The Forgotten Children: African American Children and Child Welfare Reform in St. Louis, 1890-1930

By

C2010
Thomas Thirlkel

Submitted to the American Studies Department of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Co-Chairperson, Ray Hiner

Co-Chairperson, Cheryl Lester

David Katzman

Robert Kent

Rick Spano

Date Defended: _____

The Dissertation Committee for Thomas Thirlkel certifies
that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

The Forgotten Children: African American Children and Child Welfare Reform in St. Louis,1890-1930

Co-Chairperson, Ray Hiner

Co-Chairperson, Cheryl Lester

David Katzman

Robert Kent

Rick Spano

Date Defended: _____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

COH – Colored Orphans Home

CSSACP – Committee for Social Services Among Colored People

CWLA – Child Welfare League of America

PMC – Professional Managerial Class

SFH – St. Francis Home

SLJC – St Louis Juvenile Court

SLPA –St .Louis Provident Assoc.

SLPD – St. Louis Police Department

Tipton – Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls

Introduction

The modern American child welfare system has its origins in the social reforms of the late nineteenth and early-twentieth-centuries. Motivated by a concern for the welfare of children combined with anxiety over a perceived breakdown in social order, Progressive Era reformers increased the power of the state to supervise and intervene into the lives of American families. In order to facilitate the expanded authority of the state, Progressive Era child savers modernized existing child welfare institutions and created new ones.

Chief among the concerns of Progressive reformers was the problem of assimilating European immigrants. In the twenty-five years preceding World War I, eight million new immigrants settled in America.[1] Frustrated with the resistance of adult immigrants to assimilation, Progressive Era reformers turned their attention to immigrant children as the best hope for promoting immigrant assimilation. Important progressive initiatives such as the settlement house, the playground movement, and the education reform all became methods for "Americanizing" immigrant children.[2]

In promoting the assimilation of European immigrants, Progressive reformers also had to contend with the problem of racial classification. In the early-twentieth-century, American naturalization laws still restricted citizenship to whites.[3] Increased immigration from Southeastern Europe and Russia

[1] Steven Mintz, Huck's Raft: A History of American Childhood (Cambridge, Ma: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2004), 200.
[2] Mintz, Huck's Raft, 202-206.
[3] Ian Haney-Lopez, White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 1.

challenged longstanding beliefs about racial classification. In the existing system of racial classification, some of the new immigrant groups were considered nonwhite. The problem of racial classification was further complicated by the fact that contemporary taxonomies for racial classification were confusing and contradictory. Popular and scientific beliefs about which groups should be considered nonwhite conflicted, leaving no clear standard for determining who was white.[4]

Problems related to determining which immigrant groups were white did not directly affect the naturalization status of African Americans. Blacks had been guaranteed citizenship under the Fourteenth Amendment. However, in the early- twentieth-century, through law, violence, and social custom, the promise of citizenship for African Americans was largely unfulfilled. Thus, the almost complete denial of civil rights to African Americans placed most on the margins of American society.

African Americans' position of being citizens without many rights posed a problem for Progressive Era reformers' plans to assimilate European immigrants. The exclusion of African Americans from most aspects of social life clearly conflicted with American democratic values; yet, popular opinion required that blacks remain in their marginalized social position. As a result, the demand for segregation required reformers to develop a rationale for extending citizenship to European immigrants, while maintaining a system of racial segregation.

[4] Haney-Lopez, White by Law, 5.

Social science became an important part of the process developed in the early twentieth century for defining African Americans as unfit for citizenship. American social science knowledge helped modernize white hegemony at a time when it was unstable by reworking old racial stereotypes into new scientific facts.

In the 1990s, scholars of American ethnicity began to produce a body of literature critiquing European immigrant assimilation in terms of whiteness theory. According to this scholarship, race was is not a biological category but a social construction. According to whiteness theory, racial categories are the product of politics and culture and reflect competing notions of history and destiny. More importantly, they become the means by which power is organized and contested.[5]

Whiteness as a racial category is grounded in ideologies and social practices that allowed whites to maintain their dominant position in American society. This new scholarship argued that the assimilation of European immigrants was dependent on their transforming their status from outsiders to becoming white. Immigrant groups, in turn, quickly learned the importance of whiteness and actively pursued strategies that allowed them to become white.[6]

In using whiteness as a method of analysis it is important to recognize its limitations. Scholars have criticized whiteness for being overly broad in its conclusions. Specifically, it has become an all purpose explanation for political,

[5] Matthew Frye Jacobson, Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 9.

[6] There have been a number of studies that have documented the transformation of European Immigrants into American whites: see Noel Ignatiev, How the Irish Became White(New York, Routledge,1995) and Karen Brodkin, How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says About Race in America (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1994).

social and cultural developments.[7] There are concerns that reducing the study of events to a study of race places too heavy an explanatory burden on whiteness.[8] Scholars have also criticized whiteness for blurring distinctions within groups and other sources of identity. Finally, whiteness has been criticized for portraying racism as an all pervasive and unchanging social system. In constructing racism in this way it has neglected the efforts of oppressed groups to resist or contest racism. [9]

Keeping these limitations in mind, I think that whiteness can be useful in understanding how racial ideology influenced the implementation of child welfare reform in St. Louis. From a purely legal point of view, immigrant groups had to negotiate their racial assignment in order to become citizens. It is difficult to conceive of a way that some European immigrants could have become citizens without first being accepted as white. Before proceeding, it is important to look more closely at the concept of whiteness. Whiteness scholarship has been criticized for tying whiteness too closely to immigrant participation in the labor market.[10] In defining whiteness largely in terms of class formation, this scholarship has limited the usefulness of whiteness as a means for understanding how race operates in American society. This is especially true when it comes to examining the relationship of whiteness to Progressive Era

[7] Eric Foner, "Response to Eric Arnsen" International Labor and Working Class History 60 (Fall 2001), 57-60.
[8] Peter Kolchin, "Whiteness Studies: The New History of Race in America" The Journal of American History 89 no.1 (June 2002) 154-174.
[9] Foner, "Response to Arnsen" International Labor and Working Class History, 60 (Fall 2001), 57-60.
[10] Jacobson, Whiteness of a Different Color, 18.

child welfare reform. Racial discourse in the early-twentieth- century as it relates to the creation of new citizens was more concerned with fitness for self-governance than participation in the labor market.

My thinking about the nature of race has been influenced by the work of Matthew Frye Jacobson. In Whiteness of a Different Color, the author argues that race is largely a matter of perception. People perceive racial difference and then ascribe meaning to that perception based on prior learning and experience.[11] This explanation of race as a matter of perception and cognition helps explain the fluidity of race as a social construction. Jacobson's definition of race as perception allows for an understanding of how conflicting definitions of whiteness could exist at the same time. Since the construction of systems of racial classification is largely dependent on historical context, older definitions of whiteness are contested by groups wishing to be considered white. This was clearly the case in the Progressive Era when new immigrant groups pressed for inclusion among those considered white.[12]

Moreover, conceptualizing race as a matter of perceptions that are historically contingent moves us away from thinking of racial differences as natural or inherent attributes to considering race as a form of ideology. For the purposes of this project, considering race as a historically contingent form of ideology permits an examination of the ways in which it became a factor in Progressive Era child welfare reform.

---

[11] Jacobson, Whiteness of a Different Color, 10.
[12] James Barrett and David Roediger, "In-Between People: Nationality and the New Working Class," Journal of American Ethnic History, 16 no. 3 (1997), 15.

Chapter 1 examines the importance of modern social science to racial ideology and child welfare reform. One of the important contributions of post-modern theorizing has been its ability to demonstrate the inherent connections between the creation of scientific knowledge and the exercise of political power. Foucault, in particular, has exposed the underlying relationship between intellectualism and the use of political power[13]. The reworking of old racial stereotypes into modern theories of science is an example of how knowledge was used to legitimize existing social arrangements.

