



PROJECT MUSE®

“Indian Girls Prefer Park to Housework”: Native Labor,
Runaways, and Carcerality in the Twentieth-Century San
Francisco Bay Area

Caitlin Keliiaa

The American Indian Quarterly, Volume 48, Number 4, Fall 2024, pp.
350-377 (Article)

Published by University of Nebraska Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/aiq.2024.a969748>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/969748>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

[134.114.101.75] Project MUSE (2026-07-20 19:09 GMT) Cline Library at Northern Arizona University

“Indian Girls Prefer Park to Housework”

Native Labor, Runaways, and Carcerality
in the Twentieth-Century San Francisco Bay Area

CAITLIN KELIIAA

Abstract: In Northern California’s San Francisco Bay Area, behind the façade of well-appointed homes, lie traces of a once thriving labor program. From 1918 to roughly 1942, the Bay Area Outing Program coercively recruited over a thousand Native girls and women from US Indian boarding schools to work as live-in housemaids in homes across the Bay. In exchange for room, board and meager pay, Native women and girls as young as twelve cooked, cleaned and lived in the private homes of their employers. This article examines the understudied facets of gendered Indian labor and carcerality in the context of Western outing by exploring early twentieth-century outing runaways and Native women’s experiences in California’s juvenile justice system. To this end, the author considers the powerful and painful stories of women and girls who expressed their dissatisfaction, ran away, stayed out past curfew and found themselves in Bay Area “detention homes.” Caitlin Keliiaa’s use of the term “runaway” considers a spectrum—women who had public departures and those who quietly absconded in the night—also considers those who left without permission. Ultimately, the article argues that outing functioned as a carceral force that sanctioned criminalization and incarceration of Native women. In turn, outing women resisted containment, constant control, sexual surveillance, and labor exploitation.

Keywords: Native American, women, labor, twentieth century, California, carcerality

INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1922, the Berkeley *Daily Gazette* published an article revealing early twentieth-century traces of Native American women's labor in the San Francisco Bay Area. Notably, it covered the recent absence of said labor and the coercive and enforced nature of their work—four girls ran away from their places of employment. In large capital letters the title declared, “Indian Girls Prefer Park to Housework.” The article employed stereotypical tropes, claiming “[t]he call of the open was stronger than the city home for four Piute [*sic*] girls.” Allegedly, these young Native women had camped out at Oakland's Lakeside Park before they were discovered by a police officer and “turned over.” The last words of the article explain that the girls were “placed” in Berkeley and Piedmont homes for summer work, and they were under the care of Mrs. B. V. Royce, matron for the Bay Area Outing Program.¹

This brief glimpse from over a century ago captures the often-overlooked history of Native American domestic workers in the Bay Area. Across the bay, behind the façade of luxurious homes, lie traces of a once thriving labor program. Between 1918 and roughly 1942, the Bay Area Outing Program coercively recruited over a thousand Native women from US Indian boarding schools to work as live-in housemaids in affluent homes across Berkeley, Oakland, and the greater Bay Area.² In exchange for room, board, and menial pay, young Native women and girls as young as twelve cooked, cleaned, and served as caretakers in the homes of their employers. Outing was a national, federal program established by the Office of Indian Affairs. The Bay Area iteration of outing was run successively by three women: Bonnie V. Royce, Jeanette Traxler, and finally Mildred Van Every. Matrons and employers surveilled their charges and enforced strict codes of conduct. Yet, Matrons rarely conducted house visits to ensure girls were safe and given proper care. As the program was regionally based, all Indian women—students or not—were considered for employment. For roughly two decades, the Bay Area Outing Program established a readily available exploitative labor market.

This article examines the understudied facets of gendered Indian labor and carcerality in the context of Western outing. I do so by exploring early twentieth-century outing runaways and Native women in California's juvenile justice system. I illuminate Native women's resistance to settler colonialism and argue that outing functioned as a carceral force that allowed

the criminalization and incarceration of Native women. In turn Native women resisted the worst elements of outing, especially by running away. While perhaps numbering in the hundreds, few scholars have taken up study of regional and school-based outing programs. Abigail Markwyn's and Margaret Jacobs's research on the Bay Area outing program opens up questions about runaways, carcerality, and detention, which I pursue here.³ While I examine the Bay Area iteration of outing, carceral elements are undoubtedly found in other national outing programs.

First, I provide a theoretical framework, and connect it to the literature on carcerality, criminalization, sexuality and gender. Second, I review the history of outing both nationally and in the West. Third, I turn to the Bay Area Outing Program, describing how it functioned and drew Native women and girls into wage labor. Fourth, I examine federal records to demonstrate how the outing program and local detention centers policed and contained Native women who were seen not as victims but as perpetrators of crimes. Woven through these cases are the matrons, employers and officials' fear of promiscuity and their need to control Native women's sexuality.⁴ These records demonstrate the government's detailed management and exploitation of women in the outing program—but most importantly, Native women's resistance to it.

Historians have primarily focused on runaways in the context of Indian boarding schools.⁵ Few have examined those who ran away from outing programs, nor have they detailed young Native women's carceral experiences while outing. To this end, I consider the powerful and painful stories of women and girls who expressed their dissatisfaction, ran away, stayed out past curfew, and found themselves in Bay Area "detention homes."⁶ My use of the term "runaway" considers a spectrum—women who had public departures and those who quietly absconded in the night, at times not garnering the outing matron's attention until days or weeks later. Therefore, this term considers those who left without permission—an infraction that highlights the carceral nature of outing. Ultimately, I find that outing women resisted containment, constant control, sexual surveillance, and labor exploitation.

I uncovered this intimate view of Native women's lives from a federal archive.⁷ Among outing records are "employee" files that reference outing women's places of employment, wages, tribal affiliation, and more. While the archive is revealing, it is not comprehensive. Only in rare cases are girls' letters to family and friends present—and only because they were

confiscated. Conversely, the archive reveals issues that women may have meant to conceal. While much of this data was created by outing matrons and federal officials, it nonetheless offers a glimpse into the complex lives of Native women. Retrieving their historical voices is vital.

While incarceration means the literal confinement of outing girls in Bay Area jails and juvenile detention centers, carcerality is not just caging but also containment, confinement, and limiting movement. As Sarah Haley notes, carcerality can reinforce racialized constructions of gender and gendered divisions of labor. Her concept of the “domestic carceral sphere,” is helpful in considering the outing home as carceral. While framed in the forced domestic labor of paroled Black women in Georgia, Haley’s concept underscores the white home as carceral. Within the domestic carceral space, Black women were contained and exploited for their labor. Haley argues the domestic carceral sphere, “restored white women’s historical role as domestic managers with full control over black female workers.” Thus, domestic carceral servitude, “reinforced patriarchal notions of white women’s dependency and white supremacist structures of racial subordination.”⁸ These same conditions echo the structure of the outing program.

Therefore, confinement of girls within outing homes, limiting their movements and subjecting them to the limitations of domestic work is an extension of carcerality. Scholars agree that reservations and Indian boarding schools were designed to be carceral institutions.⁹ Consequently, outing homes as extensions of schools were a form of confinement. The fact that runaways existed, girls were prevented from leaving and that outing was the only option, illuminates the carceral nature of outing. Understanding outing as carcerality highlights how outing programs are extensions of the carceral framework of boarding schools. They thus require, containment, surveillance and punishment. Crucially, this subjects Native women and girls to carcerality. These were the specific features of carcerality that outing women experienced.

