

Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

---

University Library Faculty Publications

Georgia State University Library

---

Spring 2014

## Dinny Gordon, Intellectual: Anne Emery's Postwar Junior Fiction and Girls' Intellectual Culture

Jill E. Anderson

Georgia State University, [janderson73@gsu.edu](mailto:janderson73@gsu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/univ\\_lib\\_facpub](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/univ_lib_facpub)



Part of the [American Literature Commons](#), [American Popular Culture Commons](#), [Cultural History Commons](#), [History of Gender Commons](#), [Intellectual History Commons](#), [United States History Commons](#), [Women's History Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Anderson, Jill E., "Dinny Gordon, Intellectual: Anne Emery's Postwar Junior Fiction and Girls' Intellectual Culture" (2014). *University Library Faculty Publications*. 136.

[https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/univ\\_lib\\_facpub/136](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/univ_lib_facpub/136)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Georgia State University Library at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Library Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@gsu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@gsu.edu).

**DINNY GORDON, INTELLECTUAL:  
ANNE EMERY'S POSTWAR JUNIOR FICTION  
AND GIRLS' INTELLECTUAL CULTURE**

In Anne Emery's 1961 junior novel *Dinny Gordon, Sophomore*, high-school sophomore Dinny Gordon and her friend Melinda Jones stop by their town's public library, where Dinny happily checks out a new book on the Dead Sea Scrolls, held for her by the librarian. When Melinda, surprised, asks about her reading choice, Dinny replies, "Oh, I like books about finding the ancient world. . . . I'm going to be an archaeologist someday." Melinda, who has never heard the term, asks, "Why, for goodness' sake?" Dinny, hugging the book, responds, "Oh, well . . . . I'm just queer for that sort of thing. I think it would be more fun than anything else," then adds, for the sake of the friendship, "Who knows? Maybe next year I'll decide to be a teacher," the more typically feminine profession Melinda hopes to pursue, though Melinda carefully adds that she would rather be a wife and mother.<sup>i</sup> What is remarkable about Emery's Dinny Gordon series is that Dinny never changes her mind. The character's passion for ancient history is established in *Dinny Gordon, Freshman* (1959) and continues throughout the series. Though her original circle of friends fails to understand her fascination with Latin and ancient history, beginning in *Sophomore* Dinny amasses like-minded friends—girls and boys alike—who share her intellectual orientation and support her progress toward her long-term goal of becoming an archaeologist.

Emery published four books in the Dinny Gordon series, the last of several junior novel series she wrote, with the final book, *Dinny Gordon, Senior*, coming out in 1965, two years after the publication of Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*. One of a number of authors who made names for themselves by writing for teenage girls, Emery, a former schoolteacher with five children of her own, wrote over twenty junior novels between 1946 and 1965. Emery consistently used the formulaic nature of the junior novel, with its emphasis on personal growth and adjustment, to explore more challenging ethical issues, from cheating to urban and Appalachian poverty to anti-Semitism and prejudice against Nisei internees. In her Dinny Gordon series, Emery positively portrays a girl who manifests what I am calling *intellectual desire*, which encompasses not only passionate engagement and activity in the life of the mind, but also the desire to be in relationships with others who share that engagement. Though serious-minded girls are portrayed in most of Emery's books, Dinny Gordon is Emery's most complete portrait of intellectual desire in a sympathetic heroine, contained in a genre not known for its positive emphasis on intellectual activity and generally portraying heroines eager not to be identified as "grinds" or "brains."<sup>ii</sup>

The intellectual girl has gone largely unrepresented in postwar US girls' history. Though important work has been done on girls' intellectual lives in earlier periods, such discussions have been rooted in debates over the value of education for girls, period. By the postwar era, with mandatory school attendance laws in effect, education for girls was a given. As schools increasingly offered courses in "personal adjustment," "marriage and the family," and similar areas, schools became sites for social and sexual identity formation for teenagers; Susan K. Cahn and Susan K. Freeman's work on postwar girls

and high school culture suggest that for girls (and boys as well), intellectual engagement was secondary to personal development and social success. Other historians and media scholars, including Susan J. Douglas, Ilana Nash, Rachel Devlin, and Mary Celeste Kearney, have focused on the cultural work performed by the circulation of images of girls in postwar mass media, noting a cultural predilection for images of empty-headed, sexualized, consuming teenage girls whose vapidly ultimately confined their influence to the patriarchal domestic sphere. In her 1992 sociological memoir *Young, White and Miserable*, Wini Breines notes that some intellectually-minded girls in the postwar era had to dissimulate, to present themselves as “good” girls, in order to cover somewhat more illicit interests, such as Beat and black culture. Breines’ harrowing account of Anne Parsons’ thwarted desire to pursue a career in psychiatry and her decline into insanity and suicide is a powerful critique of the harm the “grind”/“butterfly” binarism could wreak upon intellectually-minded girls who failed to sublimate or camouflage such desires. Accepting Parsons’ story as representative of the doom awaiting intellectual girls during the immediate postwar era, however, risks occluding further investigation into intellectual culture and community among girls of the time.<sup>iii</sup>

Historians have reported signs of intellectual girlhood, voices of girls engaged in intellectual effort. Susan J. Douglas recalls post-Sputnik calls for academic excellence being applied to girls as well as boys; Kelly Schrum has quoted early readers’ letters to *Seventeen* asking for more of the intellectually challenging fare offered in the magazine’s initial issues; Carley Moore has described various kinds of girls’ writing published in *Seventeen*, including “Curl Up and Read,” a column of readers’ book reviews of serious literature, published between 1963 and 1967 (January 1964’s column was written by

thirteen-year-old Eve Kosofsky, the future Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick); Sevan Terzian has discussed girls' participation in the Science Service's Westinghouse Science Talent Search and ambiguous representations of female scientists in *Science World* magazine—all important starting points for locating intellectual girls in the postwar era. More recently, in her discussion of the Science Talent Search, Rebecca Stiles Onion has argued that STS officials constructed their annual finalists and winners—boys and girls alike—as “productive rebels”: young people adhering to progressive and essentially inner-directed models of creativity, perseverance, curiosity, and intellectual inquiry but whose social skills and general “well-roundedness” allowed them to simultaneously display and normalize high levels of intellect.<sup>iv</sup>

Emery's junior novels, particularly in her Dinny Gordon series, performed a similar function: the display and normalization of an inner-directed, intellectually driven girl. Dinny's existence, however, is rooted in a specific genre generally considered to be highly conservative. Emerging in response to the popularity of Maureen Daly's young-love novel, *Seventeenth Summer* (1942), the junior novel brought significant authorial reputations to Emery, Rosamond du Jardin, Janet Lambert, Lenora Mattingly Weber, and Mary Stolz, among others. Like *Seventeen* magazine and other cultural texts directed at girls, junior novels—with their descriptions of girls' clothing, cosmetics, and pursuit of such other necessary accessories as “popularity” and a steady boyfriend—have been seen as promoting girls' consumption while also being deprecated as being formulaic and disposable objects of consumption in their own right. Different authors, however, developed signature characters and styles within the genre: Stolz' novels tended to be more introspective with ambiguous resolutions; Weber's novels took on darker themes

and focused heavily on class distinctions; Lambert's military-family novels were set explicitly against wartime backdrops, with a major character dying in the Korean War. Part of a broader culture developed specifically for girls that blended entertainment with social prescription, junior novels were at once agents and objects of consumption as well as agents of instruction.<sup>v</sup>

