“You do not feel as if you’re an inferior sex when you are at an all-women school.”

When you approach Smith College from downtown Northampton, Massachusetts, the road turns slightly and heads directly up a hill, forking so that you suddenly face two magnificent wrought-iron gates framing a clock tower that looms out from behind two enormous chestnut trees. Beyond these gates the college campus extends in both directions. Still a standard-bearer in higher education for women, Smith boasts such famous alumnae as Barbara Bush and Nancy Reagan, Betty Friedan and Gloria Steinem, Sylvia Plath, Madeline L’Engle, and Molly Ivins. And, of course, Julia Child.

Although Smith has recently completed major new construction, for all of its modern additions the college retains the beauty and feel of an old New England campus, simultaneously imposing and intimate. Many of the central buildings are the original dormitories, or “houses,” as Smith calls them. Students need walk only a few feet to their classes, the library, or the Elbow Room coffee shop on Green Street. Hubbard Hall, where Julia Child lived for all four years of her undergraduate education, looks largely the same today as it did in the early 1930s. Group photos of the Hubbard Hall classes of ’34, ’74, and ’94 depict young women who vary only in the formality of their clothing and poses. Despite changes in styles, it is evident that a sense of camaraderie remains constant over the years.

For most of the college’s history, students who lived in Hubbard dined together in their own house or with residents of two other small houses. This model of college meal service, including candlelight dinners with table linens and formal service, was meant to keep students socially connected to their housemates, thereby creating a more intimate form of community within the larger student body. Students past and present agree that small-scale dining and house loyalty are Smith traditions. Classes could be held anywhere on campus, but meals were with your housemates. Remembering her time at Smith in the 1930s, Julia said:

I was always hungry and I ate everything. The food here was perfectly all right. I don’t remember anyone dieting or having eating disorders. There were no vegetarians and no nutrition police. We just ate. Everything. The small houses and the individual cooks made very good sense.¹

In 2004 major changes occurred in the traditions of eating and socializing at Smith. Amid much debate, the numerous dining halls were centralized, with a few different houses offering specialized meal options. Hubbard House now serves a larger percentage of students and provides all vegetarian and vegan entrees. An even more visible change occurred with the construction of a new campus center, funded in no small part by the two-million-dollar sale of Julia and Paul Child’s house in Cambridge. Perched on the periphery between campus and town, the building focuses activity in a new way, drawing students and local residents alike in through its glass corridors. College officials promote the new center as a place for “hospitality, welcome, and exchange” and liken its presence to a “village square.” Although the college offered to name the building or the café after her, Julia declined, insisting that if her name appeared anywhere on the building the lettering be no more than one inch high. Etched into a window to the side of the café is a nearly translucent inscription: “In grateful recognition of Julia McWilliams Child, Class of 1934, for her many contributions to Smith College.”

Creating communal ties around meals remains an important matter at Smith College. It is no surprise that such relationships figured prominently in the life of Julia Child, whose career centered not only on teaching people how to cook but also on the premise that dining well leads to conviviality. Mastering the art of French cooking meant attaining more than kitchen skills; it also meant bringing people together in the most enjoyable of social settings.

Julia’s college education did not directly propel her into the world of cuisine either as an intellectual subject or as a vocation, but her experience at Smith helped shape her as a professional woman in a field dominated by men. Charlotte Snyder Turgeon, Julia’s friend, fellow alum, and cookbook
author, insists that while at Smith none of them were “interested in food.” Her statement is hardly surprising, since the predominant American fare of the times was nothing notable, particularly among upper-middle-class New Englanders. The standards for cuisine can be gleaned from the commencement supper for the class of 1934: roasted stuffed chicken, filet of sole, au gratin potatoes, new green peas, and dinner rolls. Invisible workers cooked the meals while student waitresses handled the service.