A key factor in incarceration is criminalization. In her seminal text, Luana Ross argues that settler laws rendered Native peoples “criminal,” for criminal meant other than Euro-American. Further, settlers created new laws that defined everyday Native behaviors as “offenses.” Through these means, Native peoples were made deviant, a purely social construct with arbitrary parameters.¹⁰ Indeed, certain behaviors and peoples can be criminalized. Heidi Stark argues that historically, settler nations render Native resistance as criminal. This practice was also gendered. Native

women's bodies "we're constructed as inherently deceptive." This perception of deviancy, "gave rise to a number of restrictive policies that stripped Indigenous women of their political authority."¹¹ Given Ross's and Stark's analyses, historically, Native women were marked as both criminal and lawless. Further, settlers interpreted Native women's expressions of sexual independence or agency as "wildness." In turn, these fears served to justify the control of Native women's lives. Consequently, outing women who were perceived as deviant, those who resisted, or exhibited agency were all presumed criminal. In short, Native women were treated *like* criminals even if they had never committed a crime.

Further, at the turn of the century, the public viewed the sexuality of working-class young women in urban areas as a potential threat.¹² Sexual expression, whether confirmed or presumed, was immediately identified as delinquent or criminal behavior and frequently led to a young woman's incarceration. In short, young working women of the era were caught in an interconnected web of social fears that rendered them sexually deviant and criminal. This was especially true for Native women as racialized subjects. Where the average young working woman's sexuality would have been surveilled by the larger society and its criminal justice system, Native women's sexuality was *also* monitored by the outing program. Her sexuality was policed in order to create gendered labor exploitation. Compared to their peers, Native women and girls were disproportionately criminalized and incarcerated in this system.

OUTING IN CALIFORNIA CONTEXTUALIZED

The outing system in the western US was built on a longer history of Native labor exploitation by European settlers. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Spanish missions and Mexican ranchos were carceral spaces that established an entrenched system of Indian enslavement, with Indian labor as the foundation for California's economy.¹³ In both eras, Native people were taken against their will and forced to labor. At missions, neophytes—or converted Indians—constructed buildings, herded cattle, worked fields, and performed all the labor that contributed to the wealth of the Spanish crown and the proliferation of the mission system.¹⁴ Under the gendered division of labor, men performed work in trades like masonry, carpentry, leather work, or manual labor in the fields. Women managed domestic tasks such as sewing, washing,

culling wheat, and grinding *piñole*—or pinenuts. This division of labor essentially kept Indian women inside the mission compound. Further, children were targeted for they could be “taught with ease and without violence.”¹⁵ This exploitation continued into the Mexican and American periods.

In 1821, when Mexico achieved independence from Spain, the mission economy became available to settlers called “*Californios*.”¹⁶ Mexican California relied on the exploitation of California Indian people born in the mission system. The rancho system, a feature of Mexican California emulated the gendered division of labor in missions. Women performed cooking, cleaning, basketmaking, and hide working, while men plowed fields, herded, butchered, and cared for livestock. Rancho labor was largely debt peonage—workers paid off debt with labor. Most received goods rather than money, including beads, tools, and alcohol.¹⁷ However, when in need of more labor, *Californios* like Mariano Vallejo carried out seasonal expeditions to seize, kidnap and enslave Indian people. They were forced to work and held against their will.¹⁸

In the US period, settlers continued these long-established practices. In the legislature’s first session—five months before California became a state—officials passed the 1850 Act for the Government and Protection of Indians. Lawmakers understood that California Indian labor had long benefited both Anglo and Hispano settlers in the state.¹⁹ In effect, the new law legalized the enslavement of California Indian people. The Act authorized white settlers the custody, control, and earnings of Indian children and vagrants. Indian servants—who were effectively enslaved—became increasingly popular in homes across the state.²⁰ Slavery and sex trafficking were part and parcel of this law and its 1860 amendment. Indentured young Indian women served purposes of both “labor and lust.” Settlers willingly paid higher prices for a “likely young girl.”²¹ As Native women were quite profitable; they were especially targeted and stolen from their communities. Starvation, war, and sexual assault shaped their lives.²²

This policy also created a demand for domestic labor, performed by Indian children. Across the state, Indian children waited on white settlers and their families: cooking, washing, doing laundry, and caring for children. In exchange for control of Indian people, the law required settlers treat their “Indians humanely and . . . properly clothe and feed them.”²³ However, the Act lacked provisions to establish legal rights for Indians, and thereby made the stipulation of humane treatment unenforce-

able. Throughout Northern California, Indian child labor was especially prominent.²⁴ Well after the Act was repealed, Native children remained entrenched in an enduring system of domestic child labor. Decades later, Indian boarding schools in the Western states carried on these traditions, through the “outing” system.

“Outing,” coined by Richard Henry Pratt, was a program designed to transfer Native people “out” of their communities to work in white homes.²⁵ Pratt believed that white contact was the “supreme Americanizer.” In 1878, Pratt conducted his first outing experiment on Indian prisoners of war at Fort Marion in Florida. Freed from their chains, Pratt sent these prisoners to labor for local whites where they earned a small wage. The perceived success of outing inspired Pratt to continue his experiment in 1879 at the first US off-reservation boarding school—Carlisle Indian Industrial School in Pennsylvania.²⁶ Pratt’s “civilizing” program consisted of a half day of basic education and a half day of manual labor. Later, Pratt would deplore the Office of Indian Affairs for its use of boarding schools to train Native people into subservience and control.²⁷ Nonetheless the complex reality of outing remains. On one hand, it exploited and infantilized. On the other, Native people actively sought outing employment as a means of achieving some autonomy in their lives. Through Pratt’s experiment, outing became the cornerstone of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Indian education.

Indian boarding schools separated Indian children from their families and culture, incarcerated them and intended to mold them into Christianized laborers who conformed to patriarchal norms. These institutions upheld the logics of settler replacement—to *transform* the Native. The nature of schools was gendered and operated on Indian child labor. Indian boys built the dormitories, Indian girls cleaned them. And where boarding schools separated Indian children from their families during the school year, outing programs kept children away during seasonal breaks as well. Each boarding school typically operated its own outing program and contracted out student labor to local white farms and homes. Where Indian boys might labor as farm hands or blacksmiths, Indian girls solely worked as domestics. Officials peddled both on- and off-school labor as “work experience” for the purposes of “education.” This practical training secured their social status as America’s laboring class.²⁸

As outing programs expanded into the western states, they continued these patterns of confinement and labor exploitation, but with a key difference. Pratt carefully selected outing homes to ensure employers treated

students like family members rather than servants. Surprise site visits were meant to ensure children's welfare. In the West, however, outing focused less on cultural incorporation into settler society and more on labor extraction. And it built upon the long-established systems of Indian labor in California. Given the history of Indian enslavement and indenture in the West, local settlers may have been more inclined to embrace outing labor.²⁹ The Phoenix Indian School's outing program, for example, located an onyx factory on its campus to appease the demands of a local businessman.³⁰ In Sherman Institute's prolific outing program, hundreds of outing students lived and labored as farmworkers.³¹ Indeed, officials strategically positioned both institutions to provide local businesses with cheap Indian child labor. School-aged youth—teenagers or younger—performed labor fit for adults.