This first chapter also examines the role that the creation of a new taxonomy of racial classification played in stabilizing racial assignments for the early twentieth century.[14] Starting in the late nineteenth century, America shifted from being a religious to a more secular culture. In the process, the old religiously based explanations for racial differences were losing their salience with the American public. To address this concern, American science created a system of classification for the American population that defined the population in terms ofgroup membership. This new system of classification allowed American

[13] According to Foucault, knowledge is more a matter of how society constructs facts for the purpose of maintaining power. White I think that there are problems with his emphasis on linguistics to prove his point; his theorizing does allow specific historical contexts to affect how scientific knowledge is created and used. It is this regard that I think that his work is useful to this project. See Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books,1977) and The Order of Things: An Archaeology of Human Sciences (New York: Vintage Books, 1996)

[14] In making a distinction between racial assignment and racial identity, I am relying on a framework developed by Karen Brodkin in How Jews Became White Folks: And What That Says About America, Brodkin notes that racial assignment deals with the social position and status assigned to a group by the dominant culture. This contrasts with racial identity, which refers to attempts by individuals within a social group to develop a sense of identity within a specific racial assignment.

science to create a hierarchy of superior to inferior groups.[15] Thus, Chapter 1 looks at racial taxonomy as a social and political phenomenon. It is primarily focused on the way in which other parts of society used this knowledge to create a definition of progress that was racially conservative in that it defined progress as for whites only. In this chapter, I pay special attention to the relationship between American social science research and the conservative racial ideology that was dominant in the first decades of the twentieth century. Racial conservatives operated from within a biological framework that argued that blacks were innately inferior to whites.[16] Based on the assumption of presumed inferiority, racial conservatives advocated for public policies, which limited African American access to participation in American society. Through social science research Progressive Era reformers were able to rework longstanding racial stereotypes into modern scientific theories. Thus, it modernized white hegemony by making it appear empirical and natural.

Finally Chapter 1 discusses social science as supporting an official story of African Americans as being unfit for self-government. Priscilla Wald defines "official stories" as those narratives that are adopted as part of the rhetoric of the initiatives of the nation builders.[17] Through social science research Progressive

[15]Hamilton Cravens, "Child Saving in the Age of Professionalism, 1915-1930" in American Childhood: A Handbook and Research Guide, ed. Ray Hiner and Joseph Hawes (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1985), 416.
[16] Daryl Michael Scott, Contempt and Pity: Social Policy and the Image of Damaged Black Psyche,1880-1996(Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 1.
[17] Wald defines an "official story" as those narratives that surface in the rhetoric of nationalist movements. As official stories these narrative command an authority not accorded to other narratives. For a more elaborate discussion of role of official stories see Priscilla Wald, Constituting Americans: Cultural Anxiety and the Narrative Form (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995).

Era reformers were able to rework longstanding racial stereotypes into modern scientific theories. Thus, it modernized white hegemony by making it appear empirical and natural.

Chapter 2 recognizes the importance of professionalism to Progressive Era child welfare reforms. Child welfare reform was part of a larger social movement that attempted to bring scientific knowledge and efficient management to most aspects of American life. Most child welfare reformers were organizational professionals. Their role was to use specialized knowledge to ensure that bureaucratic organizations carried out their goals.

Chapter 2 also highlights the role that professionals played in disseminating racial ideology. Here again the relationship between knowledge and power is elaborated. In Chapter 2, I use social work as a case study to examine the way in which professionalism used scientific knowledge to reinforce the dominant cultures views on race. At the start of the twentieth century, social work was one of several disciplines to professionalize. Among the roles that it played was as an agent for maintaining social cohesion. As such, social work incorporated the new scientifically based racial taxonomy into its work.

Chapter 3 examines social thought among early-twentieth-century African Americans. In the first decades of the twentieth century, African Americans developed their own discourse on family and child rearing. Influenced by the social uplift movement, African Americans articulated a philosophy that emphasized responsibility and respectability. The first section of Chapter 3 looks at the influence of the black church on African American ideas about family.

Capitalizing on the increase in African American literacy, black churches began to publish periodicals. Black church leaders used these to influence African American public opinion.

The next section of Chapter 3 looks at the role played by the black secular press in shaping black public opinion. Secular publications took their lead from religious publications. Their advice also emphasized the importance of social propriety. In this part of Chapter 3, I examine the role that class bias played in the advice given by black social elites. I analyze the role that anxiety about the mass migration of poor African Americans played in the type of advice given.

This chapter further elaborates class distinctions in a discussion of African American middle class concerns about the urbanization of poor African Americans. In this part of Chapter 3, I discuss the harsh criticism that black elites leveled at poor black migrants. Specifically, this chapter discusses how black elites in their criticism of poor blacks replicated some of the stereotypical images of African Americans found in white discourses on black life.

Finally I argue that the combination of an emphasis on social respectability combined with the privileging of a sheltered family led many black social elites to undervalue some aspects of African American culture that actually strengthened black families. In making these observations I focus on the importance of kinship networks and reciprocal sharing to black families.

Chapter 4 examines the reasons that St. Louis became an important destination during the Great Migration. Specifically, Chapter 4 examines how African American cultural, educational, and political institutions affected the

trajectory of the First Great African American Migration to St. Louis. Chapter 4 will examine how these institutions helped to make St. Louis a desirable location for migrants.

In Chapter 4 I highlight the influence of St. Louis's position as a North-South border city had on African Americans. This chapter emphasizes how the uneven application of racial segregation allowed African Americans the opportunity to develop the institutions and skills necessary to contest some aspects of segregation.

The first section of Chapter 4 provides a brief overview of the origins of St. Louis's African American institutions. This section details the influence that nineteenth century African American settlement had on African American institutions. This section is followed by an analysis of early-twentieth-century African American efforts to promote education and social welfare. It compares the success that African Americans had in creating schools with the more limited success they had in working with the city's social welfare system.

Chapter 4 provides a critique of African American political influence. This section documents the ability of black political leaders to block attempts by the Missouri State Legislature to impose segregation onto the state's integrated system of train and street car travel. It also points out the limitations of African American political influence. It demonstrates in cases where white privilege was at stake black political influence was limited. As a case study, this project looks at history of residential segregation on St. Louis. In particular, Chapter 4 uses the

1916 Residential Segregation Initiative to illustrate the limitation of black political influence in cases where a challenge to white privilege was involved.

Chapter 5 examines the history of St. Louis's two African American children's institutions, the Colored Orphans Home and St. Francis Home. This chapter discusses the relationship of these two institutions to St. Louis's child welfare system. Chapter 5 emphasizes the impact reforms in the organization of philanthropy had in naturalizing whiteness and in determining the quality of care provided by these two institutions. Specifically, this chapter will document how St. Louis's child welfare leaders incorporated into their distribution of funds the conservative racial ideology that was prevalent at the start of the twentieth century.

Chapter 5 examines how the trajectory of these two institutions was affected by their ability to use white social capital.[18] The difference between treatment given in the Colored Orphans Home and that presented in St. Francis is difficult to explain when affiliation to white institutions is not considered. St. Francis Home, with its affiliations with the Catholic Church, fared better than the Colored Orphans Home. Chapter 5 contrasts the influence of social capital with the importance of child welfare reform in St. Louis. This study shows that St. Francis Home operated in a way that should have alarmed St. Louis child savers. Yet reformers seemed to pay little attention to St. Francis. Chapter 5 illustrates

[18] Social capital is a term developed by sociologist Robert Putnam to describe the importance of social contacts and networks to human productivity. It refers specifically to the connections among individuals and the norms of reciprocity that arise from them. For a more detailed discussion of social capital see Robert Putnam, Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000).

how racially stability was more important to white reformers than reforming African American child welfare institutions.

Chapter 6 looks at the management by African American women of the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls. This school was one of seven industrial schools created in the early-twentieth-century to assist African American girls, and was only one of two state-run industrial schools. The other schools were privately run schools that received state funds.

In Chapter 6, I examine how black women used the opportunity of operating a state facility to create a version of materialism that incorporated aspects of African American culture, and in the process promoted their own version of African American womanhood. They attempted to inculcate in the girls under their care a conception of womanhood that would counter the negative stereotypes that dominated white discourse on black women. African woman relied on the idea of respectability as the basis for contesting white stereotypes. This chapter shows how that version of womanhood both resonated with and misunderstood the girls under their care.In focusing on respectability, this study is deliberately restricting its focus. Its primary interest is in the ideas of reformers. Missing from this study are the contributions of working class black women to African American culture. The risk in focusing on the role of social elites is that their influence can be overstated. Therefore this study should be read with the understanding that it is focusing on one segment of a diverse culture and is not intended to reflect the contributions of all of African American culture.

The St Louis juvenile court is the subject of Chapter 7. As one of the most modern of Progressive Era institutions, the juvenile court offers an opportunity to investigate the intersection of racial ideology and child welfare reform. Reform is mediated through institutions like the juvenile court. As a local institution it is subject to pressures to conform to local practices, including racial practices.

