ability to provide the data required for the successful completion of this experiment. What was important was their bodies, and the effect that Bailey’s health regime had on the development of their bodies. There was no attempt made, either by Bailey or by those present as audiences at the Open Days, to relate to the children on an
individual level. They were experimental subjects; they were exemplars of the physical benefits of Bailey's health regime; and they were stereotypical orphan children, who should be grateful to their benefactor for plucking them from the gutter they would otherwise have spent the rest of their lives in. None of these impressions left any room for an engagement with the children as individuals, and they clearly felt it. Bailey may have achieved his aim in delivering the impression of a set of perfect bodies and perfect teeth to the Australian public, but it was done at the cost an imperfect set of social relations for the Hopewood children.

**NATURAL HEALTH AND ITS PRACTICES**

For Bailey, the practice and application of natural health principles was the keystone of his project. The children were to be brought up on a health regime solely based on these principles. He expected them to derive great health benefits from this regime, and these benefits would be demonstrated to the Australian public at large by a combination of scientific validation and reporting of his data, and other publicity activities such as press and media reportage, and demonstrations such as the Hopewood Open Days. He hoped to use these methods to encourage the wider adoption of his natural health model throughout Australian society. The Hopewood children themselves were to be encouraged to intermarry, and the vigorous good health which they possessed by virtue of the Hopewood natural health regime would be passed on to the next generation, who in their turn would also continue in the diet, passing on the virtues of natural health for generations to come. Bailey's vision for the future was of a vigorous
and healthy Australian population, made so by the adoption and practice of the natural health principles on which he based his own life.

I have already indicated, in relation to the conduct of the daily routine at Hopewood, how the day was structured around the consumption of food. The day was structured to ensure that the Hopewood diet was adhered to at all times, and that there were no opportunities for outside food to be consumed. Of course, as I have highlighted, the children either found or made opportunities for the consumption of these forbidden fruits, despite Bailey’s best precautions.

Maintenance of the Hopewood diet was critical to the success of Bailey’s project. As such, it is to be expected that the approved Hopewood diet (see Appendix to Chapter 4 – A Ten Point Plan for Health and Longevity) was provided at all times and that there would be no sanctioned deviations from this. The accounts of meals at Hopewood are consistent in their description of a diet based on fruit and vegetables with the minimum of cooking, with absolutely no meat or sugar:

Breakfast...sometimes it was porridge, terry meat we used to call it. It was like porridge, sort of, sticky and horrible...(We had) the terry meat sometimes but no sugar, no honey. Oh honey, yeah, we were allowed to have honey. Treacle. We weren’t allowed to have margarine. Dried biscuits for lunch with nothing on them...they gave you your raw, everything salad, raw grated everything...That’s grated everything. Grated carrots aren’t so bad. Grated cabbage! (Rowena).

The breakfast was the worst thing-salad and chickpeas for breakfast (Jesse).

At Moree we were made to eat raw pumpkin which was awful. I don’t mind cooked pumpkin with a little bit of butter but raw pumpkin was just awful...Once they gave us raw beetroot. Raw beetroot, now I don’t mind that a little bit but raw pumpkin really did taste off (Warren).

We used to take nuts and raisins and sultanas and a piece of block cheese. I mean we had terrific food. I can remember getting off the bus, coming home from school, they used to drop us off at
the pavilion and straight in for a fresh squeezed fruit drink or a piece of watermelon or something. I don’t ever recall being hungry even though we weren’t allowed to pick. Morning tea which was fruit and your lunch and your afternoon tea which was fruit or fruit juice (Peggy).

Conformance to the dietary regime was an absolute requirement for all the Hopewood children, to the extent that severe sanctions (for instance being sent to your room for up to days at a time) would be visited upon any of the children who resisted its application. Mealtimes were rigorously supervised, to ensure that the specified menu was properly consumed, and we have already seen that Bailey took great pains to minimise the opportunity for the children’s diet to be tainted by outside influences. Despite the instances we have already documented of the various ways in which the children resisted the application of Bailey’s dietary regime, it appears that there were also a number of cases where the children had no experience of ‘normal’ food until they left Hopewood. This was extended in the case of Peggy, who had been so totally isolated from non-vegetarian foods that when placed in domestic service after leaving Hopewood, she did not know how to cook meat, a fact which resulted in severe beatings from what was a none too sympathetic employer. Bailey’s program of sanctions and controls over the eating process was in many cases therefore successful, ensuring that the children were only ever exposed to the Hopewood diet whilst they were under his charge.

Far from being an impediment in their later lives however, many of the children speak positively of the effect that the diet has had on their lives, and claim an adherence to it even now, when most of the former Hopewood children are aged in their fifties:

I purposely brought up my daughter as a vegetarian because I was a vegetarian. I had never been sick of my life so I thought it must be good you know, and I’d heard how other children were sick and had stones in their kidneys and they had all these throat infections and they had all these terrible things wring with them, and I thought, well I want my daughter to grow up like me and not have any health problems and so I did. I brought her up as a vegetarian until she went to boarding school and that’s when she started to have problems, when she started to eat meat (Michelle).
Warren even speaks of the positive benefits which he has felt after returning to the Hopewood diet only recently prior to being interviewed, after lapsing from the diet for many years. The children’s experience of the Hopewood diet is not a single experience as Bailey would have hoped, of the reproduction of vigorous good health in all his charges by the rigid application of his dietary principles. The diet was resisted by some of the children who, being children, were tempted by the sweets and other forbidden foods which they became aware of through contact with other children at school. For others, however, Bailey did provide an enduring legacy of dietary practices which they uphold and advocate to this day.

The natural health regime which Bailey propounded and implemented at Hopewood was not solely concerned with diet, although this was undoubtedly the lynchpin of Bailey’s program. Physical labour was, as we have seen, a regular part of the children’s day from a very early age. As well as performing the very important function of tightly controlling the otherwise spare time of 86 children, and providing a free source of labour for some of the more menial tasks at Hopewood, the physical work performed by the Hopewood children was also an important source of physical exercise for the children. This was supplemented by daily physical exercises (Peggy), as well as a variety of sporting activities. Swimming, horse riding, tennis and running were all available to the children, and the YWAA Annual Reports invariably contained some references, including photographs, emphasising the children’s physical accomplishments and activities. The emphasis for Bailey was, as we have consistently seen, on the children’s bodily development. The developmental activities which were emphasised for them as
children were physical development activities. Their progress was celebrated in terms of the accomplishment of physical milestones and achievements. In Bailey’s terms, the natural health gospel was about the discipline and development of the body of the child. It was enacted on the body of the child through the discipline of diet, work, and exercise; and the success of the natural health program could only be measured in terms of the physical indicators of the child’s bodily development.

The natural health movement from which Bailey drew his inspiration was, as I have discussed earlier in defining the origins of Bailey’s dietary and health regime, a movement which took as a basic article of faith the primacy of nature over science in the provision of a healthy lifestyle for people. Bailey was committed to the use of scientific, experimental methods and scientific reportage to demonstrate the success of his project. In keeping with his natural health blue-print, however, the actual health practices used at Hopewood in relation to the children were derived from a conviction that the virtues of nature were sufficient in themselves to guarantee the children’s health. In accordance with the natural health principles of such as Carrel, Bailey’s view was that the modern medical science, and in particular the rise of modern medicines and methods of treatment, had made modern man soft and weak, and was one of the principal reasons for the decline of modern Western civilisation.

The natural health diet, and the program of healthy work and exercise which Bailey designed for the children, embodied all these principles, and the children’s accounts of their lives at Hopewood confirm their application in the daily routine of life.
at Hopewood. Bailey supported this by a medical regime which emphasised prevention
over cure, and reliance on the body’s own defensive and recuperative powers to combat
disease and injury. This was to be supported by the invigorating properties of the natural
health diet. Bailey’s regime was to be nature’s way of health management and control.
To this end, the practices of Hopewood actively discouraged the engagement of medical
practitioners for the diagnosis and care of most common ailments and injuries. Almost
all of the Hopewood children interviewed attest to a medical regime at Hopewood in
which traditional medical practitioners did not play a role, with some reporting that they
never saw a doctor once during their whole time at Hopewood (Rowena, Peggy). In the
few circumstances that medical practitioners were required, Bailey ensured that these
were sympathetic to his views.

The standard response to an illness was for the child to be confined to bed on a
diet of orange juice (Rowena, Jesse, Peggy). Staff members understood that doctors
could only be called in with Bailey’s permission (Jesse). There is evidence to suggest
that at least one staff member resigned over a disagreement with Bailey over whether or
not a doctor should be called to attend one particularly seriously ill girl (Naomi). The
official Hopewood justification given to staff for this practice was that the natural
recuperative powers given to the body by the Hopewood diet made any sort of traditional
medical intervention unnecessary.

In most cases, this regime appears to have been successful in allowing the
children to recover from the majority of childhood ailments. Nevertheless, in more
serious cases, the rigid application of these methods could have serious consequences for the child involved:

I had glandular fever so I was a very sick girl. This was at Moree and so far about six months I was laid out on the dining room table...I was stretched out on the dining room table, for six months and out on a fast. And I went down to, apparently, about three and a half stone...not all fast, diluted fruit juice and something else (Heidi).

Even in this situation, in the direst of medical conditions, ownership of the body of the child and of the processes to be enacted on that body is vested in Bailey and his teachings. His principles were to be applied, irrespective of the consequences for the child involved, on the assumption that the inherent virtue of the natural health diet would, in all circumstances, eventually allow the child to recover. In this particular situation, it was only through the intervention of an outsider who reported the situation to government authorities that the child in question was given access to a more appropriate level of medical care, including being flown to hospital.

The Hopewood hierarchy’s desire to control the bodies of the children was not merely confined to their lives at Hopewood. Peggy recounts an incident which occurred at the age of eighteen or nineteen, when after being diagnosed with acute appendicitis she was urgently admitted to hospital for an appendectomy. She was later punished by the Hopewood staff (by having her Christmas present withheld), because she should have consulted a doctor sympathetic to the Hopewood cause. Rowena recounts a similar incident at the age of sixteen, where Bailey refused to sign the permission form for her to have her appendix removed. Clearly, conventional medicine was viewed with a great deal of suspicion under the Hopewood natural health regime. In most cases, it was preferred not to allow medical intervention, but to allow nature to take its course. Bailey’s own health had been saved by natural health and by a natural diet; it had not
been saved by drugs and doctors. He translated this belief into a set of medical practices at Hopewood in which the practices and cures of traditional, scientifically based medicine were not even the last resort, but were beyond the last resort.