Dinny Gordon, as an instructive character, stands as an example of Onion's "productive rebel;" Emery portrays her as a well-rounded, attractive girl who at first struggles with her friends' resistance to her intellectual interests. Significantly, Emery also grants Dinny companions, creating a range of intellectually stimulating girl and boy characters. Though she toys with the label "queer," Emery highlights Dinny's attraction to—and for—very specific, intellectually marked boys, with the most significant one sharing her "queerness" for ancient history. Dinny is never judged by Emery for displaying or acting on her intelligence; neither is she portrayed as an isolated or alienated intellectual in need of a social (or literal) makeover. Many of Dinny's culturally resistant behaviors (refusing to date boys she is not interested in, preferring to focus on studies) are conservative stances that most parents and authority figures would have approved of. Yet Emery neither punishes nor insists on changing Dinny's more unconventional preferences. Within the framework of a typical postwar junior-novel series, the Dinny Gordon books offer an extended and positive portrait of a thinking girl who challenges social and dating conventions without sacrificing the relationships that sustain her intellectual growth. To read the fictional Dinny as a prescriptive role model is to open further historiographical space for the intellectual girl during the postwar era, and

to lay groundwork for the identification of real-life Dinny Gordons, girls who developed—or hoped to develop—their intellectual passions.

### **“I’m Going to See Pompeii”**

In a 1958 article published in *Junior Libraries/Library Journal*, Anne Emery wrote: “The most important characteristic of youth today is his search for something to believe in, something that will remain honorable and admirable the longer he knows it, something that will make his life worthwhile.” A year later Emery published *Dinny Gordon, Freshman*, the first volume of her Dinny Gordon series; three more Dinny volumes followed in 1961, 1964, and 1965. Emery hoped, with her writing, to provide reading experiences as absorbing as her own passionate girlhood reading had been. She had also observed her own daughters’ reading experiences, noting how the junior novels of popular author Rosamond du Jardin had helped give one daughter, a reluctant reader, the confidence to tackle more challenging texts. For Emery, junior novels, including her own, were steppingstones to more demanding reading; dating stories, she argued, could be a chink in “the armor of [girls’ reading] resistance.” Though librarians and teachers had mixed responses to Emery’s work, her books remained popular among teen girls.<sup>vi</sup>

Over the course of the Dinny Gordon books, Dinny’s intellectual focus remains the central and most consistent aspect of her identity. The “something to believe in” that Emery grants Dinny is a passion for learning, specifically focused on ancient history, and, as the books progress, an increasingly concretely defined career goal. Though packaged as a standard girls’ novel—the 1968 Berkley paperback edition of *Freshman* includes on

its front cover the line “The entertaining story of a popular girl who *doesn’t* want to date!” with the reassurance on the back cover that “a charming Southern boy named Curt Beauregard” will change her mind—*Freshman* establishes Dinny’s passion for ancient history. Emery sketches young Dinny’s growing fascination with the subject, beginning with her early exposure to Nathaniel Hawthorne’s *Tanglewood Tales*, her fourth-grade class visit to a mummy exhibit at the Chicago Museum of Natural History, her discovery of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* in seventh grade, and finally, her enjoyment of the story of the discovery of the buried city of Troy—one girl’s intellectual history.<sup>vii</sup>

In a neat fusion of conventional middle-class girl life and intellectual curiosity, a night of babysitting provides Dinny with a life-changing intellectual encounter. With the children in another room watching television, Dinny becomes deeply absorbed in a book about Pompeii, feeling herself to actually be there:

Claudia and Julius and Diana seemed like her own friends, and a surge of exhilaration carried her out of this time and place and into the past, on a wave of excitement. . . . With a gleam of light, the centuries seemed to disappear.

Closing the book, “Dinny felt as if she held eternity in her hand. . . . [T]onight she had found something that she would keep the rest of her life.” This “something” is intellectual—engagement with Pompeii through passionate reading. Her exhilarated immersion in the world of Pompeii suggests an important and essentially relational moment of self-identification: she has bonded with the Pompeians. Reaching home, Dinny frames a specific goal—a trip to visit Pompeii, Athens, and the Acropolis after graduation—and a means of earning money toward that goal.<sup>viii</sup>



Throughout the series, Dinny holds a series of jobs—babysitting, starting a summer daycamp, working in a store and in the town library—in order to save enough money to finance her hoped-for trip. Miriam Forman-Brunell has noted that teenage girls who babysat frequently did so to earn money to satisfy consumer desires—not, as employers and educators had hoped, out of maternal desire. Emery is frank about Dinny’s dislike for children. For Dinny, babysitting is solely a source of income. Yet, Dinny’s plans for the money do not involve typical teen-girl consumption; in *Sophomore* she daydreams about using her earnings to buy new clothes, but resolutely pushes an alluring catalog away, knowing that she will have her highly fashionable sister’s hand-me-downs. In this case, Dinny’s more conventional older sister, Roxie, provides the means for Dinny to remain fashionable while being saving her own money for her trip overseas.<sup>ix</sup>

Required to do a project for a science contest, Dinny proposes a geological diorama showing Pompeii before and after its restoration. Her young science teacher, Mr. Parsons, enthusiastically endorses her idea, wistfully expressing his own interest in an archaeological career: “But it’s an uncertain living. I couldn’t afford to count on a job, they’re so scarce. Even the summer appointments are hard to get—but I keep hoping.” Mr. Parsons conveys the competitiveness and uncertainty of the field to Dinny in a way that highlights his own hopefulness and avoids dashing her own hopes, without underscoring the gender difference. Dinny’s Latin teacher, while unaware of her plans, singles Dinny out as a promising student; Dinny’s ancient history teacher, mentioned briefly in *Sophomore*, is an archaeologist who travels with her archaeologist husband. Librarian Miss May also shares Dinny’s fascination with ancient history, holding aside relevant books for her. Dinny’s parents support her desire to travel abroad: her mother

approves her trip plans, saying “You can do anything you really want to,” and over the course of *Senior*, her father makes arrangements for her to travel with a historian colleague who regularly conducts tours of ancient sites in Europe and the Near East.<sup>x</sup>

Dinny’s passion for ancient history, however, is inexplicable to her circle of friends, who are puzzled by her fondness for Latin and by the amount of time she spends on her science project. Rather than socializing with her friends, Dinny spends her winter break in the library, portrayed as a warm, cozy space, conducive to serious work. Dinny is deeply engaged by her effort:

[What] she found so fascinating was the age-old lure of the treasure-hunt— finding a clue, a suggestion, a hint, in one chapter that led her through a whole new question to a new track, through book after book.

The trouble was, she never wanted to stop the search.