Chapter 7 includes in its analysis of the juvenile justice system the practices of the St. Louis police department and the St. Louis juvenile court. The police operated as gatekeepers for the juvenile justice system. In the early-twentieth-century, they had great discretion in whether juveniles were charged and referred to the juvenile court. Focusing on the role of the police helps explain why African American children were over represented within the juvenile court. Police statistics from this period show that black children, especially boys were referred to the courts at much higher rates than whites.

Chapter 7 is also concerned with the outcomes of court dispositions. Based on a review of court statistics, I argue that the court naturalized racial ideology. Black children were treated different from white children. This is most evident in the decisions about incarceration. Black children were committed to the state's industrial school at much higher rates than white children. Another interesting finding is the courts decisions to adjudicate most black children as delinquent. The number of African American children classified as dependent is remarkably small.

The final section of this study is the epilogue. In this section I review some basic conclusions of this study. What is clear is that the African American

institutions in this study all experienced segregation differently. Their connections to white institutions seem to have played an important role in how these institutions coped with racial segregation. At the same time it is important to note that child welfare reform served more than one purpose. It modernized the delivery of child welfare services and whiteness. This final section compares this study's conclusions with those of other scholars, who have viewed American social welfare programs as veiled investments in whites. In making such comparisons, I hope to determine whether social welfare as an investment in whiteness parallels the creation of the modern child welfare system.

.

Chapter 1

A New Taxonomy of Race: Modernizing Racial Assignments for Twentieth-Century America

In the late-nineteenth-century, there was a spirited debate over the future of African Americans in American society. The idea of place was central to this debate. Many white southerners perceived that Reconstruction had disrupted the social order in the South by allowing African Americans to assume social and political positions to which they were not deemed entitled. The post-Reconstruction debate over the proper role for African Americans in American society was in reality a debate on how to restore the old southern social order by retuning African Americans to the bottom of that order.[1]

During this period, competing discourses on the exact nature of the character of African Americans developed. While the discourses shared a common belief in the innate inferiority of African Americans, they differed in terms of the extent to which they assumed it was possible to assimilate African Americans into American culture. That is, a radical racial ideology argued that blacks freed from the restraining influences of slavery were rapidly retrogressing to their natural state of bestiality.[2] Radicals insisted that there was no place for African Americans in civilized society and condoned the most extreme measures of violence and brutality as necessary for controlling blacks. Much of the violence fomented against blacks in the early- twentieth-century was promoted by radicals.

---

[1] Williamson, The Crucible of Race: Black-White Relations in the American South Since Emancipation (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 81.
[2] Williamson, The Crucible of Race, 6.

In contrast to this radical ideology was a conservative ideology that emphasized a more paternalistic approach to the treatment of African Americans. Racial conservatives believed that society could accommodate the supposed racial inferiority of African Americans by keeping them on the margins of society.[3] Conservatives were not comfortable with the extreme brutality, opposing racial violence because they believed that it promoted lawlessness.[4]

Most early-twentieth-century social science research reflects the opinions of racial conservatives. Its conclusions confirmed the opinion that African Americans were innately inferior to whites. Much of this research further concluded that African Americans were among the groups in American society that were not fit for self-governance.[5] Indeed, leading American psychologists Robert Yerkes and Lewis Terman endorsed the idea that because of their intellectual inferiority blacks were not capable being good citizens.[6] It is therefore not surprising that arguments for disfranchisement often included evidence of the supposed intellectual inferiority and immaturity of African Americans.[7]

The Importance of Official Stories

Priscilla Wald views American social science research on racial differences as an "official story." She defines an official story as made up of those narratives that are incorporated into the rhetoric of nationalist movements and

[3] Williamson, The Crucible of Race, 6.
[4] George Fredrickson, The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914 (New York: Harper, 1971), 284.
[5] Scientific Racism made similar assumptions about Native Americans and Mexicans. An extensive discussion of scientific racism can be found in Jacobsen, Whiteness of Different Color.
[6] Florette Henri, Black Migration: Movement North (New York: Anchor Press, 1975), 310.
[7] Fredrickson, The Black Image in the White Mind, 275.

initiatives.[8] Once elevated to the status of official story, narratives take on added significance and authority. They acquire their new authority because they reflect the views of the nation builders. As official stories, these narratives serve to exclude other narratives that contradict the logic and beliefs of the dominant culture. Most frequently these excluded stories belong to marginalized groups within the society.[9]

Wald argues that official stories serve one other important purpose, to reduce cultural anxiety. She contends that national stories of identity seek to harness or contain cultural anxiety produced by the exclusion of alternative narratives. In other words, cultural anxiety is the result of the inability of existing cultural norms to rationalize fully the exclusion of alternative stories.[10]

Clearly this was the case in the Progressive Era. Many Americans were alarmed at the impact of industrialization, urbanization, and immigration on American society – American society was becoming more centralized and bureaucratic. The small-town values of the nineteenth century were being challenged by more complex and scientific perspectives. For many Americans, ambivalence about social change led to a feeling of anxiety and uncertainty.

Within the Progressive Movement there was a strong element of conservatism. Progressive reformers, and in particular child welfare reformers, wished in part to replicate within modern society the experience of living in a

[8] Priscilla Wald, Constituting Americans, 2-5.
[9] Wald, Constituting Americans, 5.
[10] Wald, Constituting Americans, 9-10.

small rural community.[11] The Progressives' assertions that spending time in nature contributed to healthy child development is an example of how many Progressive child savers attempted to recreate the values of the rural village. Summer camps, work farms, and even the cottage system, were in some aspects an attempt to preserve the experience of living in a small town.[12]

The Rise in African American Assertiveness

The status of African Americans in a post-Reconstruction America was a major source of cultural anxiety. Despite the concerted efforts of whites to reposition African Americans to the edges of American society, racial assignments in the late-nineteenth century remained unstable. The convergence of rapid social change with the emancipated status of African Americans made nineteenth century racial policies and etiquette appear less applicable to new social conditions in the South. Industrialization and urbanization led to a greater sense of confusion over what were the proper social roles for African Americans. The social science discourse on race reflected an attempt by the broader culture to reconcile an ideology of white racial superiority with the changing social conditions brought on by a modernizing American society. In other words, the social science discourse on race was part of the process whereby whiteness was being reconfigured into its modern form.

It was within this context that the second generation of blacks born after emancipation (1885-1905) came of age. Less willing to adopt the subservient and deferential postures of the previous generation, this generation developed a

[11] LeRoy Ashby, Saving the Waifs: Reformers and Dependent Children 1890-1917 (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984), 207.
[12] Ashby, Saving the Waifs, 207.

strong sense of racial pride and determination to become full participants in American society. Their perceptions of themselves and the actions derived from this perception directly challenged the foundation of whiteness. The “New Negro” formed a sense of identity that was not completely dependent on racial assignment from the dominant white culture. The stability of “whiteness” in part depends on the convergence of racial assignment with racial identity. The power of racial classification in part depends on the ability of the dominant culture to influence the self-perceptions of marginalized groups.[13] Thus, an attempt by blacks to form identity separate from racial assignment for most whites produced both increased anxiety and the need for control among whites.

The rise of a national consumer culture in the South also provided opportunities for blacks to disrupt and challenge southern racial practices. Thus, the development of national marketing of products created public spaces where blacks and whites had the opportunity to mix more freely. From the railroad station platform to the chain store and movie theater, the introduction of a national consumer culture created places where segregation practices became murky and confused.

African Americans took advantage of the confusion by exploiting the ambiguity of new public places. The train station platform in particular became an arena for disrupting white privilege. While waiting for on a train, African Americans steadfastly refused to remain in the place assigned to them by the lager society. Blacks refused to cede the train platform, as a public space, to

[13] Bell hooks, “White Representations in the Black Imagination,” in Black on White: Black Writers on What It Means to Be White, ed. David Roediger, (New York: Schocken Press, 1998), 33.

whites. Many blacks chose to wait in close proximity to whites rather than making themselves invisible by withdrawing to the back part of the platform.

African Americans found other ways to use consumerism to exploit the murkiness of early-twentieth-century racial customs. Much to the consternation of the railroad companies and southern whites, some African Americans insisted on purchasing first-class train tickets. When refused entrance to first-class cars, blacks sued the railroad for breech of contract.[14] Though most of these lawsuits were unsuccessful, they are indicative of the degree to which consumer culture made traditional segregation practices untrustworthy.