Bailey sought to provide an enduring legacy of natural health practices in the Hopewood children. Some certainly internalised the natural health values and attitudes Bailey sought to uphold and promote:

we learned not only how to be clean on the outside, but clean on the inside. He never stopped teaching us how to take care of our bodies, and now if I ever get sick, I don’t call a doctor, because I know it was my own fault and I know why I got sick in the first place, and I know how to get well again. I stop doing what made me sick...So the first thing I do is to rest; I don’t eat, and if I do it is only fresh juices (David, cited in Trop 1971:122).

Bailey’s sentiments on the subject of natural health, and his notions of the proper care and control of the body, are echoed and upheld almost verbatim here: the emphasis on prevention over cure, the notion that improper habits of living are what causes disease, the reliance on fasting and juices as a curative measure, and the reluctance to rely on doctors for medical advice and assistance. These were the principles on which the dietary and health practices of Hopewood were built, and in this and other cases there has been an enduring positive legacy for the Hopewood adults from the dietary regime to which they were subjected as children. They attribute continued good health throughout their life to the constant application of these principles. What has not occurred, despite Bailey’s best intentions, has been a cross-generational impact for the principles of natural health. Even in those cases where the children of the Hopewood children have been exposed to the natural health diet, there is no evidence to suggest that either the principles of natural health, or any broader improvement in health status, has occurred. Where the Hopewood natural health principles have had an impact is on that generation who were
brought up at Hopewood, and who were socialised into the acceptance of those principles. There has been no eugenic impact of the kind envisioned by Bailey; the benefits of the natural health program have not been passed on to the next generation.

Bailey's natural health program was implemented through the domination and control of the bodies of the children under his supervision. As the children's testimonies have shown, not only did Bailey preach the gospel of the natural health diet, he rigorously applied its principles to all aspects of the children's upbringing. The medical care of the children's bodies was also controlled rigorously by natural health principles. Even though Hopewood was under formal medical supervision as required by the Child Welfare Department, formal medical intervention was not a practice of Hopewood, even, it appears, in the direst circumstances. Bailey's confidence in the regime of bodily control which he had formulated was such that his system of thought could not perceive the need for any type of medical intervention beyond his own. The moral and ethical superiority of 'nature', as embodied in his dietary and health regime, was sufficient of itself to guarantee the health of his charges. Bailey's was a strict order, but it was an order which took its authority as much from the moral value of nature, as it did from the rational value of science.

**DISCIPLINE AND PUNISHMENT AT HOPEWOOD**

Bailey's natural health regime was a system for the development and control of the growing bodies of the children under his charge. It was a codified social system with a set of rules universally understood and applied within that system. I have already identified instances of resistance from the children to the demands of Bailey's system,
including the eating of food contrary to the Hopewood diet, refusing the approved Hopewood food, avoidance of daily chores, and hiding away so as not to be part of the ceremonial of the Bowral Open Days. In order to enforce the application of his principles, Bailey established a system of sanctions and punishments, a system which gives further insight into the modes of operation of Hopewood, and of the responses of the inmates of Hopewood to its operations.

There does not appear to be any codified or consistent code of behaviour expected from the Hopewood children, which would give a consistent version of the types of behaviours for which sanctions or punishments would be invoked. The initial punishment of children for offences was under the control of the staff at the various Hopewood establishments, and these staff varied in both the types of behaviour they were prepared to tolerate, and in the punishments which they would mete out for these offences. Both Bailey (YWAA Annual Report 1949:5), and Madge Cockburn (Interview 1995), complain about the difficulties in obtaining staff willing and able to enforce his regime in the way he designed it. In this context, especially given the geographic dispersion of the Hopewood establishments, Bailey was unable to directly control the disciplinary regime at each establishment. It should also be noted that there were variations as the children grew older, for instance the treatment of the group of girls under Nan McLeod’s supervision at Canberra is reported by them as allowing more leeway, both in terms of the range of behaviour tolerated, and in the sanctions applied for misbehaviour, than had been experienced at a younger age at Hopewood itself. A variation in the range of acceptable behaviour was therefore impossible to eradicate.
Notwithstanding their de facto leeway in most aspects of discipline, staff were left in no doubt that the one area where variations would not be tolerated, and where the disciplinary regime must be rigidly enforced, was in the application of the Hopewood diet. It was expected, and it was enforced, that all children would partake of the diet, and that no deviations would be tolerated. The application of the Hopewood dietary regime was, as we have seen in all other areas, the central controlling feature of Bailey’s modes of discipline.

The very strict regime of social control has already been highlighted, and in particular the control of the children’s time, that characterised the Hopewood experience. This control was enforced, in the first instance, by the close supervisory regime enacted by Bailey’s staff. This regime was most closely followed at times when activities critical to the success of Bailey’s project were being conducted, such as at mealtimes. Extant photographs of mealtimes at Hopewood show a high level of supervision and surveillance of mealtime activities.

This is confirmed by a number of accounts of the children (Rowena, Heidi), showing the extent to which mealtimes were on the one hand, closely supervised, and on the other,
that sanctions were quickly enacted on those children who did not act appropriately
during the mealtime. The application of discipline at Hopewood was in the first instance
then a matter of supervision and surveillance: if the children were closely watched,
particularly in those activities deemed critical by Bailey such as eating, then there would
be little opportunity for aberrant behaviour. Punishment as such would not be necessary
except in extreme circumstances, as the children would be either too closely watched, or
too busy, to get into too much trouble.

Bailey enacted a disciplinary system of control enabled by surveillance and
constant activity. That the children did resist this regime of control I have already
documented. As such, it became necessary to enforce a set of sanctions against those
whose resistant behaviour was discovered. The one account given by a former
Hopewood staff member indicates that Bailey gave very clear directions that physical
punishment was not to be used, at any time, in disciplining the children: “he said...the
children are never to be smacked. And you weren’t allowed to hit them and you didn’t.
You weren’t allowed to hit them” (Jesse). In saying this however, Jesse goes on to give
an account which indicates that even in Bailey did not sanction the use of physical
violence by the staff against the children, he was nevertheless happy to encourage the
threat of physical violence as a method of coercion:

I had all the Catholic boys, on the balcony and in the house, up stairs. There was two of us, and I
was in charge, I was responsible for them and I was putting them to bed because they were
mucking up. They didn’t muck up very much but this night they were mucking up and I said “If
you children don’t go to sleep I’ll...” I said I’d do something. I couldn’t hit them. I didn’t want to
hit them. I was yelling at them obviously and Mr Bailey came in from his bedroom which was
just across the hall and he handed me a handful of balloon sticks, and he said “Here you are Miss
Philpott, if the boys don’t go to bed immediately you have my permission to hit them with these”.
So I just walked around with them and the boys went to bed without any trouble.
The preferred range of non-violent sanctions at Hopewood included being sent to one’s room for a period of time which varied according to the severity of the offence (Rowena, Heidi, Ingrid), or withdrawal of privileges (Naomi).

If Bailey gave the same instructions to all staff which he gave to Jesse regarding the use of physical punishment, it is overwhelmingly clear from the accounts of the children that physical punishment was regularly used, at all Hopewood establishments, as a sanction against deviant behaviour. Physical punishment appears to have been used by a variety of staff, although some individual staff members are consistently identified by the children as being particularly violent. The types of physical punishment inflicted range from the occasional smack, through to more violent, potentially dangerous, and humiliating incidents:

If you sat there with your elbows on the table, he didn’t care whether you were a boy or a girl, he used to stand on that landing on the stairwell going up and the keys used to come down on your elbow and he never missed. He never missed. The keys always got you elbow (Peggy).

Once I was just picking my food with the knife and this bastard, now this man’s an ex-policeman right, he picked me up like a rag doll at the pavilion, carried me upstairs to the dormitory, he wore a big leather belt and he pulled it out and he just held me by the arm and he got into me, and he hit me that bloody hard that I’ve shit myself-literally (Hugh).

Mealtimes were obviously a risky business at Hopewood, and from these accounts it appears that the punishments for infractions at mealtime were regular, summary, and severe. Bailey’s instructions to his staff may have forbidden the use of physical punishment for the Hopewood children. In practice it appears that whilst some may have used other forms of punishment for some minor infractions, once out of Bailey’s surveillance, the staff regularly used physical forms of punishment on the children which were, in some instances, extremely brutal and violent.
Despite the necessity to hand the day-to-day implementation of discipline to his staff in the various Hopewood establishments, Bailey himself still took a very direct, personal interest in the application of discipline there. Bailey’s definition of eugenic fitness included, as I have already noted, a significant component of proper citizenship. The physical capabilities which were to be developed under his eugenic program could not be directed towards socially desirable goals without an awareness on the part of the children of their responsibilities as functional citizens. Hopewood’s modes of discipline and control were an essential component of this part of Bailey’s program. The boundaries of acceptable behaviour were to be set, the responsibilities of the citizen were to be understood, socially beneficial patterns of behaviour were to be learnt and internalised. Discipline and punishment at Hopewood were integral parts of the socialisation of the Hopewood children.

Consistent with his pattern of centralised direction and control of the children’s upbringing, Bailey took both a personal interest in the deviations of the children from his standard of acceptable behaviour, and also a personal role in the application of punishments for offences by the children. In addition to their role in dispensing punishment for misbehaviour to children at the time, staff also prepared what the children refer to as a ‘behaviour report’, which would be given to Bailey on the next occasion on which he visited that establishment. On reviewing of the report, Bailey would then personally dispense his own form of punishment to the guilty children. Given the fact that Bailey’s visits were irregular and to some establishments infrequent, this could result
in a gap of some months between the actual incident, and Bailey’s final punishment of the child:

There were all these reports that were given by the people that were looking after us. And then there was the punishment to be dealt out. Like, if there were straps to be had, like there would be a list of punishment. If Bailey hadn’t been there for six months some of these acts went back six months, we were now getting punished for (Heidi).