NATIVE COMMUNITIES, WAGES & OUTING RUNAWAYS

The Bay Area Outing Program emerged from both Californian traditions of Indian labor exploitation and federal Indian policy. In practice, the program funneled student labor from western boarding schools such as the Chemawa Indian School in Salem, Oregon, Sherman Institute in Riverside, California, and Stewart Indian School in Carson City, Nevada. And where most boarding schools outed both boys and girls, the Bay Area Outing program exclusively outed girls and women. Native women learned of Bay Area outing in three main ways: through referrals from boarding school or reservation officials, through recruitment efforts by outing matrons, and finally through word of mouth. Occasionally, parents or relatives referred girls to the outing program. Some agreed to send their daughters for the experience and wages. Largely, girls in boarding school had little choice in outing. Some felt they were coerced.³² Once in the Bay Area, outing matrons placed girls in homes throughout the region. Positions were concentrated in the East Bay, especially in the affluent city of Piedmont. Some girls outed for short stints during seasonal breaks while others worked for the same family for years. While some women outed into their twenties and even thirties, most were adolescent, between fourteen and nineteen years of age. Outing labor was consistent with the gendered curriculum girls received in school. Domestic training, or "training in dispossession," as Lomawaima calls it, reinforced Native women's subservience and "proper place."³³ In-

dians were not being welcomed into American society with gendered, menial labor; they were being systematically divested of their autonomy. Native girls and women were meant to gain “civilization” through their work in American homes, but they were simply moving from one carceral space to another.³⁴ These intimate, private spaces were productions of colonial rule and maternalist regulation. That domestic labor of the era was grueling, backbreaking work only solidified this relation.³⁵ Live-in domestic work was especially difficult—particularly the “on call” nature of employment at all hours of the day, without commensurate pay. All the same, Native women gravitated to outing in the Bay Area for an income and new experiences.

The Bay Area’s population boom in the early twentieth-century made for a diverse labor force. Among thousands of recently arrived Southern and Eastern Europeans, Mexicans, Asians, and African Americans, outing girls, like Japanese women, were relegated to domestic work. Native-born white women held higher-status and better paid jobs in offices, department stores and factories. Women of color were typically excluded from these positions.³⁶ Also, California had the greatest shortage of household workers, so women of color filled domestic jobs native-born workers rejected.³⁷ Further, the promise of city life was attractive—bright lights, new people, movie theaters, and amusement parks were certainly a draw. Wages however were essential.

Outing program wages varied but fell on a scale between \$10 and \$50 per month, rarely reaching as high as \$100. The average monthly wage was roughly \$22.50 a month. This includes all documented wages from 1926 to 1944.³⁸ In 1939, full-time female domestic servants in California averaged about \$545 annually. By contrast, Native women in the outing program averaged \$300 annually—or about 55 percent less than the state average.³⁹ Moreover, young women still enrolled in boarding school only saw one-third of their monthly pay. Two thirds of her wages were paid “through” the superintendent of her respective boarding school. Ostensibly, the school held onto students’ wages for safekeeping. However, it is unclear if students ever received wages paid to their school. Therefore, on average they received only \$7.50 of their monthly wages. Whether or not she was enrolled as a boarding school student, all outing worker’s monies were held and managed by the outing matron. These restrictions aside, home conditions and lack of employment in their communities inspired Native women to “out.”

In the early twentieth century, Native communities had little access to wage work and in Depression-hit remote reservation communities in California, jobs were scarce. Those that existed were seasonal and often reserved for male ranch hands or construction workers. Outside of domestic work, few jobs existed for Native women.⁴⁰ Amidst these conditions were families that needed support, on- and off-reservation. Without access to a steady income, many Native families were vulnerable. Sending their daughters to work in the Bay Area was their best option.

A 1931 survey found that Indian communities on and off reservation lacked basic needs. In Dresslerville, Nevada, near the California border, conditions in one Washoe community were modest. Whole intergenerational families of nine or more lived in a one-room cabin.⁴¹ In Modoc County, California, one testimony described the situation in the local Native community as “utter poverty.” There, Indian people were unable to secure employment and if so, only seasonally—roughly four months out of the year.⁴² Overall, labor conditions in Native communities were precarious at best. And access to wage work was difficult especially in a discriminatory world. Therefore, domestic outing work in the Bay Area was a strong option. While wages were less than their white counterparts, they were comparable to Native men’s wages in rural communities.⁴³ Also, domestic work offered year-round wages rather than seasonal. Further, job discrimination was not a factor—girls were hired specifically because they were Native. Young women eager to work were well-positioned to support their intergenerational families. These benefits aside, outing came at a price, pushing some young women to run away.

Though scholarship on outing runaways is incomplete, scholars suggest runaways were common. For instance, at the Haskell Institute in Lawrence, Kansas, outing girls ran away in response to stifling rules, overwork, and undesirable conditions. Parents, too, had reservations about the program. While some encouraged their children to “out” so they could earn money and gain new experiences, other parents criticized the program for subjecting their children to long, strenuous hours of labor. Many parents believed their children had become ill because they were physically overworked. Students also disliked outing. Some girls broke the rules of their outing contracts and tested their employers by staying out late, smoking, having sex, and befriending Indian girls of “bad influence.” While many runaway girls were no doubt unhappy with the physical conditions of their employment, others left because

of low wages.⁴⁴ Regardless of their reasons for leaving, Native women's departure was often met with police intervention.

Historically, Native people have been perceived as habitually unlawful; they have received harsher sentences for racialized infractions compared to their non-Native counterparts.⁴⁵ In fact, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, Native youth were often tried as adults and incarcerated in California prisons such as San Quentin.⁴⁶ This context sets the stage for outing women who were additionally targeted for deviant behavior. In their maternalist positions of power, outing matrons wielded much control over Native women's lives. They embraced Victorian ideals and enforced strict codes of conduct including sexual restraint. They policed their wards to ensure compliance. Native girls and women had to constantly seek permission from both employers, matrons and officials. Ultimately, matrons had the power to remove, incarcerate and dramatically alter the lives of Native women. Outing women who frustrated these standards—especially regarding sexual activity—were reprimanded and often incarcerated.

Native women were under the guardianship of the outing matron, but legally, all minors in California were subject to *parens patriae*. This doctrine gave the state power over all children and youths identified as delinquents. Outing girls were often cited for “status” or noncriminal offenses such as mingling with immoral companions or wandering the streets after curfew. These noncriminal offenses typically led to their incarceration in detention homes. Records do not substantiate whether they were formally charged with delinquency. However, because criminality was often linked to issues of the home, single parents—especially single outing mothers—were closely surveilled, subject to criminalization, and at risk of sterilization.⁴⁷

In early twentieth-century California, these notions of criminality and sexuality were deeply intertwined. Youth that crossed paths with law enforcement were often presumed sexually active. Conversely, youth that were or presumed to be sexually active were considered criminal. Juvenile justice institutions routinely interrogated youth about their sexual activity. All reform school inmates were tested for sexually transmitted infections (STIs), but girls were forced to undergo invasive pelvic exams. Detention homes including those in Alameda County subjected girls to a medical examination, a psychological evaluation, STI testing, and pelvic exams.⁴⁸ Juvenile justice was gendered, and girls were incarcerated for sexual “crimes,” whether confirmed or presumed, and regardless of their

status as the victims or the perpetrators.⁴⁹ Incarceration alone was enough to mark girls as “sexually deviant.” As I show in the testimonies of Native women laborers in the Bay Area Outing Program, Native women were subjected to these explicitly racialized and gendered social anxieties in addition to the experience of labor exploitation, further restricting their already regimented lives.