Neither culinary arts nor domestic science makes an appearance in the Smith curriculum of the 1930s. In fact, the Seven Sisters colleges resisted home economics courses as an inferior path of study. Even the liberal arts classes Julia took, including four years of French, French literature, and Italian, did not prepare her for any particular career, much less the one she carved out. By contrast, the men’s colleges were designed to “mold the breed” of upper-class men into proper and educated citizens and therefore included some forms of professional training. Women’s colleges had the complicated task of educating women without knowing what American society should do with them. As Julia recalled:

When I went here in the ’30s, women had no careers. You could be a mother or maybe a nurse or a secretary. But you couldn’t be a lawyer or a banker…. We were just sort of drifting around. Back then there were very few career options for women. What you were mostly expected to do was marry and become a nice mother. Now you see many students who have great ambition and are setting a path for a career.¹

Many women’s college graduates went on to paid work, particularly in teaching and social services. However, even among these elite women, professional ambitions were antithetical to upper-middle-class femininity. It is no surprise Gloria Steinem and Betty Friedan (the woman who publicized women’s inequality as “the problem with no name”) should also have emerged from Smith twenty years after Julia’s
time. Julia and her classmates were situated between the first generation of women to have the freedom to attend college and the next generation, whose certainty in their right to higher education led them to protest their subordinate place in economic and domestic realms beyond the college grounds.

“It was my destiny.”

Julia Child attended Smith because her mother had. Carolyn Weston McWilliams was an avid alumna who enrolled her daughter at Smith “the day she was born.” Although Julia’s mother was an upper-middle-class housewife, she prided herself on her independence and her Smith education and maintained close ties to her family and college friends on the East Coast. Julia described her mother:

Well, my mother came from Dalton Massachusetts and was in the class of 1900 at Smith. She was the head of the basketball team that year and maybe for several years and her picture is now, still, in the old gymnasium, all of them in their black bloomers. She had been the captain. I remember one photograph where they were all lying on the ground with their heads in their cupped hands staring at the basketball in 1900. Very cute. And she just adored Smith and I think most people of the time period did. There were fewer of them and it was a rather daring thing to do.

Smith was considered a maturing ground for the daughters of white Anglo-Saxon Protestant middle- and upper-middle-class families. Education for these girls was partly about intellectual growth, but it was also about access to power and privilege by linking a social class in a common institution. At the same time, the college’s original Christian mission meant these women were inculcated with particular moral and social values about service and equality. Even during the heyday of enforced segregation, the college had admitted black women in more than token numbers (Julia’s mother was in the class of 1900 along with Otelia Cromwell, the first black woman to graduate from the college). Privilege and financial security were taken for granted: the college handbook during Julia’s years at Smith advised the students...
to make judicious philanthropic donations throughout their four years, and community service was also expected. For her part, Julia served on the Community Chest, an organization designed to “do good works” and raise money for local causes.

Julia’s mother and her cohort were elite pioneers who contributed to a change in the very nature of higher education by extending the generational legacy of college education matrilineally in a previously patriarchal domain. Thus Julia could comfortably say, “There was never the slightest doubt in my mind that I would go to Smith…it was my destiny.” Yet, although Julia’s mother had no doubts about sending her daughter to college, her father was, in Julia’s own words:

Very conservative, non-intellectual. In fact, intellectualism and communism went hand in hand. So you were better off not being intellectual. And if you were Phi Beta Kappa you were certainly a pinko. So that was not a very useful background for an academic career, was it?

Despite his “antediluvian anti-intellectualism,” Julia explained, “he couldn’t have objected because my mother would have killed him. No, he didn’t because he went to Princeton himself…he was just typical of many conservative people of that generation.” Her father’s conservatism reflected growing class-based fears of communism and leftist politics “imported” with immigrant populations from Europe and Russia.

Describing her family and friends in California, Julia said, “We were socially sophisticated, but not intellectually sophisticated….When I was going [to Smith] in 1934, people from the middle, upper middle class, it was not done to have a profession or to be particularly intelligent. You were supposed to go back and live the social life so that there was no effort on my family’s part whatsoever.” Indeed, for a few years after college Julia did return to her former social life out West. She remained in Pasadena until she was able to secure a job on the East Coast.

Julia’s college years were shaped by a climate of ambivalence about intellectual life, uncertainty about career options for educated women, and the prevailing culture of the upper middle class. Her family’s pedigree, combined with her hallmark joie de vivre and insouciance, meant that Julia was socially well suited for Smith. But she was, in her own words, “not a particularly engaged student.”

“I did not have all the burners turned on, as we would say.”