Bailey punishments were of course in addition to any punishment the staff member may have metered out at the time of the incident:

You were usually punished then when you done it and then when he came along, like they used to put it in their report, the behaviour report or whatever you call it, some sort of report had to be written down if they were misbehaving and then he’d come along and give you seven of it, smacks (Rowena).

Punishment at Hopewood then was an almost constant presence for the children: not only were they punished immediately at the time, but from then until the time of Bailey’s next visit they had the prospect of Bailey’s own personal punishment to look forward to as well. If the modes of discipline were almost ever present at Hopewood, in the form of staff surveillance and the control of the children’s time, the modes of punishment were ever present as well, with punishment a past and a future event. The systems of social control at Hopewood were constructed so as to ensure the minimum of deviance from the subjects of the Bailey’s great experiment.

Bailey did not extend his prescriptions against the use of physical punishment on the children to himself. Bailey’s punishments usually took the form of spankings (Heidi, Hugh, Naomi). The Blue Room at Bowral was always used for these punishments, providing a sense of formality and ritual to the proceedings as well. Bailey thus established himself as the ultimate arbiter and authority in the children’s lives. He was the dispenser of considered justice, as opposed to the summary justice metered out at the
time of the offence by the staff member on hand at the time. He also reserved to himself particular modes of punishment which he had denied to others.

In addition to the modes of punishment and discipline inherent within the Hopewood system, Bailey also availed himself, in particular circumstances, of external agents of discipline and punishment. We have already noted in regard to the complicity of the local schools in Bowral in the segregation of the children at mealtime, the extent to which Bailey was able to gain and use influence in the local community for the purposes of furthering the progress of his experiment. A similar form of accommodation appears to have been reached with the local police force, who made their resources available for the implementation of punishments on miscreant Hopewood children. One incident in particular, described by Heidi, serves to highlight the level of accommodation reached between the local schools, the Bowral constabulary and the Hopewood hierarchy:

I was seven. I bashed a couple of the kids up, I was held back after school, I missed the bus home. The Home bus went and if you missed the bus, you had to walk home which is five miles, you had to walk home and if you didn’t get home in time for tea, you missed out on tea... So I missed the bus home, it was freezing cold, I had no shoes on and I was freezing... So what I did, I was furious with the world, what I did was, I walked through the main street of Bowral, and I broke every shop window in Bowral. Every shop window, there wasn’t a piece of glass left. It was fantastic, it was wonderful. It was sexy. In the noise, and the immediate gratification, it was just fantastic, it was wonderful... They locked me up in the lockup overnight. This clearly happened with the consent of those in the Home. Clearly happened. I was in a cell overnight. I was picked up on the Saturday, taken out to the Home, thrashed and just sort of sent to isolation.

Notwithstanding the severity of the offence in material terms, what is described here is a system of discipline and punishment exponential in its effect, a cascading set of circumstances ending with a seven year old girl spending the night, with the acquiescence of those formally responsible for her welfare, in a police cell. School punishment led to Hopewood punishment which in turn both reinforced, and supported, police punishment.
The use of formal institutions of restraint and punishment was not just confined to individual instances of deviant behaviour by the children. Bailey supplemented his own disciplinary regime with arrangements with private, often denominationally based, homes for ‘uncontrollable’ children. The Good Shepherd Convent at Ashfield, the Parramatta Girls’ Home, and the St. John of God Training Centre, Morisset, are all mentioned as Homes to which ‘uncontrollable’ Hopewood children were sent for short or long periods of time. The Good Shepherd Convent, in particular, was notorious at that time as a ‘Catholic Slave Laundry’ (Gill 1997:262-5). Uncontrollability, as previously discussed, was a convenient catch-all for a range of juvenile offences, including precocious sexuality: as Winona describes those who were sent off to the Convent, they were “very naughty” girls. The use of such confinement as a “disciplinary measure” is explicitly acknowledged by Bailey in at least one instance (YWAA Annual Report 1957). However, from the testimonies of those interviewed, it appears that placement in these homes, either for long or short periods, was more widespread than this single publicised incident. It was common knowledge among the children who had been sent to the other homes, that this was a sanction which would be applied rigorously, for an unspecified range of offences:

A lot of the girls ended up here at Ashfield (the Good Shepherd Convent). It was run by the sisters and that was where people used to dump girls that were unruly. They used to have to work. They didn’t know what they had done wrong to be sent there. What I didn’t know was that when some of the girls got into their teens, now 13/14 is a very difficult time for a girl. I don’t think they knew how to handle them. They’ve got all these teenage girls going through puberty...As soon as the girls misbehaved or something they whisked them off to Homes (Naomi).

The practice is confirmed by the staff member interviewed (Jesse). Her testimony confirms the implication of Naomi’s account that uncontrollability was defined primarily in sexual terms. Bailey was clearly concerned by the prospect of unrestricted sexual
activity between the children, separating the children on the basis of gender at the onset of puberty (Hugh, Rowena, Heidi).

‘Uncontrollability’ was defined primarily by the contemporary discourse in sexual terms, and this definition, as the above testimony indicates, was shared by Bailey and the Hopewood hierarchy. This is not to say that the offences for which girls were sent to other Homes were necessarily of a sexual nature themselves. As Naomi’s testimony indicates, some of those girls who were sent off to other Homes were not even aware of the offences for which they were being punished. This is borne out by the one account which I have from a girl who was subject to this particular treatment. Peggy was sent to the Good Shepherd Convent at the age of approximately 13. She admits to a number of minor misdemeanors at the time, mostly petty theft (stealing from the poor box, stealing milk bottles for their refund value to buy lollies). These offences were not, however, linked, either by any overt action by Bailey, or in Peggy’s own mind, with her subsequent placement at Ashfield. She describes the circumstances of her move to the Good Shepherd Convent as follows:

I went to Canberra halfway through fifth class. It came to a stage where, I was the oldest girl and the only girl getting her periods and Daddy Bailey said, “I’ve got one vacancy at Bowral, who’d like to go?”. I said, “Oh, I would, I would”. I considered myself to be a big girl now, I was getting periods. From Canberra I went to the Good Shepherd Convent and I’ll always remember it. They were in retreat. I grew up a Catholic and I knew what a retreat was. And there were Hopewood girls already with the Good Shepherd nuns...It was home for, Girl’s Home, where they worked in the laundry and a lot of the girls went through the Children’s Court, and the nuns went to the Children’s Court, and if they were from a Catholic family the nuns would get them rather than go to either Parramatta Girl’s Home or some other homes were about, you know.

Peggy spent eighteen months with the Good Shepherd nuns at Ashfield. The other tenants included those juvenile offenders who had been taken by the nuns from the Children’s Court, a number of intellectually disabled adults, as well as, from her memory, at least thirteen other Hopewood girls at one time or another. She was never made aware
of what offence had led to her placement there. A subsequent conversation with Madge Cockburn regarding the availability of proper sanitary pads made it perfectly clear to her that Bailey provided his consent, and financial support for her to be there.

We complained, I did, complained about having to wash out things, rags, square flannelette things, you could never get the stains out of them. And she (Madge Cockburn) said, “Well, you ask them for proper pads. Daddy Bailey pays for you to be here.” That’s what she told me.

Peggy is still unaware to this day of why she was sent to the Good Shepherd Convent. Superficially, perhaps it is merely a matter of chance: she was the one who put her hand up on the day, so she is the one who drew the short straw. But this does not explain why Bailey lied to her. However, I have already drawn attention towards the contemporary tendency to perceive a range of juvenile indiscretions, such as Peggy herself was guilty of, as symptomatic of juvenile sexual ‘uncontrollability’. It is also significant that her placement at Ashfield occurred just at the start of her own physical manifestations of puberty. Jesse’s attitudes to the girl’s sexuality is also significant: she felt that as the mothers of some, if not all the girls under Bailey’s care, were of a dubious moral character:

there was all sorts of mothers that produced these children. There were ‘good time girls’, girls who wanted to just drop the baby and go out and smoke and drink and go out with the next boy down the street. There were girls who went out with boys while they were pregnant. There were rough girls, I suppose is a better way to put it. And there were nice girls and there were an awful lot of nice girls. But there was this bad element as well. Some of their mothers were not nice people.

Jesse’s conclusion from this was that these moral values, or rather lack thereof, would be reflected by the girls under care at Hopewood. Whether Bailey shared such personal views of his charges to this extent is not clear, although his speeches in the YWAA Annual Reports, particularly from the late 1950s on, when the oldest children were
entering puberty, exhibit a concern with the control of sexual behaviour and sexual morality not present in his earlier writings.

Education in the ‘facts of life’ was a stated aim under the Articles of Association of the YWAA. Madge Cockburn was responsible for sex education for the girls (Jesse), whilst Bailey took on the responsibility for the boys (Warren). However, access to this was by no means universal. The majority of the girls interviewed for this project were from the younger group. Those who had recollections of some form of sex education (Naomi, Heidi, Peggy), all make the point that while they can recall the older group of girls being taken away for a ‘sex talk’ by ‘Aunty Madge’, they have no such recollection of receiving such a talk themselves, and they comment about their lack of sexual knowledge until they actually left Hopewood. The only conclusion that it is possible to draw about this practice is that if Bailey did persist in his stated aim to provide information on the facts of life at the appropriate time, it was intended that the older girls themselves pass down their knowledge to the younger ones. We have already observed the difficulties that Bailey and the Hopewood hierarchy had in developing intimate relationships with the children at large. Such a practice seems to be further evidence of this. The children’s bodies were, as we have already seen, viewed as sites of potential evil as well as of innocence. Any engagement with the sexual aspect of the body thus threatened to invoke this evil, and dispel the important aura of innocence.

What can be inferred from this evidence is that as the children, and in particular the girls, reached puberty, the control of their behaviour, and in particular their sexual
behaviour, became more of a concern for Bailey. In this, Bailey was of course echoing the concerns of contemporary society regarding the incidence of sexual delinquency among the young, especially girls (Carrington 1993). From his own point of view however, control of sexual and reproductive activity was at the core of his eugenic project. It was absolutely vital that the girls, as the vessels for the reproduction of the next generation of natural health ideal types, should not indulge in behaviours which would jeopardise this role. To this end, any behaviour which could be judged as symptomatic of juvenile uncontrollability would be treated with a severity perhaps inappropriate to an instance of petty pilfering or other misdemeanours. To enforce his ability to control the children in this way, Bailey established a set of arrangements with those institutions well versed in the management of ‘wayward girls’, with the intent of excluding the girls from the possibility of temptation. Peggy’s story, then, once again reveals the essential nature of Bailey’s program at Hopewood: physical control of the bodies of the Hopewood children was paramount, in order to ensure the success of his eugenic project. Punishment was not merely a set of sanctions designed to modify the behaviour of the Hopewood children into the patterns expected of the ideal eugenic citizen. Punishment extended to the segregation of the physical body of the child from those influences which were perceived to have the potential to adversely affect the development of the child’s body according to Bailey’s ideal.