The increased assertiveness of blacks was not limited to consumerism. Younger African Americans made their presence known by their resistance to southern racial etiquette. For instance, young blacks were less willing to step aside when they encountered whites on the sidewalk and more willing to initiate conversation when sharing public spaces with whites.[15] The new assertiveness of blacks also meant that they were more willing to defend themselves when confronted by white mobs. In the face of white violence, blacks increasingly saw self-defense as a legitimate response.

Black newspapers frequently encouraged self-defense against white mobs, connecting it with racial pride. After the East St. Louis riot in 1917, The Chicago Defender published a long article on the National Equal Rights League. The article raises the rhetorical question, “who can blame blacks for striking a

[14] Leon Litwack, Trouble in Mind: Black Southerners in the Age of Jim Crow (New York: Vintage Books, 1998), 273.
[15] Ltiwack, Trouble in Mind, 210.

blow for our own continued existence."[16] The article cited the humiliation experienced by African Americans after the East St Louis riot as the reason to organize. The New York Messenger was even more explicit in its encouragement of self-defense. The paper argued the "New Negro was determined to make their dying a costly venture for all concerned."[17] The calls for self-protection resonated with African Americans because they were reflective of black self-perception. The migration north and the experience of being soldiers in World War I had helped liberate blacks from the psychological oppression of the Jim Crow South.[18]

White Southern Reaction to Emancipation

The inability of southern culture to completely protect white status and privilege was a primary source of white anxiety. At the turn of the last century, southern whites were obsessed with the changes in the demeanor of blacks. The race problem as defined by most whites was largely a problem of loss of status and psychological-well-being Black assertions of social equality, and refusal to accommodate to traditional racial customs disrupted white claims to superiority. The confusion that followed the instability of whiteness led many southern whites to a sense of despair and pessimism.

Jabez Curry, a leading Virginian educator, summed up the connection between the instability of whiteness and white southern malaise, "It is not so much the civil status of the Negro as his presence that makes the outlook

[16] Chicago Defender, "Call for Speedy Getting Together for Protection," August 17, 1917, 1.
[17] Henri, Black Migration, 310.
[18] William Tuttle, Race Riot: Chicago in the Red Summer of 1919 (New York: Athenum, 1971), 213.

gloomy."[19] In other words, it was the visibility of African Americans as they attempted to move away from the margins of society that made most southerners despair. The white response to the assertion by African Americans to a status of capable adult was designed to reposition blacks on the margins of society through law, cultural productions, violence, and scientific research.

Southern whites attempted to restructure whiteness by reinventing the past to serve the present. Middle class whites used the myth of the old antebellum black to appease their anxiety and to regain some control over African Americans. The "Old Negro" was depicted as happy, loyal, and dependable and his relationship to his master was characterized as one of love and mutual respect. The "Old Negro" allegedly appreciated the protection and guidance that slavery provided him, while southerners were appreciative of the loyal and devoted service provided by their servants.[20]

The most persistent image to emerge from this myth was the image of the all-loving mammy. Stories about the relationship of whites and their mammies proliferated in this period. In contrast to the "Old Negro" were the images of the "New Negro," blacks born after emancipation. The New Negro "undisciplined by slavery was seen as reverting back to his savage nature."[21] Without the civilizing influence of whites, the New Negro was considered to be reverting to his true primitive and bestial nature.

The image of black degeneracy was incorporated into the scientific explanations of African American behavior. Using Darwin's theory of natural

[19] Litwack, Trouble in Mind, 210.
[20] Litwack, Trouble in Mind, 184-185.
[21] Litwack, Trouble in Mind, 185.

selection to human society, social scientists suggested that African Americans as a lower race were less capable of self-control and therefore responsible for many of the social problems facing the nation.[22] Through their use of Darwin's theory of evolution, social scientists were able to present a rationale for not making social investments in African Americans. Fredrick Hoffman, in Race Traits and Tendencies in the American Negro published in 1896, successfully blended negative stereotypes about blacks with a theory of group heredity.[23] He argued that black hereditary traits made blacks more prone to crime and immorality and chided philanthropists who attempted to help blacks for failure to understand the role of hereditary in black social problems. In Hoffman's view, investments in education and material support for blacks were a waste of time.[24]

The Role of Race in National Unification

Social science research also had a direct political use. In constructing African Americans as biologically inferior to whites, social science research could be used to discredit the efforts made during Reconstruction to ensure equal rights for blacks. After Reconstruction, the issue of civil rights was viewed by southern whites as an impediment to national reunification. Northern support for civil rights for African Americans was seen in the South as an obstacle to national reconciliation. National reunification demanded that both sections of the country

[22] A number of historians have examined the relationship between racial stereotype and scientific thought in the early twentieth century. Jacobson's Whiteness of Different Color and Frederickson's Black Image in the White Mind are good references for this type of critique.
[23] Frederick Hoffman was an insurance executive who used statistics to demonstrate that African Americans were innately inferior to whites. In the early twentieth century his work was widely read an cited as conclusive proof of black inferiority.
[24] Fredrickson, Black Image in the White Mind, 235.

reach an accord on the place African Americans would occupy in a reunified nation.[25]

Most northern whites believed that blacks were inferior to whites.[26] Therefore, persuading northern whites that blacks were incapable of self-government was not difficult. As early as the late 1860s, conservative southern racial ideologues began traveling north to convince northern civic leaders to leave the "Negro problem" to the South to solve. Conservative southerners argued that their daily contact with African Americans had given southern whites the expertise to manage race relations.[27]

Northern acquiescence to southern opinion on the race question was the result of a number of factors.[28.] The racist beliefs of most northerners were clearly a critical factor in the capitulation of North. Another important factor was the growing concern in the North for problems in their own backyard. For example, the rise of the large corporation, rapid urbanization, and increased immigration alarmed many people in the north. Consequently, northern philanthropists and religious organizations turned their attention away from southern blacks to poor whites and immigrants in northern cities.[29] In focusing on immigration, northern society was also policing the boundaries of who could be considered white. The increase in immigration presented a problem of which

---

[25] Williamson, The Crucible of Race, 336.
[26] Williamson, The Crucible of Race, 4.
[27] Williamson, The Crucible of Race, 334.
[28] .The use of the term acquiescence reflects my reading of Joel Williamson's Crucible of Race. Williamson makes the case that southern elites made a concerted effort to convince their northern counterparts that the race problem in the South should be left to southerners to solve. My use of the term acquiescence refers to the decision of many northern elites to give up interest in the welfare of southern blacks and to allow southern white elites to create their own racial order for the South. See Williamson Crucible of Race, 327-340.
[29] Williamson, The Crucible of Race, 327.

immigrant groups were worthy of assimilation. Since naturalization was restricted to free white persons, the task of defining the relationship of immigrants to whiteness became more important.[30]

In capitulating to the South on the race question, the North helped clear the way for North-South reconciliation. With national reunification, most northern whites accepted the marginalized position of African Americans that had been created for them in southern society, and the image of African Americans as incapable of self-governance became part of the official story of America. However, the denial many of the rights citizenship to African Americans still required justification. The establishment of a "herrenvolk" democracy demanded a logical rationale for the exclusion of blacks.[31]

The social sciences played a critical role in providing a rationale for racism. Most social science research of the period positioned blacks as inferior, which in turn bolstered the argument that attempts to ensure the civil rights of African Americans were harmful to both African Americans and to society as a whole. From this perspective, attempts to promote civil rights for blacks ignored the importance of natural competition between racial groups within society. Once again drawing from Darwin, scientists argued that the natural competition between groups would lead to either the extinction of the lower races or to their subordination to superior races. The failure of blacks to achieve the rights of citizenship was therefore assumed to be the result of their inability to compete

[30] Jacobson, Whiteness of a Different Color, 8.
[31] A term developed by Dutch sociologist Pierre L. van der Berghe to describe counties that are democratic for the master race, but are tyrannical to subordinate groups. See David Roediger, Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class (New York: Verso, 1991) for a detailed discussion of Herrenvolk Republicanism.

with racial groups who were superior to them.[32] Put another way, blacks could not be good citizens because they were not up to the task.