Echoing popular detective-girl stories, Emery characterizes Dinny as a sleuth whose search takes the form of active, inquisitive reading.<sup>xi</sup>

Absorbed in her work, Dinny is resentful when she is interrupted in the library by pompous, officious Clyde Craybill, the nerdy son of Dinny’s parents’ friends, new to town, in need of a guide. Recognizing Clyde’s stiffness and hyperintellectualism as signs of insecurity, Dinny finds his posturing off-putting. Clyde’s unwanted advances are intellectual rather than physical: aware of her interests, he invites her to a travelogue of ancient Greece and to the Natural History Museum. Dinny is dismayed when he announces his breakup with his intellectually insufficient long-distance girlfriend and broadly hints that he prefers a girl of Dinny’s intellectual caliber. She is further upset when he asks her to the Senior Prom so far in advance of the date that she cannot plead

another engagement. Her friends are shocked by her indifference—when Dinny says dismissively, “Who wants to go to the Senior Prom?” Melinda replies, “Everyone wants to, except you.” But going to prom is not the kind of high-school achievement Dinny aspires to—she is much more excited about her science project’s going to the state competition—and Emery grants her the German measles just in time to miss the big night.<sup>xii</sup>

Importantly, by the end of *Freshman*, Dinny’s interests in Latin and ancient history have led her to a more appealing boy. While giving a speech and reciting an original poem at the Latin Club’s Roman banquet, Dinny responds strongly to an unfamiliar boy:

Lean and relaxed, he was watching the brawling feast before him with a drawling half-smile. . . . [Dinny] liked his face. He looked like her kind of person, and thus far she had found few of them at Rosemont High. . . . He was gay, he was winning. And he gave a five-minute address in Latin with a southern accent.

Curt signals his approval of her speech, and she smiles back at him, head whirling, able to think only that “Curt Beauregard was the only boy she had seen thus far in her life that she could be interested in at all.” Dinny’s interest in ancient history—and her public display of her original work in that field—at the banquet, has led her to a boy she finds interesting, and intelligent, enough to consider dating. When, at the end of *Freshman*, Melinda twits her for not being interested enough in boys, Dinny muses, “Some day I’ll find one waiting for me behind a Roman ruin.”<sup>xiii</sup>

**“You Don’t Want Just Any Boy”**

Emery never implies that Dinny's obvious intelligence and focus on her studies make her unattractive to boys; rather, her girlfriends imply that she is "queer" because she turns down dates with attractive boys, and assume that boys will stop asking her out if she doesn't begin to accept dates (in *Sophomore*, the girls report that the boys have started a pool offering five dollars to the first boy who dates her; unfazed, Dinny wonders out loud if she can collect the money herself). Boys are asking her out, and Dinny is rejecting them. Curt's response to Dinny suggests that her display of knowledge does not make her unattractive to him. Also, unlike the hapless Clyde, Curt is portrayed as both intelligent *and* socially skilled; he is already dating Dinny's popular friend Sue Saunders. Dinny's attraction to Curt is described as being both intellectual and physical. In *Sophomore*, Dinny responds to Curt's physical presence in a demanding summer-school biology course:

[H]e sat leaning back in his seat, too long to be comfortable, his legs stretched out before him. . . his wide, humorous mouth smiling with sympathy for a fellow-sufferer, his gray eyes teasing. . . . [S]he liked to look at him, admiring the strong jaw line she saw from the side, amused at the arrogant lift of his chin when he thought the teacher was stupid.

Though he is "going steady" with her friend Sue—*Sophomore* focuses heavily on the triangle between Curt, Sue, and Dinny—Curt, who clearly finds Dinny congenial and attractive, pushes the boundaries of "steady" dating by showing an interest in Dinny.<sup>xiv</sup>

In *Sophomore* Emery introduces other intellectually-driven companions for Dinny, allowing Dinny to grow beyond her original circle of friends. Julie Jennings, a

member of Dinny's extracurricular Y Club, who Dinny had dismissed previously as unpleasant, turns out to be deeply interested in French history. Dinny is charmed to meet another girl with strong intellectual interests, and the two girls develop a close friendship that sustains Dinny throughout the rest of the series. Julie tells Dinny that her popular, handsome brother Tom, known for his lack of interest in dating (he fears being locked into a "steady" relationship), wants to take her out; Julie sets Dinny up with Tom, and they attend the school play together, causing a sensation among the audience. Tom is portrayed as intelligent and appreciative of Dinny's mind and personality, particularly her sense of humor, and Dinny's ongoing affection for Tom signals her continuing commitment to dating only boys she likes.<sup>xv</sup>

In *Sophomore*, Emery also introduces Brad Kenyon, a graduate student in history, first her father's teaching assistant at Rosemont College, and, beginning in *Junior*, a PhD candidate at the University of Chicago. Prof. Gordon brings Brad home for Dinny's birthday dinner in hopes of distracting older daughter Roxie from her unacceptable boyfriend, shoe salesman Herb (Dinny reports in horror to her mother that Herb had asked her: "'Where's all this reading bit going to get you, Dinny? Why should anyone read books all the time? Where will it get you?'" ) While Roxie is, as hoped, attracted to Brad, Brad is immune to her practiced charms and seems more interested in Dinny. When Dinny asks if he is focusing on classical history, Brad replies, "I'm queer for the olden days." Thinking, "It would be fun to read Greek," Dinny is struck with admiration for Brad:

She forgot she was homely, and she smiled up at him with that glow that caused some of her teachers to look at her in surprise.

“Have you ever been to Greece?” she asked.

He looked at her with the same shock of surprise that her teachers had felt, and smiled at her enthusiasm.

Brad (who has been to Greece) offers to take Dinny to the Oriental Institute at the University of Chicago, infuriating jealous Roxie, who interprets his invitation as a date; Dinny, grateful for the age difference which allows her to frame her feelings as a harmless crush, takes the invitation as a case of two friends sharing common interests.<sup>xvi</sup>

Brad, in a sense, is both Emery’s and Prof. Gordon’s birthday gift to Dinny: she is literally awakened by Brad and her father out of a dream about Crete after having fallen asleep on the porch glider reading her father’s other gift, Mary Renault’s *The King Must Die* (1958). Dinny’s attraction to Brad is rarely described in physical terms; her first impression is of a young man with a sense of humor, with neutral physical attributes: “a tall young man. . . [who] looked as if he [were] enjoying a good joke. . . homely in a nice way, with a shock of light hair, light eyebrows, blue eyes and a wide mouth.”<sup>xvii</sup> Dinny is drawn to his enthusiasm for ancient history and his insightfulness: throughout the series Dinny confides in Brad about dating troubles, and Brad, older and outside Dinny’s high-school dating system, is able to provide perspective.