Despite Bailey’s purported intention, as stated in the Articles of Association of the YWAA, to use psychology in the development and training of his charges, there is in fact little evidence of any sustained interest either in the psychological development of
the children, or in applying the insights of contemporary psychology to their upbringing. There were no longitudinal studies of the children's psychological development, such as were taken for the children's teeth. Discipline and punishment at Hopewood were discipline and punishment of the body, and through this of the mind. These were achieved in the first instance by, as we have seen previously, the rigorous control of the children's time and physical activities. Where these modes of discipline were resisted, sanction and punishment was applied by physical means: corporal punishment, exclusion, and confinement. Whilst delegating the day-to-day practice of discipline to the staff on hand, Bailey maintained personal control and oversight of the children's behaviour, and the application of sanctions. He also established, through the cooperation and complicity of external agencies and institutions, the ability to supplement his own program of sanctions. Control of the minds of the Hopewood children was not the issue for Bailey: the achievement of his aims would be sustained by the control of their bodies, and his regime of discipline and punishment was intended to achieve that aim.

EDUCATING THE HOPEWOOD CHILD

There are more references in the Articles of Association of the YWAA to the education of the Hopewood children than to any other single issue. The Articles promise to develop the handicraft skills of the children; to develop their skills in spoken and written English; to provide them with a good general education; to give them an appreciation and love of nature, culture, and a wide range of civic virtues; and, where appropriate, to assist the children in pursuing further study. The Articles seem to indicate a genuine commitment to the educational development of the children, and to provide
them with the best opportunities possible to achieve their full potential in the field of educational endeavour. What is most surprising from the children's testimonies is that in that area where Bailey seems to have promised most to the children, there is so little of support, either direct or indirect, for the children's educational aspirations. I have already noted in another context that Bailey was more concerned with the physical rather than the psychological development of the children. This pattern is echoed in the educational arena. Where opportunities are offered, these are almost entirely for the training and development of the physical capabilities of the children. There is little if any evidence from the children's accounts that Hopewood encouraged, except in a few favoured cases, the academic or intellectual development of the children. Bailey's prime concern here appears to have been to develop the children for future positions as manual labourers, reinforced perhaps by his own success as a self-taught, self-made man.

Bailey's preferred approach to the education of the Hopewood children had been that they be educated on site at Hopewood House, in educational facilities which he provided and supervised. Under this scheme, Bailey would have controlled not only the content of the children's education, but also the children's range of social contacts. I have already noted that the potential intractability of the children's social contacts in the school environment was seen as major problem by Bailey, and have identified the strategies by which he sought to mitigate this problem.
Although Bailey was able to set up a pre-school in the grounds of Hopewood House, Bailey could not follow through on this aim for their further education, due to the objections of the Department of Education (Trop 1971:108).

In the early years at Hopewood, the children were educated at local schools, with Catholics attending the local Catholic school, Protestants the local state school. The children were taken from Hopewood House in the Hopewood bus in the morning, and picked up in the afternoon and returned to Hopewood. With the establishment of the separate cottages throughout the state, similar schooling arrangements were developed in the local areas. From the accounts of the children, it appears very much to be the case that educational activities were only conducted in school time, and that there was very little support given to the children regarding the use of their time once at Hopewood for school-related activities. I have already noted the tight control of the children’s time once they arrived home from school, consisting of work and chores, mealtime, ablutions, and a very early bedtime. Such a schedule gave little time for homework, as a number of accounts attest:

as far as education goes, when we were at Hopewood and on the farm, we’d go to school and then come back, and we’d go to do duties on the farm, there was no time for homework (Hugh).
I hadn't done my homework because when you got back to the Home, there was absolutely no opportunity to do homework and all the kids were in the same boat. You know, like we were out moving fucking rocks or digging thistles or doing some stupid exercise thing. You know, like, we weren't given encouragement (Heidi).

Once out of Hopewood in the smaller cottages, whilst the control of the children's time was not as regimented, the conditions to support study were still considerably lacking.

Naomi's description of the Canberra and Manly homes is typical of most of those smaller premises, which were generally units above shops which were owned by Chic Salons, the units then being leased by the YWAA from Chic Salons:

In Canberra we had one big room, L-shaped, we had double bunk beds in there, Nan McLeod had one room off that, and there were two other rooms off that, that were Bailey's. We had a kitchen and a bathroom and the washing machine was in the bathroom. Nan McLeod finally got a partition put up so our beds were at least a little isolated. We never had a sitting room or anything else. We only had an outside area which was like a big well. We never had a sitting room, never... Manly, you had one square room which was probably no bigger than 12 x 12. We had six girls in there. The wardrobe was out on the verandah.

Clearly obtaining any privacy for the purposes of effective study would have been nigh on impossible, remembering that the children lived in these circumstances in their high school years, when private study would have been most required. There were also very few resources, in the way of books or other study resources, in the Hopewood Houses which could be used by the children to support their studies:

We didn't have anything like we have with our own kids, like to encourage them to read... We'd get a book every year for Christmas, it was taken off us. We got them back when we were about 18, 19 years of age. So it was too late to even bother reading them... we didn't have all that we wanted for schooling. We wanted atlases. We found it hard to get those. We did in the end because L.O. gave everything to Mrs Newton that we asked, she asked for in the end. But by then it was a bit late. You needed it from Year 7. You needed all, even from Primary School. To get things sometimes was really hard because they felt that we'd gone through it too quickly. We've used too many pencils or we've used too much of this. Not realising that in a house of eight girls, what can they expect (Ingrid).

Whilst some of the children had relatively stable lives, living nearly all their lives in the one home, others were moved on a more frequent basis, with a consequent negative impact on their schooling (Rowena).
The house-parents hired by Bailey to care for the children generally lacked the capability to provide any sort of support in the intellectual development of the children. Their major roles in the children's lives were of cooking, cleaning and supervision of the children. The children's accounts consistently endorse the view that their home environment was not one which was able to support the children's academic development:

I still came in the top three right through high school in all of my subjects, but there was never anyone there to tell you to go on and study more...there was no guidance, no one to tell me different, there was never any personal belonging to a house-master, they went through them quickly so you never formed an attachment to a house-master (Hugh).

Naomi, Ingrid, and Peggy also make similar points. From the point of view of the staff, Jesse's testimony confirms this:

what probably happened and I can only say probably because I wasn't there, they probably didn't have the parenting encouragement. You see the people looking after them didn't sit down with them and say, if you get top marks in this you can be a doctor, you can be whatever you want. They probably missed that.

Most of these children's testimony in regard to their educational opportunities are consistent with what these individual accounts have revealed. There was little emphasis either on providing the resources or environment required to support the children's studies, and a lack of adult support or guidance, in either the simplest tasks such as being given help with homework, or in providing support and encouragement for the development of the academic capabilities of the children.

There were exceptions to this rule however, for what appears to be a chosen few. One of the Hopewood boys successfully trained as a barrister, another as a research scientist. These two are certainly the most successful children, in terms of academic accomplishment, to be produced by Hopewood. Whilst neither of these individuals consented to an interview, the perception of the other children of the success achieved by
these two is that this was achieved in large part through the provision of support and resources above and beyond what was available to most of the children, as described above. The perception is that those who did achieve academic excellence did so through privilege and favouritism. Certainly any opportunities for further study required the support and intervention of Bailey, and there is evidence to suggest that for those children in whom he did take a personal interest, Bailey may have taken an active hand in steering them towards a career of his choosing, as indicated in this account by Warren:

he sort of made up his mind what he wanted me to do...He wanted me to do medicine, you know I didn’t have any degree, so he made me go back and do a deferred examination what I failed in the Leaving Certificate, so I could try to get enough qualifications to do medicine...I know that I didn’t want to do it. As I said I just went along with him, so I didn’t study for these next exams and then I failed them, so that shut that door.

For those lucky enough to catch Bailey’s eye, there were academic opportunities possible, albeit in such an ad-hoc manner. Despite the lengthy treatment which the children’s educational development was given in the Articles of Association of the YWAA, there was no systematic process within Hopewood to identify children with high academic potential, or conversely those with learning difficulties. There was no system within the Hopewood establishment which could provide support, either in terms of time, resources or privacy, which could maximise the educational development of the children as a whole. Access to such support was dependent on Bailey’s personal whim, and the extent to which the child in question was noticed or personally favoured by him.

In discussing the educational opportunities of the Hopewood children, I should not of course restrict this to identifying their opportunities for performance in purely academic fields. The aims of the YWAA encompassed the broader issues of the children’s future employment and social life as well. Bailey’s eugenic ideal was, as has
already been demonstrated, one which focused on the physical capacities, the capacity for labour, of his charges. In this, he differed, certainly from the classical eugenicians such as Galton, but also from many of his contemporaries, particularly American eugenicians such as Popenoe. For Bailey, the reproduction of the eugenic ideal would produce, on the one hand, soldiers who would be able to defend Australia for external aggressors, and on the other, labourers who would take on functional roles in the Australian economy.

To this end, the training and opportunities provided to the Hopewood children were not, barring a few exceptional cases, in the areas of academic, intellectual or professional endeavour. They were in occupations of physical labour. For the boys this meant farm labour in particular, given the rural location of many of the Hopewood properties, and a range of other physical and manual labouring occupations.