NATIVE WOMEN’S TESTIMONY

In spring 1929, sixteen-year-old Vivian Cooper, a young Pomo woman from Guidiville Rancheria in California entered the outing program. Her father arranged her placement through Mrs. Keenan, a Ukiah-based Public Health Nurse. Cooper worked at homes in Richmond, Oakland, and Alameda, earning \$15 to \$25 a month.⁵⁰ Shortly after her arrival, Royce wrote Keenan that Cooper, “seems to be a nice girl but has no training at all; she had three places in all of which she has failed. I am hoping she will improve with experience.”⁵¹ Indeed, Cooper did not spend long at the homes where she was assigned. Though employers colored Cooper as inexperienced and “untrained,” Cooper equated her displeasure with the demands of the work.

On July 9, 1929, Cooper left a position at Mrs. Muldown’s house without consent. Royce reported her departure to Keenan in hopes of locating her, admitting, “I [believe] she has gone home as she appeared to be dissatisfied in each home in which she worked.”⁵² After a series of letters between Royce and Mendocino County officials, Cooper was located at her aunt’s home in Santa Rosa. In an August 1929 letter to Royce, Cooper had the chance to tell her side of the story. She was forthcoming about the reason for her departure:

I left that place because I did not like her children and also that I have to work too much just for fifteen dollars a month. . . . When I left that place I did not tell or say any word to her. . . . I am awful sorry, leaving that place without letting you understand why I left. Please send my clothes to Hopland Calif.⁵³

Cooper was not apologetic for leaving; rather, she was sorry that she had not explained *why* she left. For so little pay—two-thirds of which was sent back to Sherman—the demanding work was simply not worth it. Cooper expressed her dissatisfaction and pushed against expectations

of the matron. For leaving without permission or knowledge was an infraction, one that highlights the carcerality of outing. Ultimately, Cooper was not the only one to leave for wage issues.

Bernice Hunter, a Stewart Indian school student, came to the outing program in fall 1930 at nineteen.⁵⁴ She started in a Piedmont home at \$15 a month and worked her way up to \$30 a month in Berkeley and San Anselmo. Hunter's file is one of the few that indicates a "raise."⁵⁵ While outing, she interacted with all three supervisors: Matron Royce, her assistant Jeanette Traxler, and Matron Van Every. Where Traxler and Van Every were cordial with Hunter, Royce washed her hands of the girl. During her roughly five-year stint in the program, Hunter contracted an STI while outing and convalesced for a period at the Stewart Sanatorium. Once recuperated, Royce was hesitant to take her back. The matron despised sexually active girls and did not hesitate to express her anger. In a heated letter to Superintendent Frederic Snyder of Stewart Indian School, Royce called Hunter a "moron" and a "moral degenerate." These words were not just denigrating but reflect a eugenicist orientation.⁵⁶ Royce accused her of promiscuity and criminality. Nevertheless, as if through gritted teeth, Royce agreed to place her once again, adding, "she will never be able to hold a place for any length of time and will probably become infected again."⁵⁷ Royce expected Hunter to contract another STI and "fail."

In fact, Hunter did hold a place. After a nine-month hiatus she returned to work at the Huber home in San Anselmo. Records indicate that though she and a friend occasionally socialized late with Filipino men, the family was "well satisfied with her," and she was "treated like one of the family."⁵⁸ Though the family was apparently content with Hunter, the feeling was not mutual. After working nearly three years at the Huber home, Hunter left. In a July 5, 1935, letter, Hunter wrote Matron Van Every from San Rafael explaining her decision:

I know you are angry at me for leaving all the sudden. I guess you don't blame me if you had to work from 6:30 in the morning until [around] 9:30 at night. There is one thing I like to talk about . . . Mrs. Huber never paid me for two months. I tried to ask her but she said she paid me. . . . I wonder if you'd get it for me and I'd appreciate it very much.⁵⁹

As a live-in maid, Hunter worked grueling fifteen-hour days. Though she had received a raise in the Huber home, a demanding schedule and

withheld wages proved the final straw. Ultimately, Van Every secured one month of wages due to Hunter. However, despite knowledge of the unpaid wages, the matron's notes dismissively indicate that Hunter "did not give an intelligent reason" for her departure.⁶⁰ Like Cooper, Hunter had enough. Even if it would anger the matron, she left without permission or knowledge. Hunter's experience demonstrates that dissatisfaction was common among outing participants and that sexually active women were especially subject to scrutiny. These conditions begin to expose the carceral nature of outing.

A year after Vivian Cooper fled Mrs. Muldown's house, seventeen-year-old Martha Graham was placed in the same Alameda home. The Chukchansi woman from Coarsegold, California, outed from 1930 to 1933 in Alameda, Oakland, and Lafayette, earning \$15 to \$20 a month.⁶¹ While at Mrs. Muldown's, Graham wrote Royce requesting winter leave, "Just a few lines . . . asking you if I could go home . . . next month for my Christmas Vacation. Oh yes did Mr. Snyder send the money to you?"⁶²

Intriguingly, Graham's letter included an annotation undoubtedly written by Royce. It stated, "Do Not allow to go if it can be prevented." This rare note highlights the practice of keeping girls at work and away from their families as much as possible. It also serves as clear evidence of the carceral nature of the program. One that was theoretically voluntary yet functioned in a disciplinary way. Graham wanted to go home for Christmas vacation—a very standard and reasonable request. And Royce intended to deny her. Records do not reveal if Graham returned home for break but do show that she requested funds. Though she attended public school, Superintendent Snyder of Stewart Indian School managed her finances. It took requests like these for girls to secure their hard-earned money.

Though Graham had had a spotless record, she experienced a rough patch. In January of 1932 she was hospitalized for a gallbladder operation. When she returned to the outing program that fall, she allegedly "went wild," bringing a man into her employer's home. Thereafter, Graham ran away and was found inebriated in a park. She was accused of stealing and the incident was reported in local papers.⁶³ Graham was doubtless arrested, detained, and subjected to invasive exams. After the incident, Traxler called Graham a "problem case in delinquency," and indicated that she had fraternized with an outing woman who was known for trouble. Despite these transgressions, Traxler gave her one last chance. Graham's final placement was at the Whitaker home in Lafayette.⁶⁴ Graham's experi-

ence indicates that accusations of theft and the desire to return home were often the impetus for running away or challenging the matron's authority. Undoubtedly, bringing a man into her employer's home had marked the young woman. The infraction alone would subject her to closer surveillance and criminalization.

In more extenuating circumstances, women who challenged the outing program's rules were met with police and forced into juvenile detention homes. In 1934, Marjorie Peters, a seventeen-year-old Klamath girl and Chemawa student, joined the outing program. She had short stints at three homes earning \$15 to \$25 a month. Her first placement at the Brill home proved difficult. She had to do heavy labor like carrying wood and coal and could not get her ten- and twelve-year-old charges to cooperate. After about a month, Peters left the home. Thereafter, in the Harney home, Peters was accused of stealing a fountain pen and umbrella, and apparently had frequent calls from boys on the telephone. Peters was placed in a third home in Mill Valley.⁶⁵ In the summer of 1935, she became ill and returned to Humboldt County to recover. Though Van Every discouraged it on account of her after-hours socializing, she returned in November of that year. As was common during the 1930s, Peters was permitted to return to the program after a medical clearance confirming that she was "free from evidences of venereal or other infectious or contagious diseases."⁶⁶ These kind of health clearances were standard in the outing program.