That Brad and Dinny both identify themselves as “queer” requires attention. Theorist Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick has defined “queer” as referring to “the open mesh of possibilities, gaps, overlaps, dissonances and resonances, lapses and excesses of meaning when the constituent elements of anyone’s gender, of anyone’s sexuality aren’t made (or *can’t be* made) to signify monolithically,” adding that the term carries specific weight when used in the first person. Though Dinny’s self-characterization as “queer” refers to

her passionate desire to become an archaeologist, her friends also identify her refusal to date as incipient “queerness”: in *Freshman* Melinda cries “Sometimes I think you’re downright queer. . . . not liking Clyde, not wanting to date,” a label Dinny reluctantly accepts: “I know. . . . I’m just going to be queer, and I can’t help it,” a characterization Melinda immediately rejects.<sup>xviii</sup>

Dinny’s perceived “queerness” stands for her unwillingness to participate in a dating convention that overrides her actual interests and attractions. Though Emery signals Dinny’s heterosexuality at the end of *Freshman* when she is dazzled by Curt’s presence, her sexual identity and object choice remain incongruent with her initial circle of friends’ assessment of gender and sexual norms: they cannot understand why Dinny turns down dates with “so cute!” boys. For Dinny, looks alone are not a legitimate criterion for dating. Similarly, Emery implies that Brad has had his heart broken by a girl too much like Dinny’s siren sister, signaling, again, Emery’s commitment to heteronormativity—Brad is wary, not gay—while also granting Brad an alternative heterosexuality, one immune to conventional feminine wiles. Like Dinny’s, his “queerness” relates to his intellectual passion, and, implicitly, to the intellectual desire he and Dinny share throughout the series. Emery does not identify Dinny’s—or Brad’s—intellectual desire as a sign of sexual difference, or as a sign of what Dinny’s (and Emery’s) peers might have identified as incipient or latent homosexuality.

Beth Bailey has described how twentieth-century dating culture evolved from a “rate-and-date” system, where the object was to date many people and partner selection was a ritual performance of popularity, to the more rigid postwar “going steady” model, where partners in a “steady” couple could not date others or even converse with members

of the opposite sex. Parents and teachers who came of age in the “rate-and-date” era opposed “steady” dating, worrying that exclusivity would lead to sexual activity, but also fearing that young people would not experience a range of potential partners. Resistance to “going steady” is also a common theme in junior novels, expressed by parents and by heroines who chafe at steady boyfriends’ jealousy. In many of her junior novels, Emery also portrayed “going steady” as intellectually stultifying, with steady couples crippling limited to each other’s company and interests. Throughout *Sophomore* and *Junior*, knowing that if she goes on three consecutive dates with Curt the school will label them a “steady” couple, Dinny scrambles to find other boys she would enjoy dating. The closed system of steady dating is so distasteful to Dinny that she cannot bring herself to date even a boy she likes, exclusively, for fear of being locked into a relationship which would isolate her. Both Tom, reliably concerned about being tied down, and Brad, connected to a broader intellectual world, provide Dinny with alternatives to a rigid dating scene.<sup>xix</sup>

Bailey has described midcentury dating conventions as distinct from affectionate feeling, noting that “convention . . . structured and controlled the manifestation of sexual desire and the desires for security, for status, for a clear role in society—even the desire for love.” While Emery unquestionably upholds heteronormativity, her work challenges these conventions: Dinny is consistently shown as holding out for genuine emotional connection, a preference both conservative (resisting the sexual possibilities in going steady for the sake of going steady) and radical (resisting an emotionally and intellectually stunting conventionality). Sedgwick’s more flexible model of “queerness” allows Dinny (and Brad) to challenge monolithic sexual norms without being locked into an equally rigid heterosexual/homosexual binarism. To identify a boy or girl reluctant to



participate in “going steady” as closeted or sexually confused potentially replicates the rigid gender constructions implied by externally imposed dating norms. Dinny’s resistance to dating conventions signals her desire for sexual clarity. The “queerness for the olden days” she and Brad share fails to signify within the rigid “going steady” culture of her school, which scarcely acknowledges intellectual attraction. Nevertheless, given Emery’s foreshadowing of Brad as Dinny’s future husband, their shared “queerness,” a rich intellectual connection, is portrayed by Emery as a valid basis for ongoing adult love.<sup>xx</sup>

By *Junior*, Dinny’s relationship is sharply challenged by Curt’s irrational anti-Semitism, triggered by the arrival of brother and sister Mike and Debby Goldman in Rosemont. While Dinny likes the Goldmans, in particular Debby, whose desire to become a book illustrator and her passion for art and history place her in Dinny’s growing circle of intellectually-minded girl friends, Curt and Sue deeply resent having Jews in Rosemont. Dinny angrily confronts Curt about Mike and Debby’s exclusion from Sue’s New Year’s Eve dance, telling him “I get so mad about Mike and Debbie’s being deliberately hurt because they’re Jewish that I nearly break down,” and Curt responds dismissively: “Girls break down too easily anyway.” To Curt, Dinny is just being a girl, inherently emotional and unreasonable.<sup>xxi</sup>

When Dinny asks Curt to get acquainted with the Goldmans before judging them, Curt relates an incoherent story from his childhood:

I’ve always had this feeling—maybe it goes back to third grade. I remember then a little Jewish boy was in the class, name of Nathan Stein.

The kids picked on him—I didn't as much as some of the others—but I got the idea that Jewish kids didn't belong in our crowd, and somehow I've never been able to get over it. I just feel that way, Dinny, and you can't reason with feelings.

When Dinny does reason with him—"But you don't have to keep on feeling like an eight-year-old kid, Curt. . . . Why shouldn't you forget it completely and try to treat the whole thing reasonably?"—Curt implies that an effort to be rational would be insincere: "I do. But I've got this feeling—and it seems kind of phony, somehow, to act as if it weren't there." He pacifies her by saying "Oh, I try to be civilized, even when I'm prejudiced," adding, "[Debby's] all right, but she lets her brains show too much." Eager to believe that Curt will try to overcome his anti-Semitism, Dinny does not grasp the depth of his prejudice—nor does she register that Curt's prejudice takes the form of attacking a girl for being too obviously brainy.<sup>xxii</sup>

Brad provides Dinny with the intellectual space and companionship she needs to handle this problem on her own terms. Having introduced Dinny to the Oriental Institute in *Sophomore*, a gesture which establishes the Oriental Institute as a defining site for their relationship, in *Junior* Brad invites Dinny to the Institute to hear a noted Jewish scholar speak on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Dinny travels to Chicago with Julie, Tom, and Debby, friends who all share her intellectual curiosity. After the talk, the group attends the reception for Dr. Geissler. Dinny sees groups of scholars at the reception in animated conversation about their work:

Three men from the Museum of Natural History were reminiscing about their last field trip in Mesopotamia. . . . A group of scholars from the

Hebrew Theological Seminary talked with a couple of Jesuit priests about disagreements in interpretations of the scrolls, discussing the scholars involved in the project as if they were neighbors in the next block. A couple of scholars from the Oriental Institute laughed at some past errors in deciphering ancient writings as if they were school boys recalling jokes on the teacher.