Child Welfare Reform and the Creation of White Citizens

Between 1890 and 1915 white southerners put in place most of the Jim Crow laws and social customs. The Jim Crow system was intended to enforce white supremacy by severely diminishing the political, social, and economic power of African Americans.[33] A critical feature of race relations under the Jim Crow system was keeping African Americans in their place. Under Jim Crow, any vestige of social equality was eliminated. A woman from Virginia summed up the beliefs of many white southerners, "It was important for white men to rule, black men to serve."[34]

As a part of the movement to eliminate any avenue for social equality between blacks and whites, the southern states disfranchised most African Americans. With the end of Reconstruction, the ability of African Americans to influence elections was very limited. By 1890, there were few places in the South where whites had not curtailed the electoral power of African Americans.[35] The movements in southern states to disenfranchise African Americans drew its impetus from the symbolic importance that whites attached to African American voting. In the minds of many southerners, the right to vote was equated with social ambition. Therefore, most southerners believed that access to the ballot

[32] Fredrickson, The Black Image in the White Mind, 245.
[33] Litwack, Trouble in Mind, 218.
[34] Litwack, Trouble in Mind, 218.
[35] Litwack, Trouble in Mind, 221.

box would lead to other demands for social equality.[36]

The effect of black suffrage on the anxiety level of most southern whites is evident in the attempts to limit the franchise. Many southern whites equated political equality with sexual equality. Thus, many southern men feared that if black men were allowed to vote the next step would be black competition for white women.[37] They viewed the possibility of intermarriage and rape as the inevitable outcomes of black suffrage. The effort to limit black franchise was not limited to Negrophobes. The social elites in the South, many of whom took a more paternalistic approach to race relations, supported efforts to restrict black voting. Many educated southern whites saw black equality as a source of humiliation. Black suffrage was a further reminder of the degree to which whites had lost control over the ability to maintain the racial caste system.[38]

The relationship between race and citizenship is particularly relevant to Progressive Era child welfare reformers. The Americanization of immigrant children was seen as a high priority by Progressive Era child savers. Middle- and upper-class white reformers, responding to what they perceived as the demise of American values, made establishing the conditions for attaining citizenship one of their primary concerns. Reformers and immigrant families were convinced that assimilation required the adoption of middle-class values and attitudes.

Reform efforts were aimed at children in part due their malleability. Frustrated with the resistance they experienced in working with adults, Progressive Era reformers focused on children. The Progressives created new

[36] Litwack, Trouble in Mind, 224.
[37] Williamson, The Crucible of Race, 306.
[38] Williamson, The Crucible of Race, 306.

institutions and revamped older ones to intercede in and direct the development children, whom they considered to be embryonic citizens. A Kansas City juvenile judge summed up the views of many Progressive child savers when he declared the early-twentieth-century the era of citizen building.[39]

Assimilation of immigrant children proved to be a complex and at times arduous process. The process of citizen building had to account for variations within whiteness. Not all groups within the racial assignment of white were considered equals. The creation of racial hierarchy of status and privilege within whiteness required that naturalization be predicated on their position in the hierarchy.[40] The child welfare programs designed during the Progressive Era were intended to prepare immigrant children for life in the working class. In many cases, Progressive reformers and child welfare professionals actively discouraged immigrant children from aspiring for anything greater than being a semi-skilled worker.[41]

Most Progressive Era child welfare reformers showed little interest in African American children. They operated comfortably within the prevailing racial constructs of the early-twentieth-century. Most child welfare reformers ignored the needs of black children. Blacks child welfare programs largely depended on the support of the black community[42]. Settlement houses reacted to the

[39] Ashby, Saving the Waifs, 7.
[40] Jacobson, Whiteness of a Different Color, 33.
[41] For a detailed discussion of the relationship between child welfare reforms and class, see Peter Halloran, Boston's Wayward Children: Social Services and Boston's Homeless Child, 1830-1930 (Rutherford, N.J.: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 1989) and Eric Schneider, In the Web of Class: Reformers and Delinquents in Boston, 1830-1930 (New York: New York University Press, 1999).
[42] Howard Rabinowitz, Race Relations in the Urban South 1865-1890 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 143.

changing racial composition of their neighborhoods in one of two ways. Many settlement houses attempted to deal with African American residents by setting up segregated programs. Other houses chose to relocate. This was the decision of Christamore Settlement House in Indianapolis, Indiana. Beginning in the 1910s the racial makeup of Christamore's neighborhood began to change. As blacks began to use the settlement house's services in greater numbers, immigrant participation dropped. In a two-year period, immigrant participation at Christamore had dropped by half.[43] The women who ran the settlement house rejected the idea of allowing black residents to use the house's facilities two days a week. Instead, Christamore made the decision to move. It began fundraising for a new facility in 1922. Chrismatore's new building opened in 1926, in a largely immigrant neighborhood.[44]

Racial Taxonomy and Racist Ideology

Early twentieth century American social science helped preserve the political importance of whiteness by providing whiteness with a modern epistemology. The creation of a scientific rationale for white supremacy provided a new language for racial classification.[45] The logic and language of science made racial differences appear to be a natural phenomenon.[46] The new taxonomy of race that emerged at the start of the twentieth century was

[43] Ruth Hutchinson Crocker, Social Work and the Social Order: The Settlement Movement in Two Industrial Cities 1889-1930 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 36.
[44] Crocker, Social Work and the Social Order, 36.
[45] Jacobson, Whiteness of a Different Color, 33.
[46] Through out the early twentieth century there was social science research that challenged the conclusions of scientific racism. Most of this research was published in the 1920s and was not widely accepted until the 1930s. This included the works of such important scholars as Franz Boas, Ruth Benedict and E. Franklin Frazier. For a discussion the rise of culturalist explanations of racial differences see Peggy Pascoe, "Miscegenation Law, Court Cases, and Ideologies of 'Race' in Twentieth Century America" The Journal of American History 83 no.1 (Jun 1996) 44-69.

grounded in quantitative evidence. One of the clearest examples of the use of quantitative data was Frederick Hoffman's Race Traits and Tendencies of the American Negro. In this work, Hoffman relies on statistical data to support his hypothesis that, because of their natural inferiority, African Americans were incapable of assimilation into Americans society.[47]

Statistical analyses of African American inferiority published in the early twentieth century supported the assertions of social Darwinists that African Americans were a lower social group. By 1900, Darwinism provided the basis for a reformation of racist ideologies that justified slavery.[48]
Therefore, it is not surprising that the conclusions developed from these typological models of race proved indistinguishable from popular racial stereotypes. The old images of blacks as having low intelligence and being prone to crime and laziness found their way into the racialized science of the early twentieth century.[49] The statistical studies of African Americans had an important influence on American social policy. Most of these studies concluded that character traits of African Americans were immutable and that addressing the social problems facing African Americans was pointless.[50] This logic allowed American social welfare policy in the first decades of the twentieth century to ignore the needs of African Americans.

The ability of social science to become a part of the official story of race during the Progressive Era hinged on its advancement of the agenda of

[47] Audrey Smedley, Race in North America Origins and Evolution of a World View (Boulder, Co.: Westview Press, 1999), 239.
[48] Fredrickson, The Black Image in the White Mind, 255.
[49] Smedley, Race in North America, 236.
[50] Fredrickson, Black Image in the White Mind, 251.

Progressive reformers. Progressive Era child savers were primarily interested in the assimilation of European immigrants. Scientific inquiry that was not grounded in the political concerns of Progressive reformers was systematically eliminated public policy debates. The gate-keeping role of official stories can be seen in the exclusion of anthropological explanations of race that provided too broad a definition of whiteness. Throughout the Progressive Era, American naturalization law restricted citizenship to "white persons." This requirement forced the federal courts to determine on a case-by-case basis who was white.[51] The lower courts were evenly divided in their use of either a scientific or a common knowledge definition of race of whiteness.[52] However, after 1909 the anthropological definition of whiteness began to emphasize place of origin over skin color. This broader definition of who was white allowed too many non-European groups to be considered white. In 1919, the Supreme Court rejected scientific explanations for the narrower common knowledge standard.[53]

It is surprising that the Supreme Court would reject scientific notions of race, given the pervasive influence of racism on American scientific discourse. Racism affected every area of scientific inquiry. It is not necessary for the purposes of this study to detail how specific disciplines were influenced by racism.[54] In order to illustrate the influence of racism on child welfare policy, I have focused on two disciplines, psychology and psychiatry, that were influential

[51] Ian Haney-Lopez, White by Law, 1.
[52] Haney-Lopez, White by Law, 73.
[53] Haney-Lopez, White by Law, 77.
[54] See Audrey Smedley, Race in North America,Daryl Michael Scott, Contempt and Pity,and Jacobson, Whiteness of a Different Color, for a more in-depth discussion of race and early-twentieth-century American science.

on child welfare reform in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. At the end of the nineteenth century, American society saw children as a distinct group within the national population. This new perception of children allowed children to become the subject of scientific study and public policy.[55] Psychology and psychiatry became two of the most prominent disciplines in the scientific study of children.