When describing her college years, Julia consistently noted her immaturity and suggested that not until she was thirty was she “really grown up….When I came to college, I was an adolescent nut.” She blamed only herself for her shortcomings as a student, pointing to the intellectual achievements of her friends. Julia came to college with a set of good, basic educational skills but was unsure of the purpose in studying hard. The Smith student body as a whole seemed to express ambivalence between enjoyment and studiousness, as indicated by the preface to the 1934 yearbook:

Some of our class Senior year, or the year before, became quite highly intellectual and were to be found only behind barricades of the learned journals in the Seminar Rooms, or running through the Library with a bibliography clutched in one hand and a haunted look on their faces. These were the people who had gaily elected Grade iv courses….But lest I should be much misunderstood, let us hasten to say that never have we been too studious a class. Beautiful but Dumb has been frequently suggested as our class motto—a gross slander, of course, but also something of a compliment….And what shall we do next year? A mystery it is for most of us.¹

Financially secure enough only vaguely to register the need for a future vocation, Julia clearly landed on the side of fun. Women’s freedom from corsets, long skirts, and other restrictive norms was still fresh in the 1930s, and rambunctiousness was part of the Smith environment. Julia wholeheartedly embraced the kind of humor that was central to her social circles and times. She poked fun at herself for needing a bigger bed than all the other girls and for having to cry on her mother’s arm at Thanksgiving so that she could return to college with more appropriate East Coast styles of clothing. The student handbook, a booklet filled with serious advice about how to master one’s education, was also peppered with pithy commentary, such as the following “Hints to Freshmen”:

Communism has never successfully been worked out. Wear your own clothes and let other people wear theirs.

Smith is a college, not a country club.

Bridge is the thief of time.

Don’t be embarrassed to study. It may save you the shame of a premature departure from Northampton.

Above all, don’t be afraid to make mistakes….you need reminiscences and we need topical songs!⁵

This combination of seriousness and fun was literally embodied in the pairing of Mary Case and Julia McWilliams as first-year roommates. Their mothers, both from the class of 1900, had “preordained their friendship.” Although Mary was, by her own account, “studious,” achieving Phi Beta
Kappa and investing herself in her studies, Julia was more carefree. Called “Fatty” and “Skinny” by their friends, the pair got along well, even with their contrasting interests. Julia described Mary as “very amusing, and we used to get—as one did in those days—into such terrible giggle fests that we would take the fire rope and stretch it across the room and hang the bedspreads on it so we couldn’t see each other. That would help to some extent.” The room divider eventually became a green rug that remained in place for their first year in Hubbard House. Although Mary claimed she was still able to study, she also said, “All I remember are the jelly donuts—Julia’s favorite—flying over the green rug.”

The next year, the girls remained side by side in Hubbard, but in separate rooms.6

Julia often focused on her pranks at Smith. As she recounted her tales at reunions and fundraisers, each story became iconic, from painting the toilet seat in the bathroom red to hanging the infamous green rug out the window so that it cast a dark shadow over the housemother’s afternoon tea. Julia talked about attending various performances, including concerts by visiting orchestras, Gertrude Stein’s Four Saints in Three Acts, and an opera with a “great big fat soprano from the Metropolitan Opera [who] had a bosom that stuck out about three feet.” She was active in campus organizations and joked about being a Grass Cop, “wearing a badge and blowing a whistle when some unlucky soul walked on the grass.” One year she served as a representative to the student government. “I was always active,” she claimed. Yearbook photos show her involvement in the junior promenade, although she wrote, “I do not remember one thing about being the Refreshment Chair for the Junior Luncheon.”

Much is often made of Julia’s short-lived basketball career, begun to satisfy her mother’s legacy and ended when, in awe of her 6’2” frame, the officials changed the rules to eliminate the jumping center. Julia also took rhythmic dancing, gymnastics, and swimming and probably spent some time at the cabin Smith owned, where students could go for extended hiking trips. As she liked to remark, “I was having a good time. A very good time. I remember consuming large quantities of jelly doughnuts and driving around to speakeasies, later that evening, back at Hubbard House, Mary Case looked out into the hallway, and “there, traveling on all fours, was the French Chef.”

Such social moments peppered Julia’s experience at Smith. “We had a joint informal musical-sketch vaudeville with Smith and Amherst that was a great deal of fun,” she recalled. “And we drank a great deal of beer and terrible whiskey and thought we were being very wicked and were…if you went down to a game in New Haven, everybody just got terribly drunk…and yet we were terribly naive and innocent. I mean, back then nobody smoked.” When Julia came to Smith, southerners were often the basis of her humor. One issue of The Tatler notes:

Julie McWilliams is terribly upset because you know that there’s a sunspot. Now this hasn’t been enough to throw most well balanced girls off, but it means a lot to Julie. Southern California (where her old homestead is) is, as a result of said sunspot, going under water. And Mother McWilliams can only swim eight strokes breast stroke, so do you wonder our Julie is worried?”