For the girls, the training was primarily in the domestic field: "They never wanted us to be anything else bar maids" (Helen). The YWAA's influence on the future direction of the children's life also extended to providing direction and assistance in gaining
employment. Some of the girls were given jobs by Chic Salons, in both the factory (Rowena), and the office (Naomi, Ingrid). Peggy's first job after leaving the nuns at the Good Shepherd Convent was as a domestic at a farm near Tumut, where a number of other Hopewood girls were also working. Such 'boarding out' schemes for female domestic state wards were traditionally forms of cheap, 'slave' labour (Jamrozik and Sweeney 1996:95), and Peggy's account is of an exploitative, unsupportive environment which confirms this version. The children (or by this time young adults), were given assistance in obtaining any necessary items or tools required for their future employment. It is notable in this instance that the support for, and assistance to, the children in finding gainful employment was more generally available, more easily accessed, and less dependent on the personal patronage of either Bailey or Cockburn themselves, as we have seen in the provision of assistance for the children's further education. The chosen social role of these children was not to be as the next generation of great minds; they were to be the labourers, farm hands, domestics and of course the mothers and fathers of the next generation.

PERPETUATING THE IDEAL

The lynchpin of Bailey's eugenic plans was his intention that the children intermarry, and perpetuate the virtues of his natural health model into the next generation. All the gathering of experimental evidence, the imposition and supervision of the natural health dietary regime, the close and constant surveillance and management of the children's time, all these would be for nothing if the beneficial lifestyle which Bailey hoped to demonstrate at Hopewood was not passed on to the next generation. This begs
the question: were the children aware of his plan, and how did they respond to it? In the end, there was not one marriage between a Hopewood boy and a Hopewood girl. On this essential criterion, Bailey failed. To what extent can the testimonies of the Hopewood children, and the existing documentary evidence, shed light on what appears to be the fundamental failure, in Bailey's own terms, of his grand project?

From the testimonies of those children interviewed, it is clear that the children were made aware that it was Bailey's wish that they intermarry. Whilst none could define an exact source for this knowledge, it emerges from their accounts as an unspoken piece of common knowledge, in which they all participated:

I think they would've liked some of us to marry...I'm sure we heard it when we were growing up that they would've liked some of us to marry. I heard it but I don't know who said it (Peggy).

I grew up with that knowledge (of Bailey's intention for the children to intermarry). I tell you, that knowledge has been there forever. Bailey did discuss that but I'm not sure if that was my original source. But I grew up with that knowledge because parallel to that was that I had to pick one of these people that I hated, to spend the rest of my life with. 'Cause I hated all those boys (Heidi).

it was always said that if two of us got together...Bailey and Cockburn would let, you know, set us up with a home and everything else (Winona).

From her point of view as a staff member, Jesse confirms Bailey's desires on this point, with the further important qualification that it was not just a desire for the children to intermarry, but it was intended that such intermarriages should perpetuate the Bailey natural health regime. This was the ultimate eugenic intention, a second generation and beyond of Australian children fortified by the natural health lifestyle:

he thought it would be the absolute ultimate if they did marry and kept on the diet. He thought that would prove and it would have proved that what he did for them was right (Jesse).
It is therefore certain that there was a general awareness among the Hopewood children that Bailey wished them to marry once they had attained adulthood. In addition, there was also an awareness, as indicated by Winona’s statement, that Bailey would provide generous financial support to any couples who did fulfil his wishes in this way.

Given the fact that Bailey’s wishes on this matter appear to be well known among the children, and that some form of financial benefit could be expected, the fact remains that none of the children intermarried. This is not to deny that there were some forms of sexual interplay between the girls and boys as they grew up. Both Hugh and Warren report spying on the girls while they were getting dressed after bath time, although in neither case do their accounts progress beyond a detached, voyeuristic observation. At a later age, Hugh admits to sexual liaisons with a number of the Hopewood girls. Winona recounts her own romantic attachment to one of the Hopewood boys, which in fact ended in a proposal of marriage to her which she rejected. From all the accounts, this appears to have been the closest which any of the children came to carrying out Bailey’s wishes.

Winona’s description of the reasons for her own refusal of this offer of marriage perhaps provides the key to understanding why none of the children were ultimately to marry:

I suppose it’s because we regarded each other as brothers and sisters. We didn’t in one sense but in another because we were all so closely together you were regarding them more a sibling, can you say sibling in a sense not being brother or sister, it was more a sibling. They were your siblings, there was no way you would go and marry your sibling, that’s what it was. John and I were very close but nothing came of it when he asked me to marry him.

Ingrid puts the same case in slightly different terms:

You knew too much about each other. You knew a lot about each other. Even though we didn’t live near each other, we all knew so much about each other. I wouldn’t want to marry someone I
knew all that about. Really it would be a bit boring, wouldn't it? Nothing to talk about. It's funny really that out of all of us, not one person, even really wanted to.

Such findings are consistent with what is perhaps the only extant study of a similar project to Bailey's, the Israeli kibbutz. Spiro (1975:348) reports that kibbutz children brought up in communal groups will not marry within the group, as they view the group they were brought up with as brothers and sisters. This represents strong evidence that construction of the family as an exogamous social unit is dependent on the degree of communality present between the members during their early years. As I have already noted, Bailey presented Hopewood to the world as a large family. The family image legitimised Hopewood, it sanitised Hopewood, and it made what was an unusual social experiment comprehensible to a wider public whose support, donations, and potential adoption of the natural health lifestyle were all important to Bailey. From their own experiences and intuitions, the Hopewood children themselves constructed themselves into a family, seeing themselves as brothers and sisters. It is this construction of themselves as a family, as brothers and sisters, which was a prime component of their social identity at the time, and which remains a prime component of their social identity to this day. It was in fact the strength of this Hopewood family identity which caused the downfall of Bailey's eugenic dream. The Hopewood children were part of a family, that family was the most important part of their life, so how could you possibly transgress the rules of familial behaviour by marrying your brother or your sister? In the area where Bailey sought to provide his greatest legacy, the construction which he had built in fact let him down. There would be no Hopewood family for generations to come because the Hopewood family had come into being in this generation.
Appendix 1 – Articles of Association of the Youth Welfare Association of Australia

The following are the principal objectives of the Association. For the sake of brevity, machinery clauses have been omitted.

1. To perfect Australian Youth by developing and improving their physical, mental, moral and spiritual qualities and characteristics.

2. To demonstrate to the people of Australia the degree of improvement in health, physique, deportment, intelligence, ability and character which results from the application of rational care, training and diet from birth.

3. To conduct a suitable home or homes for the reception and protection of prospective mothers in order to promote favourable pre-natal conditions for babies.

6. To conduct an ideal home or homes for the permanent care of war time babies, orphans, and the children of any who are unable or unwilling to make adequate provision for them.

7. To promote robust health in the inmates of the Association's homes by the cultivation and preservation of sound teeth, attention to diet, exercise, hygiene, fresh air, harmony, and the provision of suitable clothing and comforts.

8. To apply psychology in all stages of training the children in the Association's homes, and Kindergarten methods in the education of the infants, giving especial attention to the early cultivation of natural and willing obedience, self-discipline, and the development of all of the basic qualities of character and elements of mind.

9. To develop handicrafts amongst the children in the Association's homes by the provision of suitable materials, tools and training.
10. To encourage and teach self-expression, the use of good English, the proper pronunciation of the spoken word, and the art of debate amongst children and young people.

11. To provide a good general education for children, either in the Association's homes or elsewhere.

12. To encourage the children in the Association's homes to have an affectionate regard for birds and animals and an appreciation of bush and rural life and nature, and to gradually enlighten them at an early age and in a natural manner concerning the facts and origins of life.

13. To encourage in the children in the Association's homes an appreciation of beauty, and to develop their talents, and to provide for such children facilities and instruction in horticulture, arts, deportment, domesticity, popular sports and other forms of recreation; to encourage good fellowship, charity, purity of thought and action, truthfulness, a sense of honour and unselfishness amongst such children, also to encourage them to manifest such virtues as good manners, gentleness, patience, perseverance and fortitude.

14. To engender good citizenship, domestic and social virtues, mothercraft, a good civic spirit, democracy and patriotism.

16. To accept and provide in the Association's homes for children, infants and children from overseas, and, if necessary, to arrange for and pay for their transportation to Australia.

17. In suitable cases, to provide and make available for young people in the Association's care, the highest standards of education including University courses.
20. To assist the children in the Association's homes to procure suitable employment, or to establish themselves in life, and also, to continue to support them until they are self supporting.

21. To maintain contact with ex-inmates of the Associations' homes by holding re-union gatherings or other means to invite their continued interest in the objects of the Association, and to encourage marriage between them by making loans to enable them to acquire and/or furnish their own homes.

29. To promote the increase of the population of Australasia.

30. To promote the virility of Australian life.

(YWAA Annual Report 1949:3-4)
CHAPTER 8 – CONCLUSION – HOPEWOOD AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

When I look at Carol, Marcia, Richard and our other babies I am thinking not so much of them but of their children and their grandchildren.

What conditions will prevail in Australia fifty years hence?

Are we to shrug our shoulders and say we won’t be here so why should we worry? That is not your idea of love for children, is it? What the conditions will be in Australia fifty years hence are very much your concern, because to a very great extent it is determined by what we do now.

It takes generations to alter the habits of a Nation. Since our way of life is surely bringing about our extinction it is clear that it must be corrected.

L.O. Bailey, Youth Welfare Association of Australia Annual Report, 1943

HOPEWOOD AND CHILDHOOD

To whom does childhood belong? This question has been posed in relation to the social construction of childhood and the social utility of children by Shamgar-Handelman (1994) and Gittins (1998). It is an issue which goes to the core of the Hopewood project, questioning as it does those issues of the bio-political reproduction of the social and biological character of the species-being which I have argued to be the most dominant
characteristic in Bailey's experiment. Clearly, the 'interest of the child' is an interest which goes beyond the concern with the legal, moral and ethical rights of the child in isolation. The 'interest of the child' extends to the interests of society as a whole. The child may be seen as an adult-in-the-making, children *in toto* are society-in-the-making. They represent future citizens, containing the potential either for perpetuation and reproduction of established modes of social organisation, or to challenge those modes of organisation. They are the latent manifestation of the future life of the species-being. As such, the ownership of children, in the sense of the power to make decisions about their socialisation, is socially contested ground. Children's social competence is denied by modern social discourse, which defines social competence in terms of adult praxis (Qvortrup 1994:4), so ownership of the processes of their socialisation is transferred to the adult world. These processes of socialisation are very much defined within a functionalist perspective, and consequently the values to be transmitted through socialisation are defined in terms of their social utility.