One of the best examples of how social science was used to continue the marginalization of African Americans was the use of intelligence testing to question the intellectual ability of African Americans. By the late 1910s, intelligence testing had become a widely accepted method for measuring intellectual ability. During World War I, the army used intelligence testing in determining which recruits were suitable for military service. The testing program was directed by Robert Yerkes, who was at the forefront in developing intelligence testing at the time. Yerkes developed a complex theory of the evolution of the mind and was able to correlate the complexity of the nervous system with the complex operations of the mind.[56] He posited that in correlating these operations, innate intelligence could be measured.

Yerkes published the results of his testing program in 1921; African American had the lowest scores. The results of the army tests were quickly accepted by many social scientists as conclusive proof of the intellectual inferiority of African Americans. Yet, the results were criticized for a lack of

[55] Cravens, “Child Saving in the Age of Professionalism 1915-1930,” 416.
[56] Cravens, “Child Saving in the Age of Professionalism 1915-1930,” 432.

standardization. Yerkes administered two different tests adjusted for level of literacy. Most African Americans were assigned to the non-literate group.

Other psychologists tried to replicate Yerkes's results. For example, Edward Thorndike attempted to answer the criticism of Yerkes's methods by administering the same test to high school students. Despite a small sample for African Americans, Thorndike concluded blacks were intellectually inferior.[57] Specifically, he reported that only 4% of black students' scores were above the median score for whites. Thorndike also noted that only one black student had a score equivalent to the high scores of whites. Remarking on this finding, Thorndike stated, "In many practical ways the upper limit of the group (blacks) is as important as its average or typical status."[58] Psychological testing of African American children followed a similar pattern. The application of intelligence tests to black children went to the heart of American cultural anxiety. Lewis Terman concluded from his test results that due to their low intelligence, no amount of remediation for African American and Mexican children could make them intelligent voters or capable citizens.[59]

The negative images of African Americans found in most of the social science literature of the late-nineteenth and early- twentieth-centuries was intricately connected to the politics of racial segregation. In producing images of African Americans as mentally defective, American psychiatry provided policy makers an important rationale for the systematic exclusion of African Americans

[57] Edward L. Thorndike, "Intelligence Scores of Colored Children in High School," Journal of Applied Psychology (1923), 41.
[58] Thorndike, "Intelligence Scores of Colored Children in High School," 44.
[59] Henri, The Migration North, 326.

from meaningful participation in American society. Its discussion of race included the popular early twentieth century belief that Emancipation had a negative impact on the mental health of African Americans.[60] Many American psychiatrists argued that the rise in rates of insanity for African Americans in the years after Emancipation was the result of their being unprepared for the stresses of living in a free society.[61]

In order to support this claim, American psychiatry included in its rationale the image of the "Old Negro" who was content in his or her servitude. Early-twentieth-century psychiatry asserted that African Americans while in slavery had few cares or worries, while in freedom they fell prey to competition and vices that deprived them of their sanity.[62] Specifically, in its treatment of young African American women, American psychiatric practice promoted racial stereotype of the over-sexed and promiscuous black woman. Psychiatrists at the Boston Pyschopathic Clinic used this racial stereotype in diagnosing sexually active young women. Young white women who were sexually active outside marriage were considered to be suffering from hypersexuality, while in young African American women sexual activity was seen as evidence of their natural state of immorality.[63]

African American Response to Scientific Racism

[60] Scott, Contempt and Pity, 13..
[61] Scott, Contempt and Pity, 12.
[62] Scott, Contempt and Pity, 12.
[63] Elizabeth Lunbeck, Psychiatric Persuasion: Knowledge, Gender, and Power in Modern America (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 205.

Starting in the late nineteenth century, African American scholars produced a body of literature that contradicted the conclusions of scientific racism. These scholars produced research which directly challenged the idea that blacks were intellectually inferior to whites. Alexander Crummell's work provides an example of Progressive Era African American scholarship. Crummell uses the history of white efforts to suppress black education to challenge the idea that blacks were intellectually inferior. In discussing antebellum laws in Southern states that prohibited the education of African Americans Crummell writes, "It was done , too, with knowledge that the Negro had brain power. There was no denial that the Negro had intellect. That denial was an after thought." Crummell then goes on to list African American scholars who have contributed to American culture. [64]

One of the major conclusions of scientific racism was that because of genetic traits that determine intellectual ability there was no real variation among the African Americans. One of the most consistent challenges to this reasoning came from W.E.B DuBois. In The Philadelphia Negro, Du Bois uses sophisticated sociological methods to demonstrate that the city's African American population was a varied as its white population.[65] What makes Du Bois study important is the way that it asserts that in many cases the experience of African Americans was similar to that of whites. Using statistical methods, Du

[64] Alexander Crummell, "The Attitude of the American Mind Toward the Negro Intellect" in Black Scholars on the Line: Race, Social Science and American Thought in Twentieth Century ed Jonathan Scott Holloway and Ben Keppel,(South Bend, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press,2007) 45.

[65] W.E B. DuBois, "The Size, Age, and Sex of the negro population" in Black Scholars on the Line: Race, Social Science and American Thought in Twentieth Century ed Jonathan Scott Holloway and Ben Keppel,(South Bend, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press,2007) 134.

Bois is able to demonstrate that the problems of Philadelphia's black population was similar to the those of the nation as a whole. He then moves to demonstrate how environmental factors contributed to the problems experienced by Philadelphia blacks. [66]

Segregation limited the dissemination of African American scholarship. At the start of the twentieth century, most black scholars were affiliated with black colleges and their work did not reach a wide audience . Many white scholars from major universities simply chose to ignore the findings of African American scholars. Progressive Era black scholarship was also limited by its own elitism. Early twentieth century black scholars saw themselves as an enlightened intelligentsia who would lead the black masses to salvation. This belief would lead them to at times embrace destructive stereotypes – uncivilized Africans, unworthy poor, and unqualified females.[67]

Evidence of African American elitism can be seen in an essay written by W.E.B. Du Bois in 1901 on blacks in New York City. In this essay, Du Bois makes a strong argument on how poverty, poor housing, and high rents negatively influenced the adjustment of black migrants to New York City.[68] However, in the same essay, he attempts to distinguish the morals of educated African Americans asserting that they were as good as those of white middle

[66] [66] W.E B. DuBois, "The Size, Age, and Sex of the Negro Population" in Black Scholars on the Line: Race, Social Science and American Thought in Twentieth Century ed Jonathan Scott Holloway and Ben Keppel,(South Bend, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press,2007) 134

[67] "Introduction, Black Scholars on the Line: Race, Social Science and American Thought in Twentieth Century ed Jonathan Scott Holloway and Ben Keppel,(South Bend, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press,2007), 12.

[68] W.E.B. Du Bois, The Black North 1901: A Series of Articles Originally Published in the New York Times Nov-Dec 1901 (New York: Arno Press, 1969), 12.

class Americans.[69] In this essay, it is clear that Du Bois by rating the morals and education of black migrants as below those poor whites is making class the core of the "Negro Problem".[70] These remarks illustrate the way most educated African Americans attempted to extract themselves from the double bind created by negative racial stereotypes. Ironically, in distinguishing themselves from the black masses, middle-class blacks were still not free of the effects of racism.

The elitism of African American scholars should be understood as an extension of the frustration that many black intellectuals felt in having to live within the confines of American racism. In the early-twentieth-century, educated African Americans faced a difficult dilemma. As noted above, Scientific racism allowed for little individual variations within any racial category. Thus, most whites saw all blacks as being essentially the same in character and intelligence, thereby generally ignoring the achievements of educated blacks. Kelly Miller expressed the frustration of many educated blacks. In a 1913 essay on race relationships Miller writes, "There is a growing disposition to ignore the Negro of superior attainment as an insignificant exception or freak of nature, not to be calculated as a factor in the ordinary equation.[71] Later in the same article, Miller states, "When reference made to the Negro we are prone to think of a composite savage and banish from the mind the superior man."[72] These remarks clearly

[69] Du Bois, The Black North 1901, 18.
[70] Du Bois, The Black North 1901, 18.
[71] Kelly Miller, Race Adjustments: Essays on the Negro in America (New York: Neale Publishing Co., 1908), 105.
[72] Miller, Race Adjustments, 106.

show the frustrations of educated and professional African Americans in coping with racial stereotypes.