Emery humanizes these scholars, portraying them as “school boys recalling jokes on the teacher” without downplaying the intellectual nature of their conversation: the field trip, the scrolls, the ancient writings, all of deep interest to Dinny, are made hospitable to the reader without diminishing the intellectual weightiness of the materials being discussed. At the same time, Emery’s snapshot of scholars at work portrays an intellectual camaraderie likely to appeal to Dinny and, possibly, to a like-minded reader.<sup>xxiii</sup>

When Brad introduces Dinny to Geissler, Geissler, pleased to hear of Dinny’s interest in ancient history and archaeology, stresses the need for passion for the work: “If you are reasonably bright and unreasonably interested, you can find a place and make a good life in archaeology. . . . [I]t has to mean something to you, perhaps even more than your own identity.” When Geissler tells Brad that his “little friend. . . could be one of the team; she could add her little bit to the search for knowledge,” Dinny, speechless, feels that “someone [had] opened a door and showed her a glimpse of heaven[.]” When Geissler encourages her to apply for the Institute’s summer apprenticeship program, Dinny is speechless. At Brad’s prompt, she responds: “[I]f I could be an apprentice and study and work with you this summer—I’d like that better than anything in the world.” Though Brad provides Dinny with the nudge, her speech, and the desire it reflects—

desire for study, for knowledge, and for the opportunity to work with Geissler and other scholars (including Brad)—are entirely Dinny’s. Dinny knows, when she leaves, that her life has changed dramatically; she finds her hand in Brad’s, and senses that it belongs there. Emery has granted Dinny a transformative intellectual experience, which she experiences in the company of supportive, like-minded friends.<sup>xxiv</sup>

Returning to Rosemont, Dinny ends her relationship with Curt, telling him: “I can’t admire . . . a boy who has to be prejudiced about anyone—Jews or Negroes or any other group of people. I just can’t. It makes me kind of sick. And that’s how it is.” Dinny describes the Jewish scholars discussing the Dead Sea Scrolls with Jesuit priests:

[A]ll those people from all kinds of places—all excited about the same thing, all talking about discoveries and new places to explore—and nobody even thought about nationality or religion. . . . The Christians and the Jews were discussing what the scrolls might mean to their different religions. . . . [ellipsis in original] Oh, it was wonderful, Curt, it really was.

Curt remarks bitterly that he supposes Brad has no prejudices, adding, “I suppose some day you’ll be working with those people all the time.”<sup>xxv</sup>

Curt’s limitations are plain: not only is he anti-Semitic and irrational, his jealousy of Brad shows that he can only interpret her transformative experience at the Institute through the lens of high-school dating culture: Dinny is spending time with another man and with people of whom he cannot approve. He is unable to appreciate Dinny’s pleasure in seeing diverse scholars united by intellectual inquiry. Dinny is relieved to have avoided further emotional entanglement with a boy she could neither admire nor respect. Going steady with Curt would have jeopardized Dinny’s hoped-for connections with

Brad, Geissler, and the Oriental Institute. By rejecting Curt, Dinny rejects neither heterosexuality nor romantic love: after meeting with Geissler, she finds herself holding Brad's hand. Yet, while Brad's romantic interest in her is foreshadowed throughout *Junior*, Dinny continues to treat him merely as a confidante. No longer "going steady" with Curt by the end of *Junior*, she remains contained within high-school dating culture.<sup>xxvi</sup>

### **"He That Is Used to Go Forward, and Findeth a Stop"**

*Dinny Gordon, Senior* opens with Dinny wistfully resisting returning home after a deeply engaging summer apprenticeship at the Oriental Institute. Emery describes Dinny's work in some detail, describing her reading and her work processing, cleaning, and repairing artifacts. Trying to explain her mixed feelings to Brad, Dinny muses,

Even when I felt like a child this summer, I knew I was still part of something big and adult and important. I don't see how I can go back to high school and have it be worth while at all. . . . Maybe it's just the feeling of being such a beginner, and having so far to go. . . . when I can't wait to go into the field.

Brad, understanding, literally places her in front of the work she has done: they go into the museum, where he shows her the vase she had worked on, on display, with a card identifying it as a water jug from Iraq, c. 1500 BC. Brad tells her that Geissler had praised her feeling and integrity for the work: "[Geissler] said, 'That little girl, she really cares!' That is almost his highest praise. . . . And of course the way is long and hard. But

it's worth it. Isn't it?" Rejuvenated by Geissler's praise, Brad's friendship, and the tangible result of her own work, Dinny cries, "I can't wait to get started again!"<sup>xxvii</sup>

But Dinny's progress toward her goals is seriously hindered by a new relationship. On her way home from mailing her application to the University of Chicago, Dinny meets Rosemont College student Steve Denison. As they talk, he asks about her college plans, and Dinny has a sense of intellectual kinship but, ominously, something keeps her from saying more. Meeting him again at a Christmas caroling party, Dinny resolves to get his attention:

If she wanted him, why then she could let him know. And if she was subtle and feminine and fetching about it, what did pride have to do with it? . . . . She had always envied [her sister] Roxie and been too proud to learn the arts she could not help admiring. But tonight Dinny felt like a new girl.

This passage is oddly inconsistent for Dinny, whom Emery never portrayed as remotely envious of Roxie's ways with boys. The "new girl" Dinny feels herself becoming is, in fact, the stereotypical postwar girl, focused on clothing (Dinny's red silk dress and accessories are described), appearance, and feminine wiles used to obtain a boy who "rates."<sup>xxviii</sup>

By taking on this conventional role, Dinny enters a relationship that distances her from her own interests. From their first meeting, Dinny feels a strong physical and intellectual attraction to Steve. On their first date, a day in Chicago, Steve's intellectual and political passions are signaled by his bringing her to his favorite used bookstore, whose owner is shown arguing politics with a beatnik customer. Over lunch, they daydream out loud, toying with the idea of Steve's accompanying her on her projected

trip. Steve playfully suggests that she accompany him to Africa instead. While Steve appears to be the kind of boy she wants: passionate, idealistic, intellectually engaged, his easy dismissal of Dinny's long-settled plans signals his lack of interest in her goals. Steve's controlling behavior, made apparent in their first real interaction at a caroling party, sets the stage for their relationship: after an intense conversation, Dinny gets up to go caroling, Steve pulls her back down, saying "You're not going to break up a beautiful friendship just for a whim?" Dinny responds assertively: "I'm not breaking up any beautiful friendship, Steve. I'm only going out and sing carols for a little while. If you want to break it up, that's your choice." When he dismisses her desire to sing carols, Dinny suddenly gives in, deciding "it wasn't worth fighting about." This uncharacteristic passivity foreshadows Dinny's increasing loss of effectiveness while dating Steve.<sup>xxix</sup>

Steve's obsession with Africa dominates their relationship. Their conversation at the party centers on Steve's high-school trip to Africa (he never names a specific region) which has left him unable to concentrate on his schoolwork:

I'm in the middle of your father's course in American history, learning all about the compromise of 1850 or something, and I keep thinking about the world today, and what difference does history make now? I mean, someone has to do something today, before the bomb goes off. . . . [ellipsis in original] I think about Viet Nam, and what's going to happen over there? I think about Africa. Someone ought to be working with those people, helping them to get organized . . . I tried to join the Peace Corps, and they told me to finish college first. So here I am in college, and it seems like wasting time.