In what I have called the Hopewood Experiment, L.O. Bailey took ownership of the socialisation process for 86 children. In doing so, he saw himself as taking ownership on behalf of future generations, believing that he would be providing a legacy, not just to these children, not even just to their descendants, but to the nation as whole. The basis of such a conception is the bio-political nature of the species-being, as formulated by Foucault (1981), or the nation state, identified with the biological signifier of race. The future of the species-being is embodied at its most fundamental level in the lives and bodies of children. Social action which guarantees the perpetuation of the species-being
is therefore most effectively conducted at the site of children's bodies. Consistent with this, Bailey's project was one that aimed at species improvement through a regulation of the body. He aimed at two particular sites of bodily regulation, the control of diet, and the control of reproductive behaviour. He imposed a particular dietary regime on the children, the planned outcome of which was to be bodily improvements in children subjected to that regime. He sought to influence the reproductive behaviour of those bodies under his control, with the aim of ensuring that the gains made in the current generation were passed on to subsequent generations. The end result would be an overall increase in the bodily health and vigour of the Australian population, which would equip it more favourably in the social Darwinist struggle for survival between nation-states.

The bodies of children are by their very physicality particularly vulnerable to harm, and this fact of their physicality has, as discussed in Chapter 5, legitimised a particular set of social discourses privileging their protection from both physical and moral harm. These discourses have also legitimised adult ownership of social power/knowledge, vesting in adults the power to control the processes of child socialisation, as was done by Bailey. Adult ownership of socialisation processes is divided between the family and the state, in a division of authority whose borders are regularly shifting. In circumstances such as those of the Hopewood children, socialisation within the biological family had been rejected by the family itself, whether for financial, ethical or social reasons. Options for their socialisation were therefore restricted to either a state apparatus or a philanthropic provider. Both these modes favoured institutional solutions to the provision of child care in such situations, despite
experiments with other methods of care such as fostering or adoption. Institutions offered a guarantee of protection from the dangers of the social world, in particular the dangers of exposure to inappropriate knowledge. They also offered a consistency and regulation of socialisation processes. Finally, they offer a control of the environment which, within the Lamarckian discipline of eugenics which had a substantial influence on Bailey’s thought, provided the perfect means to effect bodily changes in this generation which would be passed on to subsequent generations.

Within the total institution, institutional practice is directed at the control of bodies (Foucault 1991). Just as regulation of the body acts within the bio-political framework to improve and maintain the physicality of the species-being, institutional discipline of the body acts to enhance its docility, its internalisation of regulation which perpetuates existing frameworks of power/knowledge. The body of the child is particularly susceptible in this environment. It lacks the physicality to resist the technologies of power enacted by the institution. Whilst socialisation in the outside world has taken on the benign face of familial affection, in the total institution all is subordinate to the maintenance of docile bodies, and to ensuring adherence to the institution’s regulatory mode. Bailey developed his own practices at Hopewood to ensure that his prime focus, the adherence of the children to his dietary and natural health regime, was not compromised. Systems of regulation, surveillance and discipline were directed principally at making sure that the children ate only those foods defined by Bailey’s dietary regime, at the times prescribed by that regime. The ‘science of discipline’, as identified by Foucault (1991:164-9), with its techniques of the spatial
distribution, coding of activities, accumulation of time, and the composition of forces, operates in Hopewood. It operates through the physical placement of the body of the child into the confines of Hopewood and its other institutions, and the allocation of its sleeping, working, playing and eating space. It operates through the social control of time at Hopewood, in which all activities are allocated to pre-defined spaces in the daily timetable. It operates through the hierarchical system of authority within Hopewood, applied on a daily basis by Hopewood staff, but given visibility to the apex of the hierarchy through a system of reportage and surveillance.

I have argued (see also in Chapter 5), that these outcomes of dominance and control represent a fundamental dialectic embedded in the social constitution of childhood, and the ways in which social practice towards children is enacted in modern Western societies. The child is construed in these discourses as a socially and physically being in need of protection, and a potential citizen in need of socialisation. In the event of failure of the primary modes of protection and socialisation, state or philanthropic interventions have taken the form of institutional provision of care and socialisation. The institution however transforms those discourses of protection and socialisation into a regime, certainly of control and domination, often of oppression. The science of discipline enacted within the institution has as its objective the production of a machine of socialisation for the “collective coercion” (Foucault 1991:169) of the body towards docility and conformity.
The secondary literature referred to in Chapter 5 attests to this account of institutional life for children in a number of settings, and is confirmed by the experience of the Hopewood experiment. The children’s accounts are consistent in their depiction of a regime of control and order, punctuated at times by their own youthful acts of rebellion and resistance. Some individuals may have particular experiences of Bailey and the Hopewood regime which they may define as nurturing and supportive. For others an opposing experience of oppression and abuse is evident. The overall impression is of a system carefully constructed to control critical aspects of the children’s lives, underpinned by a bio-political conception of eugenic regeneration through regulated consumption and reproduction.

In the Hopewood Experiment, what emerges then is an appropriation of children for bio-political purposes. Children are one of the most powerless groups in the community, their powerlessness reinforced by the variety of discourses in order to control them. Children gain access to power and knowledge only with the consent of adults, and are subject to a myriad of structures of power and domination throughout this process which we call socialisation. What the Hopewood Experiment clearly demonstrates is the extent to which these modes of control can be exercised in the name of the good of society, particularly when existing counterbalances of familial or state interests are removed. The Hopewood children were, quite literally, creatures of Bailey, appropriated by him for their instrumental value only.
HOPEWOOD AND ENLIGHTENED SOCIETY

The Hopewood Experiment was an experiment conducted within a framework of scientific, or instrumental reason. The Weberian notion of instrumental reason provides for the identification of ‘conceivable’ ultimate solutions to be taken on...(a) practical problem” and identification of the facts which need to be taken into account in choosing between these positions (Weber in Runciman 1978:77). As Giddens explicates, “Scientific analysis can allow us to determine the suitability of a given range of means for the attainment of a determinate end” (Giddens 1971:135). Instrumental reason is therefore fundamentally utilitarian in application, seeking to determine the most appropriate means to achieve particular ends. In designing the Hopewood experiment, Bailey both appropriated existing rational methods, and used the scientific method to generate data in support of his own claims regarding the efficacy of his diet.

In my Honours thesis (Ambery 1995), I sought to place Bailey’s project within the wider context of the project of modernity identified by Adorno and Horkheimer (1992). Their basic argument is that Western history since the Enlightenment has been characterised by the spread and dominance of instrumental reason, which operates as the most significant form of modern social domination. Instrumental reason acts as a mode of domination of the natural world in the first instance, and by extension has been appropriated as a method of domination of other men. The consequence of the spread of instrumental reason has been subjugation, the objectification of men and women, and a “new form of dehumanisation” (Jay 1994:38). I have demonstrated the extension of the process of objectification in a eugenic experiment in which a group of children were
appropriated within a regime of rational dominance and control, for purposes of enhancing their instrumental value as future citizens of a white, patriarchal Australia. This thesis extends the view of Bailey’s as a modernist project within Adorno and Horkheimer’s framework through the inclusion of additional material not included in the earlier work. It also extends the argument by locating it within the debate on the practices of ‘historical sociology’ put forward by Dean (1994), in particular his critique of the depiction of rationality in the work of Adorno and Horkeimer, and Habermas, as compared to that of Foucault. For Dean (1994), the extension of rationality is not a unidirectional process of the extension of a single mode of domination, but part of a broader multi-directional process of the application of modes of social power/knowledge in a variety of forms.

The early years of the twentieth century can be seen as a period in which a faith in the power of scientific method to devise solutions to the world’s problems was paramount. Scientific principle and method came to be applied to education, the workplace and the economy. Particularly significant to an understanding of Bailey’s project, rational thought has colonised areas such the home, including child rearing and dietary practices (Donzelot 1997; Reiger 1985; Dickinson 1993), as well as being a principle feature of contemporary eugenics movements (Garton 1994; Watts 1994). In Australia, this rationalisation of society was characterised by a progressive movement “emphatic (some of them fanatic) in their confidence in applied learning. Not only science in the specific sense, but any and every aspect of scholarship and enquiry could justify itself through capacity for problem solving” (Roe 1984:11). A pattern of
endeavour is therefore clearly apparent which confirms Adorno and Horkheimer's (1992) thesis regarding the extension of the dominance of instrumental rationality in Western thought and practice.

A number of these authors have placed their investigations within the broader theoretical interpretation of the application of instrumental rationality in Western thought and practice. Reiger (1985) locates her study of the extension of rational direction and supervision of family practices in Australia within a framework informed by Adorno and Horkheimer, Weber, and the 'technocratic consciousness' of Habermas, demonstrating:

the ideology of technical rationality, the attempt to represent the family as governed by the same principles of means-end relationship, calculation and rational control, which are essential features of commercial activity (Reiger 1985:210).

Dickinson (1993) also uses Habermas as a theoretical basis for his understanding of the impact of the mental hygiene movement on the Canadian family from 1925 to 1950. Dickinson employs Habermas' concepts of rationalisation and colonisation of the lifeworld (Habermas 1984) to argue that the application of purposive-rational modes of social organisation and instrumental action has emancipatory potential in the context of the development of child rearing practices, consequent upon its ability to enhance individual autonomy and reflexivity in the context of communicative action. This stands in direct opposition to the view of Adorno and Horkheimer (1992), that the application of instrumental reason is inherently an act of domination and control.

In earlier chapters of this thesis, I have located the Hopwood Experiment within this context of the extension of rational control and direction of society. In Chapter 3, the international eugenics movement, and its particular manifestation in Australia, was
presented as applying the methods of rational control and direction to human reproductive activities. Eugenics was a movement which grew from the Victorian faith in the power of science to change the world, and mankind itself, for the better, at least as defined by the Victorians. Eugenics presented itself as a scientifically verifiable method of improving mankind's genetic potential. The assumptions and methods of eugenics were shown to be at the core of Bailey's intent in developing the Hopewood Experiment. Further to this I demonstrated the links between the spread of rationality and scientific method into the domestic sphere, particularly in the areas of diet and child rearing practices, and Bailey's project (see Chapter 4). The methods by which Bailey sought to induce his eugenic regeneration, were supported and legitimised by new scientific approaches in nutritional science and the new 'scientific parenting'. In Chapter 5, I argued that the social construction of childhood was inherent in the extension of rational control and surveillance of children in an institutional context. Exemplars were provided in Chapters 6 and 7, drawing from the lived experiences of the Hopewood children, of the application of, among other things, the modes of rational control at Hopewood. In doing so, I have located the Hopewood Experiment within the context of these ongoing debates over the extension of rational control in society.