The intransigence of racial stereotypes left many in the "talented tenth" looking for ways to distinguish themselves from the black masses. Educated African Americans used class and educational differences to separate themselves from other African Americans. In focusing on class differences, educated African Americans had to walk a thin line. African Americans elites did not want to simply reiterate the moral and genetic arguments of middle class whites. Instead, African American discussions of the "Negro Problem" emphasized the importance of environmental causes of the social problems that blacks faced.

The Chicago School and the Scholarship of E. Franklin Frazier

By the 1920s, environmental and cultural arguments began to replace biological explanations for African American behavior. Racial liberals like Franz Boas, Otto Kernberg, and Robert Parks used culture and environment to argue that African Americans could be assimilated into American society.[73] Scholars trained at the University of Chicago played an important role in changing the theoretical assumptions underlying the public discourse on African Americans. The Chicago School of Sociology helped develop a distinctive taxonomy of social reality that served as a diagram of relations of the whole of society to its parts.[74] These sociologists helped reintroduce into American thinking ideas about group

[73] Hamilton Cravens, "American Social Science and the Invention of Affirmative Action, 1920s-1970s" in The Social Sciences Go to Washington: The Politics of Knowledge in the Postmodern Age (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers university Press, 2004),16.

competition and conflict. In focusing on the role of group conflict in American culture, they provided a framework for understanding ethnic conflict as an inevitable part of urbanization and modernization.[75]

Among the important concepts developed by sociologists at the University of Chicago was the idea of social ecology. In describing a city's spatial organization as a reflection of the capitalist market, the Chicago School provided a rationale for a process of social organization that normalized and naturalized the operation of capitalism. Scholars from the Chicago school accepted the idea the capitalism produced winners and losers, and that city neighborhoods reflected the natural sorting out of a city's groups for living and working.[76] Its model of social development reduced areas of social conflict to elements in a natural evolutionary process.[77] This model for understanding assimilation shifted the emphasis from political and economic concerns to cultural ones. Thus, concern for low wages and political alienation were replaced with concerns cultural lags and social disorganization.[78]

This change in emphasis was consistent with the move by academic researchers away from reform that occurred in the 1920s. The professionalization of academic science led researchers to become more interested in developing national norms for human behavior. As a result, their research changed from a focus on the study of methods for assisting individual

[75] Alice O'Connor, Poverty Knowledge: Social Science, Social Policy, and the Poor in Twentieth Century U.S. History (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 45.
[76] Cravens, "American Social Science and the Invention of Affirmative Action, 1920s-1970s," 19.
[77] O'Connor, Poverty Knowledge, 49.
[78] O'Connor, Poverty Knowledge, 45.

adjustment to the standards of national culture.[79] In a period where a return to normalcy dominated the national political discourse, sociologists from the Chicago School provided a reassuring narrative for the eventual assimilation of large numbers of ethnic minorities. Its version of assimilation fit well with the prevailing national mood. As defined by members of the Chicago School, assimilation was a process that reduced social conflict while leaving intact the existing social order.[80]

Sociologists from the Chicago School viewed the experiences of European immigrants and African American urban migrants as similar, the common factor being the fact that European immigrants and African American migrants were initially members of rural peasant societies. As members of peasant societies, it was assumed that the two groups shared common attitudes and experiences.[81] Another conceptual tie between the experiences of peasants and blacks was their experiences as subjugated groups. The modern nation state had emerged from the conquest and subordination of ethnic groups, forcing defeated groups to assimilate into the culture of the dominant group. Similarly, blacks were stripped of their African heritage and forced to assimilate into American culture.[82]

The ideas developed by sociologists from the Chicago School appealed to African American scholars for a number of reasons. Social ecology provided African American scholars a method for challenging the racial scholarship that

[79] Cravens, "Child Saving in the Age of Professionalism, 1915-1930," 425.
[80] O'Connor, Poverty Knowledge, 45.
[81] Stow Persons, Ethnic Studies at Chicago 1905-1945 (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1987), 80-81.
[82] Persons, Ethnic Studies at Chicago 1905-1945, 81.

was so prevalent in the first decades of the twentieth century. The democratic values inherent the methods developed by Chicago School allowed African American scholars to produce a body of literature in which they asserted the basic humanity of African Americans and that, as a group, African Americans were equal to other groups attempting to assimilate. The School's emphasis on environmental factors further allowed black scholars to attribute the causes of African American social problems to environmental factors rather than to biological ones. They could effectively argue that the impact of urban migration on African American life was temporary and not a permanent condition.[83]

The work of E. Franklin Frazier demonstrates the complexity of the problems facing African American scholars as they attempted to produce an alternative narrative to that found in racial scholarship. As a member of the Chicago School, Frazier worked to demolish the racial stereotypes about a monolithic black family. He refuted the belief that African Americans were incapable of living up to American cultural values.[84] Using the ecological approach, Frazier was able to demonstrate the impact of urban life on African American families.[85]

It is ironic that in contesting the racialized social science, which marginalized African Americans, Frazier developed a rationale that still left African Americans on the margins of white society. In accepting Robert Park's assertion that African American families were wholly a product of American social

[83] Scott, Contempt and Pity, 49.
[84] Anthony Platt, E. Franklin Frazier Reconsidered (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1991), 137.
[85] Platt, E. Franklin Frazier Reconsidered, 135.

conditions, Frazier adopted an image of the black family as less capable than their white counterparts. Specifically, in asserting that African Americans were without their own culture Frazier not only seriously undervalued the resilience of African American families, he also made the adoption of white cultural norms a critical factor in African American assimilation.[86]

Frazier's interpretation of African American families was influenced by Du Bois's 1908 study The Negro Family.[87] It is therefore not surprising that he incorporated Du Bois's idealizing of middle-class family structure into his work. Like Du Bois' earlier works, Frazier ended up making family structure as an important measure for racial progress. In his first important work on the African American family, The Negro Family in Chicago, Frazier uses social class to demonstrate the variability within Chicago's African American community. At the same time, he developed an interpretation of African American life where most African Americans had not achieved middle-class stability. Class distinctions are to a degree a valid way to explain variability, but combined with Frazier's emphasis of cultural and behavioral characteristics over structural and political concerns, they create a critique that leaves the majority of African Americans as marginalized victims.[88]

Part of the limitation of Frazier's work is that despite his attempts at neutrality, his own class bias worked its way into his discussion of poor blacks. Frazier was very much a man of his own times. Even though politically a

[86] Cravens, "Social Science and the Invention of Affirmative Action, 1920s-1970s," 22.
[87] Platt, E. Franklin Frazier Reconsidered, 134.
[88] Kevin Gaines, Uplifting the Race: Black Leadership, Politics, and Culture in the Twentieth Century, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 256.

socialist, he identified with the institutional and social conservatism of the African American social elites.[89] He adopted the Victorian moral values that were popular among early twentieth century African American elites. In many respects his rhetoric is similar to that of the social uplift movement. As such, his writings are filled with references to the moral degradation and promiscuity of black masses.

While the Chicago School provided a more humane and sympathetic image of African Americans, it lacked an appreciation of the political and economic dimensions of racial and ethnic assimilation. Its adoption of the natural evolution in the process of assimilation into American society left unquestioned the existing power relationships that were at the foundation of race relationships.[90]

Two key approaches used by the Chicago School, social ecology and the ethnic cycle for assimilation, failed to adequately explain the importance of racial segregation on the assimilation of African Americans.[91] African American scholars associated with the Chicago School were less optimistic about the prospects of African American assimilation. Neither Charles Johnson nor Frazier was as optimistic as their white counterparts about the willingness of American society to assimilate African Americans. Johnson included in his analysis an appreciation of the role racial attitudes of local employers played in maintaining African Americans in low-paying unskilled jobs.[92]

Appreciation of the role of political and economic influences on assimilation did not prevent African American scholars from reproducing the

[89] Cravens, "American Social Science and the Invention of Affirmative Action 1920s-1970s," 21.
[90] O'Connor, Poverty Knowledge, 49.
[91] Cravens, "Social Science and the Invention of Affirmative Action, 1920s-1970s," 20.
[92] Cravens, "American Social Science and the Invention of Affirmative Action, 1920s-1970s," 18.

limitations of the Chicago School. The emphasis of these scholars on the importance of social behavior to argue for a greater appreciation of variation within the black community leaves unquestioned the significance of class to maintaining the powerlessness of low-income black migrants. The failure to adequately emphasize the relevance of structural factors in African American assimilation left their work vulnerable to misinterpretation by others. Daniel Moynihan's interpretation of the scholarship of Frazier is perhaps one of the clearest examples of this phenomenon. The image of the pathological black family allowed Moynihan to ignore the resilience of African American families.