In late November, the matron placed Peters with Mrs. Seifert. On December 10, Peter stayed out all night and was taken to detention the next day. Though authorities recommended she be returned home to Humboldt County, Van Every chose to give Peters another chance. On December 15, she was placed with Mrs. Whitaker in Lafayette—the same home Martha Graham had worked for two years prior. Van Every saw the position as Peters's "last chance . . . to make good," with the threat of being sent back home should she fail.

In January 1936, Peters stayed out all night twice, after which the matron gave her a third chance. In March, Peters returned home for a visit. Though she was scheduled to return on March 10, Peters instead stayed with her half-brother in San Francisco. The next day, Van Every apprehended Peters and sent her to the detention home. Oakland probation officers insisted that she leave and alerted authorities in Del Norte County. Peters was sent back home on a Greyhound bus. Peters's file reveals that women who broke curfew and stayed out late socializing were subjected to punitive

measures and treated as criminals. Outing contracts established rules and guidelines of the program including curfew. For instance, women and girls were not allowed to leave their employer's home at night without proper escort. Therefore, unless chaperoned by their employer, outing matron or some other recognized authority, girls effectively broke curfew. Further, matrons relied on the police to apprehend girls, therefore these programmatic infractions would turn into formal legal action. Minor infractions such as receiving phone calls from boys would have marked her as deviant. Though Peters committed no crime, these status offenses led to her incarceration. She was not the only one to be detained.

In the spring of 1928, eighteen-year-old Daisy Plummer, a Paiute student from Stewart Indian School, came to the outing program. Plummer had a brief first stint in the outing program before apparently being sent back to Stewart for an undefined transgression. On May 20, 1929, Plummer wrote from Stewart Indian School professing her apologies to Royce. Plummer admitted "what a mistake" she had made while in the Bay Area, writing, "I am awfully sorry and sad today and I really to goodness don't know what I'll do if I stick around here. I'd rather work that's all. I miss the girls there now. Seems to me I am in a serious trouble or put in prison."⁶⁷

For Plummer, the outing program offered freedom compared to the "prison" of boarding school life. She pleaded, "I just can't stand it here any longer. It's awfully lonesome for me no matter if the girls are nice to me. Every time I think of Oakland I had to cry and cry I was not even sick when I was at Mrs. Linden's. Only thing [that] bothered me was the cold. But now I feel over it." Apparently, her outing employer's home lacked heat. But the conditions were worse at Stewart. Plummer begged the matron for another chance,

I have disobeyed you Mrs. Royce. . . . Please could you let me go back there and work. I will promise you I will listen to you. . . . I am real sorry for not doing what is right. It's because I stick around with bad girls and I do what they wanted to do. But if I can go back with you it would sure make me happy again.

Plummer was calculated in her appeal, and must have said all the right things, for Royce gave her another chance. Later in the year when Plummer returned, she became pregnant with her first child. In January 1930, she delivered a healthy baby girl named Verna Jean. Plummer and the baby recovered at the Salvation Army Home in Oakland. In a letter to

Royce, Plummer was again apologetic, but this time inspired to advocate for better wages, "Mrs. Royce I really do hope that I will get better money this time so that I may bring my baby up in a right way. And I often get so discouraged sometimes but I am trying to forget the past and I know that I am going to be a better girl, I realize my mistakes and I know better now."⁶⁸

By June 1930, however, Plummer was in trouble again. Matron Royce, who made no secret of her dislike for sexually active girls and single mothers, was livid. On June 21, 1930, in a letter to Supt. Parrett of the Walker River Agency, Royce accused Plummer of being "irresponsible" and "slovenly in her work." Apparently, the new mother was so overwhelmed with her parental duties that her work suffered. Moreover, she was caught socializing out late among "bad company." Royce added grimly, "a negro is the latest." Outing matrons frowned upon interracial relationships, especially with African American men. Due to the assumption of Native women's promiscuity, these fears were based on miscegenation. Later, when the new mother was unable to keep her outing position, Royce forced her to labor at a neighbor's home. There, Plummer withheld her labor and apparently "sulked and refused to come out of her room." The matron declared, "I was therefore forced to place her in the Detention Home."⁶⁹

As if she had no choice, Royce washed her hands of the young mother and had her incarcerated in a detention home. As a young unwed mother, Plummer was closely scrutinized and judged, to the point where Royce felt that she was of no further use to the outing program. An uninhibited, untidy, sexually active housemaid was an anathema to all the civilities the outing program aspired to impart. As with many girls and women before and after her, Plummer was incarcerated. Fortunately, her incarceration was short-lived. She and baby were sent home soon after, never to return to the outing program. Plummer's efforts to turn a new leaf were insufficient for Royce, who saw the young woman as uncontrollable. As a single mother socializing outside of her race and refusing to perform labor, Plummer was heavily surveilled and scrutinized. Ultimately, she was not the only Native woman Royce incarcerated.

Similarly, Sadie Sam, a Paiute girl, experienced police intervention and was incarcerated in a detention home. Sam entered the outing program around 1923 as a student at Stewart Indian School. On July 3, 1923, in a lengthy letter to Stewart Superintendent Snyder, Royce reported that Sadie had been hanging around with "bad company." Allegedly, Lena

Donnelly, a Stewart student and former outing participant, had been taking girls to San Francisco and “keeping them out late at nights.” Sadie was one such girl and left her outing placement at the Thayer home for four days before returning. Royce pleaded to Snyder, “of course, I know that she is living an immoral life, but I have no proof of it”—meaning she believed Sam was sexually active.⁷⁰ Sam continued to work at the Thayer’s home but left again a few days later. Ultimately, she stayed out all night a third time, upon which Sam began to pack her bags to leave. At this, Matron Royce asked Mrs. Thayer to call an officer to apprehend Sam and detain her in a detention home. Reportedly, Royce sent her home that evening, presumably to Yerington, Nevada.⁷¹ Matron Royce was especially apt to send young Native women to the local detention home, especially when she felt the young woman in question was uncontrollable or reprehensible.

Winifred Nelson, a Klamath girl of fifteen, came to the outing program in the fall of 1932. She worked in homes in Oakland, Berkeley, and Piedmont. Winifred’s wages averaged \$15 a month, a depression-grade wage. However, one brief home in Oakland paid Nelson a low \$10 a month—one of the lowest monthly wages recorded in the program. Nelson had a troubled time in the outing program beginning with her first placement at the Benninghoven home in Oakland. There, Nelson walked half a mile to Oakland High School for her studies. She was overwhelmed by the large student population and disliked the home. After a few months, Nelson ran away and was apprehended in San Francisco and detained at a detention center.⁷²

On January 4, 1933, Royce wrote Nelson’s parents to inform them of their daughter’s departure. She wrote, “We made every effort to locate her and finally asked help of local authorities. They . . . found her in San Francisco. . . . She is now in detention there.” Royce continued, “considering Winifred’s behavior . . . I think she would be better off with you at home.”⁷³ That same day she reported the escape to Superintendent Boggess of the Hoopa Valley Indian Agency, stating, “She is so young and a very attractive girl and she needs close supervision.”⁷⁴ Indeed, Nelson had just turned sixteen and yet was responsible for a household. Royce’s letters demonstrate that the outing program required “docile” servants and sought to avoid employing Native women and girls with “behavioral issues.” This preference reveals the hypocrisy of the program’s supposed interest in Native girls’ health and well-being. Moreover, Royce’s comment

on Nelson's attractiveness exposes the matron's fear of promiscuity and her need to police Native women's sexuality.