In 1978, when Julia and Mary Case returned to commemorate the one-hundredth anniversary of Hubbard House, they described their dorm life as full of rollicking adventure and serious study, in equal measure. According to Julia, the house mothers were “innocent elderly-widow types, who were not terribly bright but very nice.” Mrs. Gilchrist “was rather fat, an old girl from Vermont and she had a way of talking with her lips pushed up.” She would hold meetings and admonish the residents sternly by saying, “Girls, you’re using too much toilet paper!”9 Another college story Julia and Mary recounted was of a wild drinking trip that would make today’s Senior Pub Crawl seem rather tame by comparison:

I guess it was my senior year. I had an old blue 1929 Ford convertible called Eulalie that cost twenty-five dollars. I remember once we went to a speakeasy in a warehouse in Holyoke. We all had one of everything they had…an Alexander, a crème de menthe, a gin and tonic…Luckily my car was a convertible, an open car, because we were all quite sick afterward. It was Prohibition but we did an awful lot of drinking.10

Later that evening, back at Hubbard House, Mary Case looked out into the hallway, and “there, traveling on all fours, was the French Chef.”

Such social moments peppered Julia’s experience at Smith. “We had a joint informal musical-sketch vaudeville with Smith and Amherst that was a great deal of fun,” she recalled. “And we drank a great deal of beer and terrible whiskey and thought we were being very wicked and were…if you went down to a game in New Haven, everybody just got terribly drunk…and yet we were terribly naive and innocent. I mean, back then nobody smoked.” When Julia came
to Smith in 2002 for an extended visit as an alumna-in-residence, both she and her friend Pat Pratt ’51 commented on how comparatively “tame” their experiences seemed and how much more open the campus had become, “with men on all floors at any time and much more freedom to do as you please.” At the same time, they both noted how intently focused on academics the students were.11

“I was very happy in all my schooling.”

Class security and the promise of marriage prevented many Smith students in the 1930s from truly considering a career after graduation. When asked about her course of study, Julia reflected that she had had “no plan, really” but a rather romantic notion of becoming a writer:

I was planning to be a great woman novelist. But the first thing to do was to gain experience. But I purposely didn’t take any writing courses because then I wouldn’t get anywhere…I was a pure romantic and an utter adolescent. The idea was to get everything else so that you can get the writing later….I wasn’t really interested in the academics of it at all. I spent most of my time growing up and doing enough work to get by….I think it was something of a class thing in that you didn’t really need to work and you didn’t very much….I guess I was thinking I would live first. I majored in history. And, like most women of my era, I was truly prepared for nothing.

Julia’s liberal arts course of study at Smith included English literature and composition, French, Italian, European history, the Renaissance and modern Europe, zoology and biology (“I bred drosophila fruit flies and dissected a frog”), economics, music, art history, and international relations. She always seemed surprised and grateful for her time at Smith, claiming:

I was never a brilliant student, still I managed to get in….There wasn’t a great clamor…so that if you just had passing studies, there wasn’t any question, particularly if you were a granddaughter or daughter. Today, I never would have gotten in at all. There’s so much more pressure on good studentship.

Even though she described herself as a lackluster student with other things on her mind, a college education placed Julia Child among the minority of women in her generation.

On the occasion of Smith’s centennial, Julia and her husband, Paul, took part in an oral history project to record the views and experiences of alumnae. The transcript reveals playful but earnest banter about the role of higher education. Julia wondered whether someone like her should even have been admitted to Smith. Paul, unwilling to give up on the belief that education was inevitably valuable, tried to get Julia to name some skills she had acquired in college. He
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reflected, “One of the many things that pulled Julia and me together is that we’re both very orderly beings. … Unlike many others [in the OSS] … Julia was unusually orderly and concrete in her job, which she did extremely well.” Julia concurred: “I do have a mind that can categorize things, that can keep order.” Their ability to break down complex systems made later tasks, such as indexing her cookbooks, into pleasant work they could share. “I certainly value everything that I had at Smith—learning how to use a library, how to do research, how to write a paper, how to pass examinations—all that was tremendously useful,” Julia said.