Capable only of formulating hazy dreams of returning to Africa, Steve cannot stick with any concrete plan long enough to make progress toward a goal. His inability to commit to even a short-term goal is evident in his work on a term paper Dinny's father has assigned, which he brags about beginning far ahead of time, but then almost does not finish because he has become bored with it.<sup>xxx</sup>

Steve's impatience and impulsivity characterize his relationship with Dinny. Early in their relationship he kisses her passionately and announces dramatically: "This is the real thing." Dinny, dazzled by the kiss, hesitates to jump to this conclusion. Steve plays continually on this sense of hyperauthenticity to bind Dinny to him, resenting time spent at work or with her friends. Dinny's characteristic perceptiveness is dulled by her growing physical attraction to Steve; her response to another intense kiss sends her into a not entirely welcome "whirlwind of feeling," and shakes her certainty about the future. Falling into an emotional confusion she had hoped to avoid while still in high school, Dinny accepts Steve's assessment of their relationship and works hard to convince herself that her intense, unsettling feelings are "real" love, in spite of her growing awareness that Steve does not care about her own future plans.<sup>xxxi</sup>

Steve's plans for *his* future, however, increasingly require Dinny's support and physical presence. Early in their relationship, Steve announces that he has decided to study at Northwestern University's School of African Studies to train for the Foreign Service, a more permanent career than the Peace Corps. Dinny approves, but is dismayed to find that his plan hinges on her also attending Northwestern, ending her plans to study archaeology at the University of Chicago. When he tells her about a group of students forming a "friendship" association with the intent to travel to Africa, Dinny considers



giving up her trip and accompanying him, fearing that Steve will lose himself if she is not present to stabilize him. She goes through the motions of preparing for her own trip, unable to discuss her plans with Steve. Dinny thinks about marriage: “She wanted to be with [Steve] and do everything she wanted to, as well as be in love. Love should not interfere with her other plans, she told herself. Nor with Steve’s future, either.” Steve’s dependence on her, however, interferes with her ability to plan for herself. <sup>xxxii</sup>

Steve’s inability to concentrate leads him to colonize Dinny’s more disciplined mind, appropriating her focus and even her home for his own needs. Claiming to be unable to study in his dorm, Steve finagles his way into studying at Dinny’s house, and Dinny finds herself doing his homework instead of hers. Though he dismisses her interest in ancient history, discrediting Dinny as an intellectual subject in her own right, he repeatedly draws on her intellectual strengths for his own benefit, proclaiming: “When we’re in touch, I can study, I can concentrate, I can touch the sky!” Dinny in turn becomes uncharacteristically domestic, typing his paper drafts, baking cookies for him, fixing coffee for him just the way he likes it, biting back uncharacteristic disappointment when he forgets Valentine’s Day. <sup>xxxiii</sup>

Time away from Steve brings Dinny back to herself. While doing her English homework—alone—Dinny finds a quote in a Bacon essay that speaks to her: “For he that is used to go forward, and findeth a stop, falleth out of his own favour, and is not the thing he was.” Hoping that Steve will move past the “stop” she attributes to his experience in Africa, Dinny also senses her own “stoppedness.” Dinny discusses the quote with Julie during a day together in Chicago, seeing a French movie and the Art Institute—activities which signal the girls’ intellectual bond, and which Dinny knows

Steve would not enjoy. Julie immediately grasps the significance of the quote and reminds Dinny that Steve's schooling is not Dinny's responsibility. The day out highlights the relational nature of Dinny's intellectual orientation: she is "stopped" by the disconnection in her relationship with Steve, and restored by engagement with texts and her friendship with the like-minded Julie.<sup>xxxiv</sup>

For most of *Senior*, Brad remains in the background, sending a funny Valentine, calling unexpectedly to catch up. His absence is due to his hectic schedule; when he calls, he grumbles humorously, "They keep thinking up things for me to do, and every one takes three days, and they're all supposed to be done tomorrow," a productive busyness that Dinny joyfully associates with the previous summer. Steve's overattentiveness betrays his inability to focus; Brad's intense intellectual engagement makes him less available—but also makes him less smothering. Dinny is forced to turn down Brad's first invitation to the Oriental Institute when Steve insists that she attend a presentation on Africa with him instead. When Brad invites her a second time, Steve insists that she not attend because he has failed to finish his history paper on time. Fortified by her reading of Bacon and discussion with Julie, Dinny angrily arranges to make the trip by herself.<sup>xxxv</sup>

This last trip to the Oriental Institute, pointedly without Steve, shows Dinny in motion and in control again. Freed from Steve's influence, she is no longer "stopped," but defiantly traveling to the space that has always represented her own goals and her relationships with others who share those goals. On the train, she muses that the absence of Steve makes her "past loves," ancient history and archaeology, seem paler and weaker. Brad's presence, however, restores the luster of those passions, which predated Dinny's relationships with both Steve and Brad. Dinny is welcomed back by the previous

summer's colleagues. Chicago and the Oriental Institute—as space, institution, and community—welcome her back and figure as her future.<sup>xxxvi</sup>

Dinny confides her frustrations about Steve to Brad, and their conversation about Steve is framed almost entirely in terms of their conflicting views of history. Dinny worries over Steve's lack of interest in history and its effect on their relationship:

[T]he thing that really bothers me—he makes ancient history and archaeology and all the things I'm concerned with seem so—well, trivial and unimportant. And he's got me mixed up now, so I'm never sure whether I ought to go on with the things I planned or drop the whole idea. . . . [H]e doesn't want me to waste any time on anything of my own. . . . I can't talk to him about Chicago, or what I did there.

Brad responds with a defense of the study of western civilization, asking:

Did Steve ever consider that what you want to do involves all of the past history of civilization? All that's left of that history is what the arts produced: writings, pottery, sculpture, buildings. And what archaeology does is uncover those arts and interpret them, to learn what man did and thought and how he lived a thousand—two thousand—ten thousand years ago. Does Steve think Plato doesn't matter? Or that history has contributed nothing to man today?

Dinny replies, “I don't think he has any real ideas about the past, farther back than American history. He's oriented to solving today's problems—and I can admire that ambition—but I've got to have my own, too.” “When I'm with the Institute people,” she adds, “I'm on the right track.”<sup>xxxvii</sup>

Brad tentatively offers, “I think you ought to know this. . . . Love ought to give you something, not just take everything away.” He continues: “Someone said once that love is not two people looking into each other’s eyes. . . . but two people looking in the same direction, together,” paraphrasing Antoine Saint-Exupéry. Brad and Dinny’s shared commitment to the study of western civilization is portrayed as an emotionally charged affinity. Dinny and Brad share a common, intense passion for the ancient past; Dinny and Steve, operating in different temporal registers, do not. Brad and Dinny’s mutual passion for history is presented as the basis for a more mature romantic relationship. Brad is not dependent on Dinny; by the end of *Senior*, it is also apparent that Dinny does not need to depend on Brad, either.<sup>xxxviii</sup>

Dinny ends her relationship with Steve when she returns from Chicago. Like Curt, Steve accuses her of leaving him for Brad. While at one level this seems accurate, Dinny leaves Steve (and Curt) in order to reclaim her own passions and interests, interests that Brad shares, which sympathetic friends like Julie, Tom, and Debby also share, and which Emery clearly endorses. The book ends not with a passionate embrace, but with Dinny about to get on a plane for the Mediterranean—carrying a telegram from Brad signed “Love.” Emery concludes the series by hinting that Dinny will get her wish that love could coexist with—and even nurture—her career plans and intellectual goals.<sup>xxxix</sup>