Two questions emerge from the formulations of Adorno and Horkheimer (1992) and Habermas (1984) over this process of rational domination. Firstly, is the depiction of the historical process of the extension of instrumental rationality, inherent in both Adorno and Horkheimer, and Habermas' accounts, able to contribute to an understanding of the Hopewood project? Secondly, if consequences can be assigned to the application of
instrumental rationality, in particular within the framework of Bailey's project, how can these theoretical suppositions be applied to Bailey's project?

The first question is of particular concern to Dean (1994), who rejects the attempt of critical theory to establish the "identity between instrumental reason and domination" (Dean 1994:97), and its overall 'progress' model of historical development. Dean favours the historical approach of Foucault, which rejects the "progressive maturation" view of history, in favour of an attempt to understand the complexity of development of types of discourse as representations of social power/knowledge (Foucault 1980:112). Reason, as an object of intellectual analysis is not to be understood as "an anthropological invariant", a universal feature of humanity, but the relation between forms of rationality and the practices to which they are linked" (Dean 1994:58).

It is possible to use Bailey's project as an exemplar, within a particular historical milieu, of the operation of such forces. As Foucault (1989) argues, we need to examine the peculiarities and specificities rather than settle for grand schematising, and in this respect Bailey's project is both specific to a particular place, at a particular time. It is clear from the evidence presented that Bailey's project was consistent with the developments documented by Reiger (1985), Dickinson (1993) and others of the extension of rational control and supervision into ever-wider areas of social action. Eugenic regulation and control of reproduction, scientific parenting and childrearing, the 'new nutrition' and the 'newer nutrition' all appear as different manifestations of this broader social principle. Bailey certainly sought to apply rational techniques to the
dietary practices, childrearing and reproduction of the Hopewood Family. Alongside this set of overtly instrumental applications of rationality stand a separate set of discourses taking seemingly the opposite pole in the nature/culture dichotomy. Bailey’s natural health gospel and dietary principles is at first impression a privileging of nature over culture, a denial of reason in favour of unreason. As I have argued in Chapter 4, whilst this opposition does derive from a set of discourses which privilege nature over culture, in Bailey’s practice instrumental reason is still dominant. Nature has been ‘misrecognised’ (Bourdieu 1986) and sterilised by Bailey’s regime of rational control and domination. Hence, diet and health has been legitimised and appropriated by the frameworks of rational discourse. The dominance of instrumental reason is therefore present across different framework of discursive practice, and certainly may not at first glance be recognisable as such. Whilst not a definitive resolution of Dean’s (1994) critique, Bailey’s project nevertheless demonstrates, for its particular milieu, the powerful dominance of instrumental reason across a range of social sites and discursive practices. Foucauldian analysis has, of course, proven its utility in understanding other aspects of Bailey’s project, in particular the bio-political perspective which unifies eugenics and dietary control, and his account of the practices of institutional power in its discipline of the body.

A more unequivocal resolution can be offered in terms of the opposition between Adorno and Horkheimer (1992), and Habermas (1984), over the social consequences of instrumental reason. For Adorno and Horkheimer (1992), instrumental reason is by its very nature a system of domination, with oppressive consequences. For Habermas
(1984), whilst still recognising the potential for oppressive consequences, the emancipatory possibilities of the rationalisation of the lifeworld offers greater potential. The emancipatory potential of the rationalisation of the lifeworld occurs insofar as it contributes to "increased reflexivity, the universalization of beliefs, and the differentiation of the value or knowledge spheres" (Seidman 1989:19). There has been no such emancipatory consequence for the Hopewood children. The application of rationality to dietary and health practice, where it has persisted for the children into their adult life, derives from a form of internalisation of the supervisory gaze along the lines proposed by Foucault (1991), rather than from the reflexivity inherent in the model of communicative action. Where the children have developed a reflective insight into their lives, the source of such reflexivity has been informed from interaction with other institutions such as tertiary education. For the remainder, the impact of Bailey's rational method has indeed been one of domination and control. In their later lives, some have freed themselves from this dominance, others have internalised it, and carry it through even now as a prime source of life direction.

**THE HOPEWOOD LEGACY**

Hopewood has provided an enduring legacy for the children who grew up under L.O. Bailey's care. It is one of the central, if not the central fact in the personal biographies of all 86 children, living or dead. From the accounts given by the children, and from the secondary accounts provided, however selectively, in Trop (1971), their experiences are remarkable for their diversity. Whilst I have attempted to identify the common threads between the 86 individual Hopewood experiences, the fact remains of
the variety between their experiences. This variety is partly derived from structural features of the Hopewood organisation as a whole, especially its geographical dispersion across a number of separate establishments. In such an environment, the experiences of Ingrid, who spent almost her entire life from the age of six at one establishment, are necessarily of a different order than those of Heidi or Rowena, who were moved from place to place at regular intervals. Experiences also vary over age grades, with different common experiences being reported for the 'younger group' and the 'older group'. A potentially interesting line of enquiry would have been an analysis of different experiences based on gender. However, due to the low response rate from the male Hopewood children this was not possible. That would have been another, and a different, thesis.

Without a doubt the prime example of diversity of experience has been the divide between those who claim negative effects from their experiences of Hopewood, ranging from emotional neglect to physical and sexual abuse, and those who report their experiences of Hopewood as being entirely positive. My research has confirmed the diversity of experience from an individual point of view. Clearly for some of the children, life at Hopewood was a positive experience. For others, their upbringing was undoubtedly abusive and filled with fear. The issue which separates the two is that of collective memory. The negative accounts are a threat to a collective memory, an agreed narrative, which has been developed and reinforced as an integral part of the lives of the Hopewood children. They destroy the myth which has transformed history into Nature, by introducing a political dimension into the depoliticised framework of the myth.
(Barthes in Sontag 1993:116-31) of Hopewood. As Barthes points out, myth is speech which has been depoliticised, and as such the introduction of the political of necessity threatens the existence of the myth.

The remarkable fact about Hopewood is its strong cohesion, its persistence as a community, despite the presence of such tendencies towards fragmentation. For 30 years after the death of Bailey the Hopewood reunion remained as an unchallenged ritual of integration and belonging. Even in the face of the controversies of recent years, the reunion still continues as a potent symbol of a shared life for the Hopewood family. The reunion has been abandoned, only to be resurrected on a number of occasions. While it is currently in a state of abeyance, there seems no doubt that further attempts to resurrect it will be made.

The death of Madge Cockburn in 1999 has initiated a major renegotiation within the Hopewood hierarchy. The caption “Those having torches will pass them on to others” appeared regularly under Bailey’s portrait in YWAA Annual Reports following his death, signifying the passing on of the aura of the charismatic leader from Bailey to Cockburn. The death of Cockburn has now initiated a similar process in the current Hopewood children. The most significant instance of this renegotiation occurred in 2000 with the broadcast of the ABC Radio National program ‘Hindsight’ on Hopewood (25th June, 2000), in which my own research was featured. In this program, the ‘good’ group was represented by the two eldest children, Richard Chambers and Marcia Millard, who had nominated themselves in the role of leaders and spokespersons for the ‘Family’.

305
Issues were discussed more openly than they had been during my own interview, even to the extent of Richard publicly acknowledging that Cockburn had been Bailey's mistress for many, many years, and that Bailey was the biological father of Cockburn's children. A revision of history has already begun. The set of ‘secrets’, as defined by Goffman (1959), which as I have already indicated, constitute a significant portion of the Hopewood group identity, is being redefined. Items previously defined as secrets are being revealed to a wider audience, whilst no doubt others are still held close to the collective bosom. This redefinition of secrets is part of a whole process of redefinition of identity as, for the first time in their lives, the Hopewood children look for new leaders within the group itself, in a world finally without the guiding presence of ‘Daddy’ Bailey and ‘Auntie’ Madge.

The substance of the new myth will also be significant for me, in so far as it serves to re-negotiate of my own place within the Hopewood Family. I have already described my own role as peripheral to the group, with the extent of a small number of close female friends of my mother. This role has been modified in recent years as I have moved towards centre stage, to continue the dramaturgical metaphor of Goffman (1959), as the needs of my research have moved me towards a more active contact with members of the group.

In the end, what Bailey most bequeathed to the Hopewood Family was not a ‘Design for Better Living’, the title Bailey intended to use for a book he never completed, intended to bring together all the lessons learnt from the Hopewood experience. Instead,
what all of them share is the Hopewood identity. They are Hopewood kids, and this is the prime component of their identity, and their primary group affiliation in their adult lives. Hopewood remains the principle means by which all the respondents I have interviewed define their identity. No matter which side of the Hopewood fence the children now sit on, it is still part of the same ground.
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ABSTRACT

During World War II and the years immediately following, a successful Sydney businessman, Lesley Owen (L.O.) Bailey, initiated a unique social experiment. Bailey formed an organisation, the Youth Welfare Association of Australia (YWAA), which took into its care 86 'war babies', 43 boys and 43 girls, children who were unable, for a number of reasons, to be cared for by their natural parents. For the next 20 years, these children were cared for by Bailey and the YWAA in a number of homes throughout NSW, which he established for the purpose, the primary home being located at Hopewood House, Bowral. The children were raised entirely on a natural health diet, primarily fresh vegetables and fruit. Formal medical care was limited, with medical interventions emphasising the preventative properties of the natural health diet, rather than the use of conventional medical cures. The children were subject to regular medical, and in particular dental, surveillance and measurement, the results of which were formally published in learned medical and dental journals in Australia during the 1950s. Bailey's stated intention was to demonstrate the virtues of his regime of diet and health, and the physical improvements which could be derived from his regime.