While Royce strongly disapproved of Nelson, the sixteen-year-old felt similarly toward the matron. In intimate letters to her sister, Nelson aired her grievances. These unmailed letters appear to have been confiscated (and transcribed) by Royce to censor the young girl.⁷⁵ Another element revealing the carceral nature of the program. Nelson wrote,

Greeting sis . . . what did you all do New Year's Eve? I celebrated in a big way. I'm attending the Oakland High School taking business. math, Spanish . . . instead of sitting at the school I come home and work like a slave. These people I work for are [unusual] . . . What people. Royce said that she'd get me another place but I suppose that is after I graduate . . . I don't get Thursdays off. Just Sunday afternoon till 6, and I have to be home, sez Lillie, but if I get in earlier than 11:30 something is wrong. Spent a week in the Juvenile Detention Home, are those good girls there. Say, they sure are tough, they use to smoke tea . . . anything to [be] disobedient. I got sassy twice. It isn't a bad place, we have court everi friday and do they ask questions, & they sure examine a woman. Boys stay there too also babies. They sure believe in balling a person out. How is Jeanette Beaver & her wagon tongue (?) and the rest of the [g]ossipers including Mrs. Nelson.⁷⁶

Nelson begins by proudly listing her course schedule at Oakland High—certainly a more thorough education than she received at Chemawa. But the promise of schooling was quickly eclipsed by domestic work. Instead of studying, she comes home and “work[s] like a slave.” And though she had expressed her misgivings to Royce, the matron did not secure her an alternative position. Unlike most girls in the program, Nelson did not get Thursdays off. Instead, she had Sundays off—less than twelve full hours of freedom. Where some girls might be able to catch a matinee or doing some window shopping, Nelson could not. Further, she was expected to stay away from the house all day during her off day.

Further, Nelson reflects on her time in detention and when she was “sassy,” perhaps resulting from her recent celebration of New Year's Eve in a “big way.” Though she surmises it “isn't a bad place,” she reveals the gendered surveillance and scrutiny in detention. Her veiled statement, “they sure examine a woman,” likely reveals that she underwent an inva-

sive pelvic exam and was interrogated about her sexual history. Girls like Nelson who were thrown in detention were presumed to be promiscuous degenerates. Detainees were yelled at or “balled” [bawled] out. There is no way to know if a young Native woman like Nelson would have undergone more scrutiny than her non-Native peers. In her tongue-in-cheek farewell, Nelson reminds us that there is a world outside of the detention center and the outing program. Her family, friends and loved ones are living their lives while Nelson is stuck. She was alone, desiring connections and trying to stay positive.

Midway through January of 1933, Royce gave Nelson another chance and arranged for a second outing home in Oakland adjacent to her high school. Nelson managed just one week at the Fiene home before the homeowner accused her of theft—a slip, some toothpaste, cigarettes and aspirin. On January 15, while Royce and Fiene met with Nelson to confront her, Nelson ran to her room in the home and, perhaps in protest or to numb the pain, drank from a bottle of Lysol.⁷⁷ She was immediately rushed to the hospital and had her stomach pumped.

Nelson’s cry for help clearly reflected her need to go home, yet Royce insisted on keeping her in the Bay Area. Under the matron’s watchful eye, Nelson was sent to recover at the outing program headquarters—Royce’s own home in Piedmont. This may reflect Royce’s sense of guilt in the situation and desire to set things right, yet it was not uncommon for the matron to bring in girls she felt needed close supervision. Indeed, Royce’s “care” manifested as tighter surveillance and control. The specialized attention was entirely unwanted.

On January 18, 1933, Nelson wrote to her sister that she was “spending a week here with Royce, maybe longer. . . . Boy I almost died last Sunday. Don’t tell anyone, had my stomach pumped up Highland Hospital. Was I sick—I took Lysol. ole Royce made me so mad. Now she tries to be so damn nice to me.”⁷⁸ A day later Nelson wrote a fourth letter airing her complaints:

You probably have heard all the mess I’ve been in, it sure was tough. I sure had a lousy place & ole Royce insisted I should stay there, but nothing doing, I’m here at her place at present, what a life, I sure hate it here. I’m going to school . . . It’s O.K. there is over 3,000 students . . . & it is crowded . . . it sure is raining down here . . . I have to walk to sch[ool] that’s what I hate.⁷⁹

In this final letter, Nelson proclaimed her hatred for Royce, the outing program, and her school. She had enough. That very evening, Nelson did not return from school and instead stayed out all night with a fellow outing girl. Allegedly the girls had been drinking and hanging out with “Mexicans.” At 5 a.m. on January 20, the police apprehended the girls and brought Nelson to Royce’s home.⁸⁰ She was promptly sent to detention and awaited the matron’s decision.

After a week in Detention, on January 28, Nelson was sent home. Royce conceded that a large city was, “no place for a girl of Winifred’s type.”⁸¹ Though her first outing stint was over, she would return in December, highlighting how girls and their families relied on outing wages. Nelson’s story reveals the dark side of outing. For her, outing work was akin to slavery. Her hard work eclipsed the promise of school life, and she had little agency. She was lonely and desired independence from a meddling matron and accusatory employer. She also craved real connections. When she had enough, Nelson found ways to blow off steam—ignoring her curfew and socializing into the night. The cost of those moments of freedom was incarceration. The outing program pushed Nelson to the brink—ingesting Lysol. An apt metaphor for how domestic work thrust Native women into a toxic, sometimes dangerous place.

CONCLUSION

As this article has explored, the Bay Area outing program functioned as a carceral force that sanctioned criminalization and incarceration of Native women. This program emerged from both long traditions of Indian labor exploitation in California and federal policy. Throughout the Spanish, Mexican and American eras, the exploitation and enslavement of California Indian people was standard. And months before statehood, California legalized Indian enslavement, especially performed by children and “vagrants.” This action created a heightened demand for domestic labor. Well after the policy was repealed, Native children remained entrenched in an enduring system of domestic child labor. Decades later, Indian boarding schools in the West carried on these traditions through the outing system, focusing less on cultural incorporation into settler society and more on labor extraction. Outing programs promised cheap Indian child labor and enforced carceral logics to maintain that labor.

In the Bay Area outing program, Native women sought new experiences and wages to provide for themselves and their families. But outing employment came at a price. Participating in the Bay Area outing program meant being subjected to carcerality on multiple levels. Native women were subjected to confinement in the outing home, literal incarceration in Bay Area detention centers, and figuratively incarcerated by a social system that allowed them no other path to self-determination and the means of survival than their submission to menial labor. Their rebellions, then, are all the more poignant because they may not have been able to imagine another reality for themselves, and yet were still able to snatch moments of happiness and freedom in fleeting hours, out past curfew or with short-term partners.

While this article has explored the experiences of women who ran away, it is crucial to note that many Native women returned to the outing program. Outing work was difficult and low-paid, but wages were essential. So, women who left without permission or fled in the middle of the night found themselves with no other option than to return to make a living. These runaway women and girls seized the only tool that seemed available to them. And when they needed wages, they returned. Their ability to appease the Matron is noteworthy.