## **Conclusion**

Dinny’s relationship with Brad represents the fulfillment of intellectual desire—the fusion of Dinny’s hunger for intellectual stimulation and her desire to share her

interests with like-minded companions. Brad is both colleague and friend, and Emery implies that he and Dinny will be a couple once she matriculates at the University of Chicago. At the same time, her other friendships also represent the relational possibilities of intellectual engagement: in Julie, Dinny has a best friend who loves history and appreciates Picasso and Bacon; in Tom, Dinny has an alternative boyfriend who understands that she would rather see a Mediterranean travelogue than go to the homecoming dance; in Debby, Dinny has a quick-minded friend who shares her intellectual curiosity. Emery's endorsement of the pleasure Dinny takes in intellectual activity and work, and Emery's refusal to punish this pleasure by withholding friendship and romance from Dinny, stand as challenges to stereotypes about intellectual girls as isolated and dateless, while also suggesting an alternative model of girlhood—Onion's "productive rebellion"—operating within apparent conformism to "good girl" standards.<sup>x1</sup>

To focus on Dinny Gordon, *Girl Archaeologist* is to focus on a representation of a model of postwar girlhood that has gone largely unrepresented; to focus on Dinny's emerging network of peers and romantic partners is to suggest an alternative discourse relating to the intellectual girl, one which embodies and expands on Onion's "productive rebel" by suggesting the possibility of intellectual relationships, rather than sentencing the intellectual girl to isolation and alienation. The friends who needle Dinny about her "queerness" and her resistance to dating are portrayed as superficial, and become more marginal as Dinny finds more like-minded friends and bonds with the similarly "queer" Brad. Dinny's one moment of conscious feminine conventionality lands her in a romantic relationship that drains her of her interests and her drive. That she falls into domestic behavior with Steve is portrayed as a signal of a dysfunctional relationship, *not* as

Dinny's capitulation to normative femininity: importantly, the series ends with Dinny's intellectual and emotional revitalization—and reconnection—after ending the draining relationship.

Finally, to foreground the Dinny Gordon books, popular texts which draw on generic formulae to *celebrate* rather than *change* an intellectually-minded girl, is to raise the possibility of writing such girls into the history of the postwar era. Reading Dinny Gordon as a model of intellectual desire is a means of creating intellectual and historical space for real-life Dinny Gordons, girls who loved to read, or who loved science, or who dreamed of pursuing other intellectual ends, girls who might have been heartened by the permission not to capitulate to friends or boyfriends who ignored or denigrated those interests, girls who might have sought out—and found—like-minded friends and partners.

## ENDNOTES

---

<sup>i</sup> Anne Emery, *Dinny Gordon, Sophomore* (Philadelphia: Macrae Smith, 1961; New York: Berkley Highland, 1963), 73-74. Citations refer to the Berkley edition.

<sup>ii</sup> Anne Emery, "Reaching the Young Readers," *Kentucky Library Association Bulletin*, January 1959, 10-12; Anne Emery, *The Losing Game* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965); Anne Emery, *Mountain Laurel* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1948); Anne Emery, *A Dream to Touch* (Philadelphia: Macrae Smith, 1958); Anne Emery, *Dinny Gordon, Junior* (Philadelphia: Macrae Smith, 1964; New York: Berkley Highland, 1966 [citations refer to the Berkley edition]); Anne Emery, *Tradition* (New York: Vanguard Press, 1946). On the use of generic series formulae to convey radical or unconventional content, see Julia L. Mecklenburg, *Learning from the Left: Children's Literature, the Cold War, and Radical Politics in the United States* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

My conception of "intellectual desire" draws on studies of women's education which emphasize the bonds formed among girls in the course of newly accessible education; cf. Martha Vicinus, *Independent Women: Work and Community for Single Women, 1850-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Anya Jabour, *Scarlett's Sisters: Young Women in the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007) 47-82; Mary Loeffelholz, *From School to Salon: Reading Nineteenth-Century American Women's Poetry* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 32-64; Mary Kelley, *Learning to Stand and Speak: Women, Education, and Public Life in America's Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008); Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Alma Mater: Design and Experience in the Women's Colleges from Their Nineteenth-Century Beginnings to the 1930s*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993); Patricia Ann Palmieri, *In Adamless Eden: The Community of Women Faculty at Wellesley* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995); Jane H. Hunter, *How Young Ladies Became Girls: The Victorian Origins of American Girlhood* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002).

My thinking has also been shaped by psychologist Carol Gilligan's discussions of what she terms the "relational paradox," wherein girls (and, in later works, boys) learn to pretend to be other than they are in order to maintain necessary human connections, at the cost of their true selves. Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984); Carol Gilligan, *The Birth of Pleasure: A New Map of Love* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003); Carol Gilligan, *Joining the Resistance* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2011).

- 
- <sup>iii</sup> Cf. Kelley, *Learning*; Lynn D. Gordon, *Gender and Higher Education in the Progressive Era* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1976). Susan K. Freeman, *Sex Goes to School: Girls and Sex Education before the 1960s* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008); Susan K Cahn, *Sexual Reckonings: Southern Girls in a Troubling Age* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007); Sol Cohen, “The Mental Hygiene Movement: The Development of Personality and the School: The Medicalization of American Education,” *History of Education Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (Summer 1983), 123-49; Wini Breines, *Young, White, and Miserable: Growing Up Female in the Fifties* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992), esp. 167-195. Grace Palladino, *Teenagers: An American History* (New York: BasicBooks, 1996); Kelley Massoni, *Fashioning Teenagers: A Cultural History of Seventeen Magazine* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2010); Kelly Schrum, “‘Teena Means Business’: Teenage Girls’ Culture and *Seventeen* Magazine,” in *Delinquents and Debutantes: Twentieth-Century American Girls’ Culture*, ed. Sherrie A. Inness (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 134-163; Angela R. Record, “Born to Shop: Teenage Women and the Marketplace in the Postwar United States,” in *Sex & Money: Feminism and Political Economy in the Media*, ed. Eileen R. Meehan (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002), 181-195; Mary Celeste Kearney, “Recycling Judy and Corliss: Transmedia Exploitation and the First Teen-Girl Production Trend,” *Feminist Media Studies* 4, no. 3 (Nov. 2004): 265-95; Susan J. Douglas, *Where the Girls Are: Growing Up Female with the Mass Media* (New York: Times Books, 1995) Ilana Nash, *American Sweethearts: Teenage Girls in Twentieth-Century Popular Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006); Rachel Devlin, *Relative Intimacy: Fathers, Adolescent Daughters, and Postwar American Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005).
- <sup>iv</sup> Douglas, *Where the Girls Are*, 21-3; *Seventeen*, Dec. 1945, p. 6, Aug. 1945, p. 4, quoted in Schrum, “‘Teena Means Business,’” 155; Carley Moore, “Writing Trouble: *Seventeen* Magazine and the Girl Writer” (PhD thesis: New York University, 2004); Eve Kosofsky, “Curl Up and Read,” *Seventeen*, January 1964, 18; Sevan G. Terzian, “*Science World*, High School Girls, and the Prospect of Scientific Careers, 1957-1963,” *History of Education Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (March 2006): 73-99; Sevan G. Terzian, “‘Adventures in Science’: Casting Scientifically Talented Youth as National Resources on American Radio, 1942-1958.” *Paedagogica Historica* 44, no. 3 (June 2008): 309–325; Rebecca Stiles Onion, “How Science Became Child’s Play: Science, Technology, and the Culture of American Childhood, 1890-1970,” (PhD thesis, University of Texas at Austin, 2012), 202-9, 255-81.
- <sup>v</sup> Michael Cart, *From Romance to Realism: 50 Years of Growth and Change in Young Adult Literature* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996), 7; Amanda Kirstin Allen, “The Girls’ Guide to Power: Romancing the Cold War” (PhD



---

thesis, University of Alberta, 2010, <http://hdl.handle.net/10048/1100>); Barbara Martinec, "Popular—But Not Just a Part of the Crowd: Implications of Formula Fiction for Teenagers," *English Journal* 60, no. 3 (March 1971): 339-44, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/812938>; Anne Scott McLeod, "Girls' Novels in Post-World War II America," in *American Childhood: Essays on Children's Literature of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994), 49-65.