This thesis examines the bio-political dimensions of Bailey's project within the context of scientific modernity. Within this context, the project is examined from three major perspectives. First, the project is examined as a eugenics experiment. The development of eugenics as a biopolitical phenomenon in the early twentieth century, both in the world context, and in Australia is analysed. Particular emphasis is given to the population debate, both world-wide and in Australia, and Australia's own race and population issues. It is argued that Bailey's project was eugenically motivated, with the intention in the first instance of improving the physical being of the generation of children under his control. Bailey planned that the children would later intermarry, and it is argued that the second stage of Bailey's eugenic plan involved passing the improvements gained in the current generation on to the next generation. These would emerge as a group of 'super people', fortified by the virtues of the natural health diet, the long term solution to Australia's issues of population quality and quantity.

The second major dimension examines the disciplines of bodily regulation within Hopewood, and in particular the Hopewood diet. Diet is viewed as a mode of social discipline, imposed within the framework of a total institution for purposes of bio-political enhancement of
the species being. For Bailey, diet is the mode of regulation which enables the eugenic outcome of trans-generational bodily enhancement. Historically, the project is also viewed as a manifestation of the increased rational regulation of the activities of the family by scientific and professional elites.

Third, the thesis examines the implications of social constructions of childhood within the bio-political context, in particular, issues of the ownership of children and children's bodies. Bailey's project was an experiment enacted on the bodies of children, and it is argued that social constructions of childhood, especially the discourses surrounding innocence and socialisation, define social ownership and constrain children's social membership. Children are constructed as the property of the social order, justifying the imposition of institutional regulation such as that of Hopewood for the purposes of social reproduction. As such, the impact of such regulation on individual children is largely ignored. Testimony from the children themselves, now adults in their 50s, is used to exemplify these conclusions. It was one intention of the thesis to provide a medium for the expression of their stories, which had largely been denied to them until now. Evidence is also drawn from Bailey's own writings, contemporary media reportage, and photographic representations of the project.

The thesis is an examination of how society views children, what society sees as the role of children, and the kinds of practices which these constructions sanction towards children. It also illuminates an episode in the history of the Australian eugenics movement, and especially the eugenics of diet. The thesis is a record of a unique Australian social experiment, and its impact on a number of individual lives.
PREFACE

I believe there was never a time when I did not know about Hopewood. My mother was one of the 86 children Bailey took on as his own, and she regaled me, my sister and three brothers with stories from Hopewood as we were growing up. My mother had been brought up to think of herself as special, all the Hopewood children were special, ‘Daddy Bailey’s’ special group of children. They had been chosen, and being chosen makes you special. My mother had not wanted for anything when she was growing up, or so she said. Though as a child my mother often threatened us with placing us, my brothers and sister, into a Home, as this was viewed as the ultimate in punishment. Her own attitude to Hopewood contained so many contradictions itself. Hopewood had been appointed in the height of opulent luxury, and it had been a very special privilege for her to be there. She referred to the girls she grew up with as her sisters, and I grew up knowing her few very close confidants as my honorary aunts.

Unfortunately for my mother, life after Hopewood did not treat her as special. A bad marriage, an alcoholic husband, and raising five children below the poverty line were certainly not what life should have provided for one of Bailey’s special princesses. In the end, life could not provide for Joan whatever it was that she wanted. After a history of mental instability, which included numerous unsuccessful attempts at suicide, many of which I, as the oldest child, had to deal with, Joan was finally successful in her bid for release from life and took her own life on March 25, 1985. She left behind two daughters, three sons, one grandson, and 82 'brothers and sisters'.
For many, including some members of her unofficial ‘family’, the circumstances of Joan’s life after Hopewood were enough to explain the end of her life: she had been a happy child at Hopewood, but an unfortunate marriage, a deteriorating relationship with her husband, and the solace of alcohol had driven her to the end. The people of Hopewood had offered help, without success. In my mind, I wondered whether this was true, or whether there was a key buried somewhere in the past at Hopewood that would unlock any more of Joan’s secrets. I already had a wealth of stories about Hopewood that I had heard from Joan, but now I listened to the others’ stories as well. I was a peripheral figure, a bit player on the fringes of a group which called itself a family. There were regular meetings, reunions which I attended, both for myself and to retain some sort of presence for Joan. I would sometimes catch veiled references to something dark in Joan’s past, but these were always fleeting, and never followed up. In the end, I never did find out whether there were any events in Joan’s life at Hopewood which could explain, or add to the explanation, of the unhappiness of her later years (if such things can ever be explained at all).

Studying sociology at the University of Western Sydney gave me a new perspective through which to look at Joan’s life and the whole Hopewood experience. Joan’s dramas, whatever they may have been, were played out in the private sphere. However her life, and the lives of the other Hopewood children, were a nexus in which private concerns intersected with, and were influenced by, the wider public arena in which Hopewood and Bailey had their being, which were in turn influenced by the wider social and intellectual influences of the day. As C. Wright Mills (1983:9-11) states:
The first fruit of this imagination—and the first lessons of the social science that embodies it—is the idea that the individual can understand his own experience and gauge his own fate by locating himself within his period, that he can know his own chances in life only by coming aware of those of all individuals in his circumstances. In many ways it is a terrible lesson; in many ways it is a magnificent one. We do not know the limits of man’s capacities for supreme effort or willing degradation, for agony and glee, for pleasurable brutality or for the sweetness of reason. But in our time we have come to know that every individual lives, from one generation to the next, in some society; that he lives out a biography, and that he lives it out in historical sequence. By the fact of his living he contributes, however minutely, to the shaping of this society and to the course of its history, even as he is made by society and its historical push and shove.

The sociological imagination allows us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two in society.

This is its task and its promise.

I have come to appreciate that Hopewood was a unique social and historical event, an event which was both influenced by, and influenced irrevocably in its turn, the lives of all who passed through its doors. I have since tried to approach Hopewood from this perspective. My first attempt to understand Hopewood (Ambery 1995), which I subsequently reworked for the purposes of publication (Ambery 1998), focused firmly on the historical and social context in which Hopewood was developed and operated. This current work, whilst still maintaining and strengthening the broad focuses of the earlier work, introduces the third part of Mills’ equation, individual biography. My interest here is not just in how and why Hopewood was established and operated, but also in how individuals played out their lives within its confines, and how their lives have been affected by Hopewood.

The imprint of some individuals on Hopewood is stronger than others: obviously as its controlling power, Hopewood bears much of the stamp of L.O. Bailey himself. Conversely, the imprint of Hopewood is stronger on some than others, some for the better, some for the worst. There is a richness in the Hopewood experience which comes from this, from seeing the interplay of the social and historical with the lives of the
Hopewood children themselves. In the end, there are 86 possible versions of this story. If this work is ‘for Joan’, it is also for Richard, for Colleen, and for all the others whose lives would, literally, not have been the same without the intervention of Lesley Owen Bailey.

The thesis is organised as follows. Chapter One provides an overview of the work as a whole, providing a biographical account of Bailey’s life and an historical account of the development of the Hopewood homes. It also provides an overview of the major issues and theoretical concerns of the thesis.

Chapter Two provides a review of my research methods, in particular some of the major difficulties encountered in accessing a group which, since a degree of adverse publicity, has become insular and discouraged outside interest in their history. I also explore my own unique position as the daughter of one of the Hopewood children.

Chapter Three places Bailey within the context of contemporary eugenic thought, both in the Australian and world context. Bailey viewed the white races were in decline, and that the threat of Japanese imperialism in World War II proved conclusively that Australia needed to strengthen the quality of its population in order to ensure its survival in a hostile world. Bailey offered a eugenic solution by using the 86 children as the stock from which an Australian super race would be bred.
Chapter Four explores the basis of Bailey's dietary and natural health practices. It places Bailey's practice within contemporary dietary theorists, and within the wider process of expansion of rational control and direction of the home covered under the rubric of 'scientific parenting'. It also explores the use of diet as a means of social control, and the prime mechanism for the bodily enhancement of the children and the creation of the eugenic ideal.

Chapter Five explores how social constructions of childhood were utilised by Bailey to legitimate and facilitate his project. In particular, it examines how issues of innocence and the social utility of children combine to justify institutional interventions which apply principles of domination and surveillance to childrearing practice.

Chapter Six draws primarily from evidence gathered from interviews with the Hopewood children, now adults in their fifties. This chapter covers issues including issues of identity and the children’s responses to their entry into Hopewood; daily routine at Hopewood; and the children’s constructions of themselves as a ‘family’.

Chapter Seven examines the experiences of the Hopewood children in the context of Bailey’s stated intentions for the project. It covers the notion of the development of a ‘perfect person’ within Hopewood; the practices of natural health and diet at Hopewood as experienced by the children; discipline and punishment at Hopewood; education; and the children’s responses to the expectation that they would intermarry and carry on the Hopewood line.
Chapter Eight draws together the disparate themes evidenced throughout the thesis. I offer some reflections on the enduring legacy of Hopewood at this point, as well as attempting to make some sense of Hopewood within the discipline of broader sociological theory.

Next to last, some reference needs to be made to my sources. The two prime sources have been the documentary evidence left by Bailey, principally the Annual Reports of the YWAA; and interviews with a number of Hopewood children. For reasons of confidentiality, and as part of my ethical commitment to my respondents, where I refer to their responses in the text of the thesis, pseudonyms will be used. For documents that are widely available, such as YWAA Annual Reports, and the wide variety of open letters and bulletins issued by the Hopewood children, their real names have been retained. Finally, I have included a number of photographs of life at Hopewood in the thesis. These have come from a number of sources, including Trop (1971), and the YWAA Annual Reports. I have a substantial personal collection of Hopewood photographs passed down from my mother, and these have been supplemented for the purposes of this thesis by contributions from the private collections of other Hopewood children, notably Colleen Kelly and Janice Berridge, for which I am grateful.

In the end, I have told the Hopewood story as a story about children, and the ways that we think about their role in society, and in fact what constitutes an ideal childhood. If childhood is the kind of ideal time pictured by Rousseau in *Emile*, (1911) a time of freedom to learn and to grow as a human being, what occurred at Hopewood is far from
this ideal. The question that the Hopewood experience raises is, to what extent do current social constructions of childhood and practices regarding children, in fact mitigate against, rather than guarantee, this ideal? Notwithstanding these questions, my work is not intended as a judgement on Bailey and his ethos. Bailey's project was widely considered a laudable one in his time, and indeed would still be considered to be by many today. The issue for judgement is not on Bailey the philanthropist, but on a society which would allow, or even encourage, such a project to proceed, and which is still unwilling to fully accept the consequences of the project on the individual lives concerned.