As she had predicted, Julia became a writer through experience rather than tutelage. Paul summed it up: “Halfway along in your brilliant career as a television person, you’ve trained yourself to write, the thing you thought you should have done…. And maybe this is actually the fulfillment of that somewhat naïve conception that once you learned some more about life then you’d be able to write.” Julia responded:

I did develop some kind of style so that it’s amusing writing that says what you want and isn’t like a damn pedant. There’s nothing worse, I think, particularly when you have to do the kind of things as technical as recipe writing and cookbooks, if it’s just dullsville. No, it’s got to be lively, [just as] teaching has to be lively.

Both Paul and Julia agreed that Julia’s precision, combined with her sensibilities about culture, allowed her to see cooking as an art. She approached food as a body of knowledge, with her sensibilities about culture, allowed her to see cookery as an art. She approached food as a body of knowledge, painting, and photography (for Paul) was a result of their prodigious good fortune in having had a particular kind of education prior to World War II. Even before the commercialization of professional cooking, cookbooks, and cookware, they were acutely aware of their position of privilege and autonomy. At the end of the oral history interview, Julia commented:

We could make a great deal of money if we wanted to but we don’t want to…. We have no desire for yachts and Cadillacs. We’re perfectly happy just the way we are …. Because we’re absolutely free agents. No one is bossing us around … I think we’re very fortunate indeed. And it’s all due to Smith College!

She laughed and reiterated, “Say that! Make sure we put it down that it’s all due to Smith!”

“Interesting folks”

Once Julia began working for the OSS (Office of Strategic Services), she encountered people beyond the relatively insulated social circles of the American upper middle class. The people she met through her job were vastly different in terms of both class and cultural tastes. (Later, she and Paul would decry the personalities of many of the bureaucrats they knew and worked for in the German diplomatic corps.) Julia’s time at Smith no doubt increased her comfort with intellectuals and cultural elites and made it easier to reject her father’s suspiciousness about international communities. Rather than stay within the confines of their professional circles, Paul and Julia sought out and found “interesting folks” in Europe. Although Julia’s friendships with Simone Beck and her other collaborators began well past her college years, it seems likely her college experiences encouraged her to choose these kinds of friends in adulthood. She noted that at Smith it was “important to fit in. At least I felt it and I think a lot at that age is whether you feel it or not…. But as I look back on it some of the most interesting people did not follow the herd at all.” Upon leaving Smith and California, Julia met what she called “fascinating people,” such as geographers and anthropologists in Ceylon. She felt “ready” to meet people like that in her thirties, and although she always claimed her social contacts occurred by chance, her position always helped her secure friendships with the most interesting people. “I think all of these things were just very fortunate, if you happened to run into people,” she said. And yet, what Julia downplayed—or perhaps was unable to see in her own life—was how her class background, her social training and habitus, had oriented her in the direction of intellectuals and cultural figures rather than bureaucrats.

“I was always very grateful that I went to school here. It gave me standards.”

In the decades following graduation, Julia remained close to many of her Smith friends, attending reunions frequently and befriending Smith alumnae and faculty from across generations. Her original Hubbard House gang kept in touch over the years, and Pat Pratt became a very close friend. One year
Julia and Charlotte Snyder Turgeon did a fundraising event where they cooked a pair of Julia’s old sneakers as a spoof on her less-than-illustrious basketball career. From 1935 on, Julia faithfully sent in alumni notes. In 1981 she noted she and Paul had “shot the wad” and bought an apartment in Santa Barbara “to escape the New England winters.” She wrote she was looking for “Smith pals,” adding that “there must be some hiding somewhere in the seaweed.”\(^{12}\) Until she moved to California in 2001, Julia returned to western Massachusetts not only for Smith events but also for community gatherings and talks at the other local colleges. But Julia was more than just a loyal alumna; she was engaged by larger issues surrounding the education of women and the maintenance of space for intellectual debate. One of her earliest acts of support for Smith came when her mother died. In 1941 Julia and her father established the Carolyn Weston McWilliams Scholarship Fund, which allowed young women from California or other Pacific Coast states to attend Smith. In 1985 Julia received an honorary doctorate. That same year she designed the menu for the inaugural dinner of college president Mary Maples Dunn, claiming the meals were “for the whole school….The food goes to the students, to every member of the community—that isn’t any VIP food.”\(^{13}\) In the same spirit, at the dedication of the new campus center in 2005 the college offered a buffet based on Julia’s recipes in an event open to the public as well as the entire campus.