As my analysis of federal archives proves, those with confirmed or presumed sexually-based infractions—getting phone calls from boys, for example—were marked as deviant and subjected to further surveillance. These women were incarcerated in Bay Area detention centers and subjected to invasive exams and interrogation. Here, Native women became confined on two counts—first through the outing program, and second through detention. In the Bay Area Outing program, labor, incarceration, and sexuality intertwined to create oppressive circumstances for Native women. Furthermore, utility in domestic labor was paramount; if a girl was no longer “useful” she was discarded and sent home. Considering the mechanics of the Bay Area Outing Program, a young woman’s escape is neither unreasonable nor surprising.

For Native women, outing was a force of incarceration and criminalization. In response, they resisted the worst elements of outing—containment, constant control, sexual surveillance, and labor exploitation. Outing presented a predicament—the promise of wages bound to the likelihood of surveillance, poor conditions, police intervention, and incarceration. Women were drawn to the Bay Area Outing Program to experience city

life and provide for their families yet found that the program was invested in their dispossession. The women whose stories I examined here pushed back. They expressed their dissatisfaction, ran away, stayed out past curfew, and resisted in the ways that they knew how. Native women's testimony tells us that despite the structure of this settler project, Native women challenged its oppressive system.

NOTES

1. "Indian Girls Prefer Park to Housework," *Berkeley Daily Gazette*, August 17, 1922.

2. Nevertheless, records suggest undercounting.

3. See Abigail Markwyn, "'It Was a Place for the Girls to Meet': Community, Native Americans, and the Berkeley Outing Center, 1927–1933" (MA thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 2000), and Margaret D. Jacobs, "Working on the Domestic Frontier: American Indian Domestic Servants in White Women's Households in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1920–1940," *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 28, no. 1 (2007): 165–99. Jacobs has several articles and chapters on outing.

4. Colonizers treated Native women as sexual objects yet regarded their sexual independence as a threat to the patriarchal family and evidence that she was out of control. Jean Barman, "Taming Aboriginal Sexuality: Gender, Power, and Race in British Columbia, 1850–1900," *BC Studies: The British Columbian Quarterly*, nos. 115–16 (1997): 237–66.

5. See K. T. Lomawaima, *They Called It Prairie Light: The Story of Chilocco Indian School* (University of Nebraska Press, 1995); Robert A. Trennert, *The Phoenix Indian School: Forced Assimilation in Arizona, 1891–1935*, 1st ed. (University of Oklahoma Press, 1988); and Brenda Child, *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families, 1900–1940* (University of Nebraska Press, 2000).

6. What we know today as juvenile detention centers.

7. These files are from the Relocation, Education, And Employment Assistance Case Files 1926–1946, RG 75, National Archives, San Bruno, CA, hereafter cited as NARA.

8. Sarah Haley, "'Like I Was a Man': Chain Gangs, Gender, and the Domestic Carceral Sphere in Jim Crow Georgia," *Signs* 39, no. 1 (2013): 67.

9. Mishuana Goeman argues that both boarding schools and reservations follow the settler "logic of containment." She writes, "Boarding schools' link with prisons is that of containing and surveillance of aberrant bodies. . . . It is important to remember that many reservations were set up as a places of containment." Mishuana Goeman, "Land as Life: Unsettling the Logics of Containment," in *Native Studies Keywords*, ed. Stephanie Nohelani Teves, Andrea Smith, Michele H. Raheja (University of Arizona Press, 2015), 81–82. Activist Carlos Montezuma argued, "Res-

ervations are prisons where our people are kept to live and die, where equal possibilities, equal education, and equal responsibilities are unknown” (quoted in Douglas K. Miller, *Indians on the Move: Native American Mobility and Urbanization in the Twentieth Century* [University of North Carolina Press, 2019], 16–27).

10. Luana Ross, *Inventing the Savage: The Social Construction of Native American Criminality* (University of Texas Press, 1998), 14–21.

11. Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, “Criminal Empire: The Making of the Savage in a Lawless Land,” *Theory & Event* 19, no. 4 (2016): 8–9.

12. Mary E. Odem, *Delinquent Daughters: Protecting and Policing Adolescent Female Sexuality in the United States, 1885–1920*, 2nd ed. (University of North Carolina Press, 1995).

13. I use the term “slavery” or “enslavement” to discuss the various forms of Indian enslavement in California. I take up Hupa scholar, Stephanie Lumsden’s treatise to frustrate the language of the colonial archive. Stephanie Lumsden, “What’s in a Name?: An Examination of Historians’ Reluctance to Use the Word Slavery in the Context of California Indian Genocide,” *Center for the Study of Women* (blog), October 18, 2018.

14. James A. Sandos, *Converting California: Indians and Franciscans in the Missions* (Yale University Press, 2008), 95.

15. Steven Hackel, *Children of Coyote, Missionaries of Saint Francis: Indian-Spanish Relations in Colonial California, 1769–1850* (The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 285.

16. Albert L. Hurtado, *Intimate Frontiers: Sex, Gender, and Culture in Old California* (University of New Mexico Press, 1999), 22.

17. W. Silliman, *Lost Laborers in Colonial California: Native Americans and the Archaeology of Rancho Petaluma*, 1st ed. (University of Arizona Press, 2004), 22–24.

18. By the 1830s, slave-raiding expeditions were a common means to meet labor demands on Mexican ranchos and regularly resulted in manslaughter. Jack D. Forbes, *Native Americans of California and Nevada*, rev. ed. (Naturegraph Pub, 1982), 59.

19. James J. Rawls, *Indians of California: The Changing Image* (University of Oklahoma Press, 1986), 88.

20. Albert L. Hurtado, “‘Hardly a Farm House—A Kitchen without Them’: Indian and White Households on the California Borderland Frontier in 1860,” *Western Historical Quarterly* 13, no. 3 (1982): 245–70. For more on all three eras of enslavement in California, see Andrés Reséndez, *The Other Slavery: The Uncovered Story of Indian Enslavement in America* (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2016).

21. Rawls, *Indians of California*, 99. See also Stacey L. Smith, *Freedom’s Frontier: California and the Struggle over Unfree Labor, Emancipation, and Reconstruction* (University of North Carolina Press, 2013).