Joyce Litton has argued that Dinny Gordon's career interests and her determination to date only boys she likes make her a proto-feminist heroine. I am less concerned with Dinny's feminist status and more concerned with how the Dinny Gordon books validate girls' intellectual interests and relationships. Joyce Litton, "Dinny Gordon, Proto-Feminist," *Journal of American Culture* 29, no. 1 (March 2006): 43-51.

<sup>vi</sup> Anne Emery, "Values in Adolescent Fiction," *Junior Libraries/Library Journal* 4, no. 9 (May 1958): 1565; Anne Emery, quoted in *Something about the Author*, ed. Anne Commire (Detroit: Gale Research, 1971), 1:85; Anne Emery, "I Try to Make My Story's Characters Real," in *Writing Books for Boys and Girls: A Young Wings Anthology of Essays by Two Hundred Sixteen Authors Who Tell How They Came to Write Their Special Kinds of Books for Young Readers*, ed. Helen Ferris (Garden City, NY: 1952), 198; Anne Emery, in Alice Krahn, et al., "Junior Novel—Pro and Con," *Top of the News* 17 (May 1961): 25; Emery, "Reaching the Young Readers," 10-12; Anne Emery, *Dinny Gordon, Freshman* (Philadelphia: Macrae Smith, 1959; reprint, New York: Berkley Highland, 1968), 124 (citations refer to the Berkley edition). For critical discussions of Emery's work, cf. Mark Neville, "Summer Reading for Junior and Senior High School Pupils," *The English Journal* 38 no. 6 (June 1949): 345, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/806932>; Dwight L. Burton, "Teaching Literature to Our Youth Today: Helping Them to Grasp Its Meanings" *The English Journal* 44, no. 5 (May 1955): 276, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/809495>; Richard S. Alm, "The Glitter and the Gold," *The English Journal* 44, no. 6 (September 1955): 318, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/808927>.

<sup>vii</sup> Emery, *Freshman*, front cover, back cover, 24-25. Emphasis in original.

<sup>viii</sup> *Ibid.*, 60-63.

<sup>ix</sup> Miriam Forman-Brunell, *Babysitter: An American History* (New York: New York University Press, 2009), 69-120.

<sup>x</sup> Emery, *Freshman*, 63, 65. Dinny is never shown being discouraged from pursuing archaeology, at that time a heavily male-dominated profession. On gender in postwar archaeology, cf. Margarita Díaz-Andreu and Marie Louise Stig Sørensen, "Introduction," *Excavating Women: A History of Women in European Archaeology*, ed. Margarita Díaz-Andreu and Marie Louise Stig Sørensen (London: Psychology Press, 1998), 21-23; Cheryl

---

Claassen, "Introduction," *Women in Archaeology*, ed. Cheryl Claassen (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), 1, 4-5. Anne Emery, *Dinny Gordon, Senior* (Philadelphia: Macrae Smith, 1965; Marathon, NY: Image Cascade, 2004), ff. Citations refer to the Image Cascade edition.

<sup>xi</sup> Emery, *Freshman*, 66.

<sup>xii</sup> *Ibid.*, 69-71, 113, 117-19, 137-42.

<sup>xiii</sup> *Ibid.*, 135-36, 143.

<sup>xiv</sup> Emery, *Sophomore*, [flyleaf], 5-6, 78.

<sup>xv</sup> *Ibid.*, 63-65, 69-71, 119-21.

<sup>xvi</sup> *Ibid.*, 28, 38, 48-50.

<sup>xvii</sup> *Ibid.*, 37.

<sup>xviii</sup> Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, "Queer and Now," in *Tendencies*, Series Q (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), 8-9. Emphasis in original; Emery, *Freshman*, 89.

<sup>xix</sup> Beth L. Bailey, *From Front Porch to Back Seat: Courtship in Twentieth-Century America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988); Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*, rev. ed. (New York: BasicBooks, 1999), 88-89, 105-18.

Mary Louise Adams has discussed "going steady" as a regulative heteronormative practice which identified the unattached as at risk of being "abnormal" and potentially homosexual; dating, Adams argues, is in itself a regulatory process intended to socialize young people into conventional married heterosexuality. Some adults approved of "going steady" as a necessary step in a young person's development toward mature sexuality, defined as heterosexual marriage. Mary Louise Adams, *The Trouble with Normal: Postwar Youth and the Making of Heterosexuality*, *Studies in Gender and History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), esp. 98-106.

<sup>xx</sup> Bailey, *Front Porch*, 1; cf. Adams, *Trouble*. I am grateful to Heather Battaly for noting the distinction between sexual conventions and sexual clarity.

<sup>xxi</sup> Emery, *Junior*, 72-73.

<sup>xxii</sup> *Ibid.*, 89-90.

<sup>xxiii</sup> *Ibid.*, 121.

<sup>xxiv</sup> *Ibid.*, 121-23

<sup>xxv</sup> *Ibid.*, 126-27.

---

xxvi Ibid., 128.

xxvii Emery, *Senior*, 8-11.

xxviii Ibid., 55.

xxix Ibid., 69-75, 62.

xxx Ibid., 61.

xxxi Ibid., 79-81.

xxxii Ibid., 87-88, 126-28, 135-36. Northwestern University housed the first formal African Studies program in the US, established by anthropologist Melville Herskovits in 1948. Jerry Gershenhorn, *Melville J. Herskovits and the Racial Politics of Knowledge* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004), 186-200. I am grateful to Larry Grubbs for bringing this information to my attention.

xxxiii Emery, *Senior*, 101, 94-99.

xxxiv Francis Bacon, "On Empire," quoted in *ibid.*, 104; Emery, *Senior*, 114-17.

xxxv Ibid., 105-110, 138-40.

xxxvi Ibid., 139-146.

xxxvii Ibid., 144-145.

xxxviii Ibid. The Saint-Exupéry quote, not identified by Emery: "Life has taught us that love does not consist of gazing at each other, but in looking outward together in the same direction." Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, *Wind, Sand and Stars*, trans. Lewis Galantière (New York, 1940; New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992), 215.

xxxix Emery, *Senior*, 158.

xl On how girls' resistance can be too easily coded as conformism, see Angela McRobbie and Jenny Garber, "Girls and Subcultures," *Feminism and Youth Culture*, ed. Angela McRobbie, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: Routledge, 2000), 12-25. Cf. also Adams, *Trouble*; Bailey, *Front Porch*; Breines, *Young, White*.