In a 1981 letter to Jill Kerr Conway, then president of Smith, Julia spoke of women’s education as an important social goal in and of itself. She wrote about Smith’s effect on her life and the need to encourage women to see that single-sex institutions could provide them with unique skills:

> I’m wondering how it would feel today. I got a wonderful education. I was a stupid klutz, I was very immature… but I don’t know how I would have turned out if I had gone anywhere else. You do not feel as if you’re an inferior sex when you are in an all-women school….If young women are well acclimated socially, they can get along anywhere….Certainly they should not dismiss the women’s colleges. They should visit them and talk to the women who are going there to see what they have to say.

> I also think, and am quite sure, that for those who are seriously pursuing academic knowledge, that probably a woman’s college such as Smith is much more liable to give one a better education because one does not have the happy distractions of a coed college, and one can concentrate on one’s studies but still have social life on the outside.\(^{14}\)

In 2002, at the age of eighty-nine, Julia returned to Smith as an alumna-in-residence, along with Pat Pratt. They visited classes and were served a meal cooked by students. In typical fashion, Julia joined the cooks in the kitchen to help out with the preparations and learn how to make Vietnamese spring rolls. She commented on the current students, their lives and their intellectual pursuits: “I worry about Smith students today….They are so worried about their careers. I have never had a career, I followed my heart.” At the same time, Julia recognized how much more complicated these choices are today: while tuition in 1934 was around one thousand dollars a year, today it is upwards of thirty-two thousand.

Following her heart also meant Julia came out of Smith with strong moral convictions. In considering what Julia got from Smith, Paul commented, “That raises an interesting question about whether there may not be value in an institution where, though all you’re doing is ‘growing up,’ still you’re getting some kind of information and therefore you are potentially a much better citizen, a much more rounded and better citizen as a result of the college….” Many of Julia’s political ideas were shaped by her time at Smith. In 1954, after five Smith faculty members had been named as communists by the House Un-American Activities Committee, Julia wrote a powerful letter to the Alumnae Association’s Committee for Discrimination in Giving. She criticized the committee’s involvement in publicizing the faculty who belonged to communist organizations, arguing that such actions went against democratic processes as well as the college’s mission:

> One of the purposes of Smith College and the main reason why its alumnae support it, is that it is a free, democratic institution, privately endowed, and subject to no political pressures from any government or any party. It can operate freely as long as its Trustees and its President have the courage to act as they see fit, with the support of the alumnae. In this very dangerous period of history where, through fear and confusion, we are assailed continually by conflicting opinions and strong appeals to the emotions, it is imperative that our young people learn to sift truth from half-truth; demagoguery from democracy; totalitarianism in any form, from liberty. The duty of Smith College is, as I see it, to give her daughters the kind of education which will ensure that they will use their minds clearly and wisely, so that they will be able to conduct themselves as courageous and informed citizens of the United States.\(^{15}\)

Julia’s words are as relevant to life in academia today as they were in the 1950s. Never one to shy away from controversy, she would probably find it fitting that the Campus Center, the result of her donation, is both an integral part of campus life and a hotly debated building. Alums and current students love the space but bemoan the loss of their intimate in-house dining halls. In a recent piece in the Chronicle of Higher Education, President Carol T. Christ argued that
private colleges like Smith have something to learn from public universities, suggesting that “the intense private communities and their centrality to institutional identity make it difficult to create public spaces for robust debate.”

Pushing for more public space in private colleges, Christ asserted that people need opportunities to debate politics without descending into personalized conflict; the “too intimate environment” of family or small-college life is antithetical to the development of public culture and civic commitments. And yet, reflecting on Julia’s experiences at Smith, it seems that the opportunity to build close personal and intellectual ties within a small community helped shape women like Julia into engaged citizens.

However, it may be that the nature of debates has changed enough to require a larger forum. Dining together at the Campus Center may encourage greater public involvement in current campus debates about the unionization of college dining and service staff or about such issues as ending contracts with multinational food corporations who don’t stick to fair-trade standards. Whether the Hubbard House loyalties of the class of 1934 or the more dispersed “urban public culture” of today’s Campus Center lead to a better kind of debate is just the sort of issue Julia herself would have relished. Publicly and openly across the table, Smith gave Julia Child much food for thought.  
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