22. Albert L. Hurtado, *Indian Survival on the California Frontier* (Yale University Press, 1990), 169–92.

23. Rawls, *Indians of California*, 87.
24. Robert J. Chandler and Ronald J. Quinn, "Emma Is a Good Girl," *The Californians* 8 (February 1991).
25. Diane Glancy, *Fort Marion Prisoners and the Trauma of Native Education* (University of Nebraska Press, 2014), 103.
26. Child, *Boarding School Seasons*, 5–6.
27. K. T. Lomawaima and Jeffrey Ostler, "Reconsidering Richard Henry Pratt: Cultural Genocide and Native Liberation in an Era of Racial Oppression," *Journal of American Indian Education* 57 no. 1 (2018): 79–100.
28. K. T. Lomawaima and T. L. McCarty, *"To Remain an Indian": Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education* (Teachers College Press, 2006), 52–53.
29. Victoria Haskins, *Matrons and Maids: Regulating Indian Domestic Service in Tucson, 1914–1934* (University of Arizona Press, 2012), 21–22.
30. Robert A. Trennert, *The Phoenix Indian School: Forced Assimilation in Arizona, 1891–1935*, 1st Edition (University of Oklahoma Press, 1988), 72.
31. Kevin Whalen, *Native Students at Work: American Indian Labor and Sherman Institute's Outing Program, 1900–1945* (University of Washington Press, 2016), 58–59.
32. Viola Martinez outed at Sherman and recalled that student's names were called for outing assignments. She once overheard a Matron tell an outing employer, "This is what we train them for, to take care of other people's houses and toilets." Diana M. Bahr, *Viola Martinez, California Paiute: Living in Two Worlds* (University of Oklahoma Press, 2010), 62–63.
33. K. T. Lomawaima, "Domesticity in the Federal Indian Schools: The Power of Authority over Mind and Body," *American Ethnologist* 20, no. 2 (1993): 231.
34. Katrina A. Paxton, "Learning Gender: Female Students at the Sherman Institute, 1907–1925," in *Boarding School Blues: Revisiting American Indian Educational Experiences*, ed. Clifford E. Trafzer, Jean A. Keller, and Lorene Sisquoc (Bison Books, 2006), 182.
35. For more on domestic work broadly, see Evelyn Nakano Glenn, *Issei, Nisei, Warbride: Three Generations of Japanese American Women in Domestic Service* (Temple University Press, 1986); Mary Romero, *Maid in the U.S.A.*, 10th anniversary ed. (Routledge, 2002); Rhacel Salazar Parreñas, *Servants of Globalization: Migration and Domestic Work*, 2nd ed. (Stanford University Press, 2015); Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, *Doméstica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in the Shadows of Affluence*, 2nd ed. (University of California Press, 2007); Judith Rollins, *Between Women: Domesticity and Their Employers* (Temple University Press, 1985); Phyllis Palmer, *Domesticity And Dirt: Housewives and Domestic Servants in the United States, 1920–1945*, 1st ed. (Temple University Press, 2010); Susan Tucker, *Telling Memories among Southern Women: Domestic Workers and Their Employers in the Segregated South* (Louisiana State University Press, 1988); and David M. Katzman, *Seven Days a Week:*

Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America, new ed. (University of Illinois Press, 1981).

36. Mary E. Odem, *Delinquent Daughters: Protecting and Policing Adolescent Female Sexuality in the United States, 1885–1920*, 2nd edition (University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 40–42.

37. Glenn, *Issei, Nisei, Warbride*, 99–109. See also Katzman.

38. While the outing program began in 1916, no wages were recorded until about 1926. Data was compiled from over 700 files, that indicated wage, including a few earned outside the Bay Area.

39. George Stigler, “Domestic Servants in the United States 1900–1940,” *National Bureau of Economic Research*, Occasional Paper 24 (1946): 12–20.

40. See especially “Bishop Subagency” and “Hoopa Indian Agency,” in *Survey of Conditions of the Indians in the United States*, Vol. 12, Part 29: California (US Government Printing Office, 1934).

41. *Survey of Conditions of the Indians in the United States* (US Government Printing Office, 1932), 11504.

42. *Survey of Conditions of the Indians in the United States*, 11465–69.

43. *Survey of Conditions of the Indians in the United States*, 11498. For instance, the Indian police officer in Dresslerville, Nevada, earned \$40 per month.

44. Child, *Boarding School Seasons*, 84. See also Myriam Vuckovic, *Voices from Haskell: Indian Students Between Two Worlds, 1884–1928* (University Press of Kansas, 2008).

45. Ross asserts that “criminal” meant other than Euro-American. Ross, *Inventing the Savage*.

46. M. Chavez-Garcia, *States of Delinquency: Race and Science in the Making of California’s Juvenile Justice System*, 1st ed. (University of California Press, 2012), 33–35.

47. In my monograph, *Refusing Settler Domesticity*, I discuss the threat of eugenicist sterilization faced by young women in the outing program. Caitlin Keliiaa, *Refusing Settler Domesticity: Native Women’s Labor and Resistance in the Bay Area Outing Program*, 1st ed. (University of Washington Press), 202.

48. Girls with broken hymens were segregated to prevent “moral corruption.” Mary E. Odem and Steven Schlossman, “Guardians of Virtue: The Juvenile Court and Female Delinquency in Early 20th-Century Los Angeles,” *Crime & Delinquency* 37, no. 2 (1991): 192–93.

49. Chavez-Garcia, *States of Delinquency*, 117–26.

50. Index Outing System—Vivian Cooper, 1932, NARA, Cooper, Vivian.

51. Bonnie V. Royce to Lucy Keenan, Public Health Nurse, June 10, 1929, NARA, Cooper, Vivian.

52. Bonnie V. Royce to Lucy Keenan, Public Health Nurse, July 13, 1929, NARA, Cooper, Vivian.

53. Vivian Cooper to Bonnie V. Royce, August 6, 1929, NARA, Cooper, Vivian.
54. Hunter's file describes her as a "digger" Indian. This was an enduring nineteenth-century term, often attributed to Native people from Northern California.
55. Index Outing System—Bernice Hunter, 1935, NARA, Hunter, Bernice.
56. "Moron" was a term of the eugenics movement, linking intelligence and criminal behavior.
57. Bonnie V. Royce to Frederic Snyder, February 10, 1932, NARA, Hunter, Bernice.
58. Index Outing System—Bernice Hunter.
59. Bernice Hunter to Mildred Van Every, July 5, 1935, NARA, Hunter, Bernice.
60. Index Outing System—Bernice Hunter.
61. Index Outing System—Martha Graham, 1933, NARA, Graham, Martha.
62. Martha Graham to Bonnie V. Royce, November 25, 1930, NARA, Graham, Martha.
63. Index Outing System—Martha Graham.
64. Thereafter the Graham family leaned on the outing program to sell their crafts. In December 1933 Martha's father sent a basket to Traxler to sell for \$5 on behalf of the family. It was not uncommon for families to sell their arts and crafts in lieu of their daughter's labor.
65. Index Outing System—Marjorie Peters, 1936, NARA, Peters, Marjorie.
66. Doctor's Note—H. G. Leland, November 4, 1935, NARA, Peters, Marjorie.
67. Daisy Plummer to Bonnie V. Royce, May 20, 1929, NARA, Plummer, Daisy.
68. Daisy Plummer to Bonnie V. Royce, January 14, 1930, NARA, Plummer, Daisy.
69. Bonnie V. Royce to Ray Parrett, June 21, 1930, NARA, Plummer, Daisy.
70. Bonnie V. Royce to Frederic Snyder, July 3, 1923, NARA, Sam, Sadie.
71. Bonnie V. Royce to Frederic Snyder.
72. Index Outing System—Winifred Nelson, 1932, NARA, Nelson, Winifred.
73. Bonnie V. Royce to Mrs. George Nelson, January 4, 1933, NARA, Nelson, Winifred.
74. Bonnie V. Royce to Supt. O.M. Boggess, January 4, 1933, NARA, Nelson, Winifred.
75. I made an educated assumption on the date. Her reference to New Year's Eve and mention of Saturday indicate the letter was most likely written on January 7, 1933.
76. Winifred Nelson to Sister, January 7, 1933, NARA, Nelson, Winifred.
77. Bonnie V. Royce to Supt. O.M. Boggess, January 20, 1933, NARA, Nelson, Winifred.
78. Winifred Nelson to Sister, January 18, 1933, NARA, Nelson, Winifred.

79. Winifred Nelson to Sister, January 19, 1933, NARA, Nelson, Winifred.
80. Bonnie V. Royce to Supt. O.M. Boggess, January 20, 1933, NARA, Nelson, Winifred.
81. Bonnie V. Royce to Mrs. George Nelson, January 28, 1933, NARA, Nelson, Winifred.