Conclusion

By the 1890s, racial assignments in the United States were becoming unstable. Changing social conditions combined with changes in science made the old taxonomy of racial classification less salient. The need to assimilate large numbers of European immigrants into a social system based on racial privilege was impossible under older models of classification that treated many immigrant groups as though they were separate races.

American social science helped stabilize and modernize racial assignments by incorporating the assumptions of a conservative racial ideology into their work. In using this ideology's assumption about racial inferiority and keeping African Americans on the margins of society, American social science helped create a new taxonomy of racial classification that allowed European immigrants to become citizens while keeping African Americans in their position of being citizens with few civil rights. Scientific racism was not the only research

on race produced in the early twentieth century. In this time period, black and white scholars produce research that challenged the basic tenants of scientific racism. However, most of this literature remained on the margin of scientific discourse. Most prominent white social scientists simply ignored this work. Its marginalization in scientific and public discourse provides evidence of how scientific racism became part of the official story of Progressive Era social welfare reform.

By the 1920s, biological and hereditary arguments for African American inferiority were losing their influence. Environmental and cultural arguments challenged the overtly racist assumptions of the earliest American social science. Environmental explanations were more sympathetic to African Americans, but most of the scholarly work carried out from this perspective still assumed that the majority of African Americans were socially deficient.

The sociologists associated with the Chicago School were among the most influential scholars on race during this period. The methods of study they developed appealed to many African American scholars, because they allowed them to assert the basic humanity of African Americans. They also allowed black scholars to contest racial segregation by asserting that African Americans were following the same path to assimilation as European immigrants.

In using the methods of the Chicago School, African American scholars also adopted its limitations, however. The Chicago School's approach to the study of assimilation reflected the conservative tenor of the 1920s. Social ecology or the ideas around family disorganization did not question the political

or economic relationships that benefited from racial segregation. The lack of understanding of the political-economic purposes of racial classification led the scholars of the Chicago School to over-emphasize family structure as a measure of racial assimilation.

It is true that African American scholars associated with the Chicago School were less optimistic about the prospects of black assimilation. Consequently, they were more willing to point to the negative effects of racial discrimination in their analysis of African American assimilation. However, they also tended to make family structure an important measure of assimilation. These academics carried on the long-standing tradition in African American scholarship of using social class as an important variant in explaining differences in behavior within the black community. The continued emphasis on class limited the effectiveness of their research to contest racial discrimination. Black scholars' use of class lacked sophistication in that it assumed that the behavior of poor blacks was substandard, rather that understanding it was a strategic response to living in poverty.

Chapter 2

The Professionalization of Social Work:

Moving Racial Assignments From Theory to Practice

This chapter examines how scientific racism became part of American culture. It highlights the role played by emerging professions in popularizing and legitimizing a scientifically based racial taxonomy. In focusing on the role of professions this chapter is able to investigate the ways in which racial ideology imbeds itself in everyday activities. In the Progressive Era, professions became a more important part of American society. As society became more complex, professions emerged as a way to manage the increasing technical information required by an industrializing society.

Professionalism in the Progressive Era was not a monolithic phenomenon. Different groups used professionalism to advance specific social agendas. Robyn Muncy's study on child welfare demonstrates how college educated women used professionalism to advance an agenda of social reform.[1] They saw child welfare as a means to expand the role of women in American society. In contrast to reform professionals were administrative professionals, who were more content with the structure of society and more interested in making institutions more efficient.

For several reasons this study will emphasize the role of administrative professionalism. It is primarily interested in how race affected the delivery of child welfare services on a local level. . The system of how St. Louis's child welfare

[1] Muncy, Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform 1989-1935, XIV

services were delivered was influenced by administrative professionals. While it is true that social work provided much of the leadership for reform professionalism, on a local level most social workers were administrative professionals. They were hired to carry out the work of bureaucratic agencies and derived their authority and status from their relationship to those agencies.

In the early-twentieth-century, scientific knowledge became the dominion of professionals. Making technical knowledge the basis for professional authority was a departure from the earlier model of professionalism. In the traditional nineteenth century model of professionalism, professional authority was largely defined by the public's estimation of a professional's judgment and reputation.[2]

As a means of gaining public acceptance and articulating the social values of this earlier model of professionalism, most early-twentieth-century professional organizations asserted a commitment to public service as part of professional ideology. American professionals recognized that for scientific knowledge to develop as a social force, it had to connect to some greater social purpose. Further, they understood that for scientific knowledge, and by extension professionalism, to have any cultural currency, the public had to be convinced that new forms of scientific knowledge would advance some long-term societal interests.[3]

To address the public's concern, early-twentieth-century professional organizations actively promoted the idea that part of the role of professionals was

[2] William Sullivan, Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America (New York: Harper Books, 1995), 57.
[3] Steven Brint, In the Age of Experts: The Changing Role of Professionals in Politics and Public Life (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 18.

to act as a social trustee. Thus, at the start of the twentieth century, professionals across disciplines expressed a common professional ethos that described professionals as altruistic, truthful, and distrustful of privilege.[4] Unfortunately, contradictions and inconsistencies permeated this definition. While claiming to reject most social distinctions, modern professionalism in fact incorporated many of these distinctions into its understanding of society. Early-twentieth-century professionals declared themselves free of old forms of social bias, but continued to treat social groups they considered inferior with disdain and disregard.[5]

Professionalism and the Legitimacy of Scientific Knowledge

The sociologist Steven Brint has argued that knowledge achieves its social relevance by associating with one of five areas of societal concern. Among the areas listed by Brint are civic regulation and social service.[6] Progressive Era child savers were able to use social science research to address these two concerns. For many progressive reformers, civic regulation was an important element of reform efforts. Thus, they viewed reform as helping reestablish social relations that had been destabilized by the rise of modern urban industrialized society.[7]

Social services became an important way in which middle-class Americans responded to the social changes that resulted from the increased complexity and interdependence of twentieth-century American life. At the start of

[4] Lunbeck, Psychiatric Persuasions, 25.
[5] Lunbeck, Psychiatric Persuasions, 25.
[6] Brint, In the Age of Experts, 45.
[7] Walter Trattner, From Poor Law to Welfare State a History of Social Welfare in America, 6th ed. (New York: Free Press, 1994), 234.

the twentieth century, many people in the middle class had concluded that they had not only lost control over society but also of their own lives. They had concluded that concentrated wealth in the hands of a few was bringing social and economic problems to the masses.[8]

Middle-class anxiety over the loss of control emerged in Progressive discourses as concerns over a loss of individuality and freedom.[9] The middle-class turned to government to help regain a sense of control over their lives and society, believing that governmental action was necessary to restore individual autonomy.[10] Thus, a common theme in most forms of Progressive Era reform was that a properly organized society could re-empower the individual and reinvigorate democracy.[11]

The general acceptance by large segments of the American population of the value of governmental action ushered in a new era of social welfare. With regard to child welfare, there was a general consensus among child savers that the child welfare policies of the late-nineteenth century that promoted the breakup of poor families had failed. In fact, these policies had exacerbated the very class antagonism they were supposed to control.[12] By the late 1890s it was clear that the policies of scientific charity and family breakup had done little to improve the lives of the poor. The continued appeal of radical ideas and

---

[8] Steven Diner, A Very Different Age: Americans of the Progressive Era, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1998), 6.
[9] Diner, A Very Different Age, 201.
[10] Diner, A Very Different Age, 200.
[11] Diner, A Very Different Age, 200.
[12] Michael Katz, In the Shadow of the Poor House: A Social History of Welfare in America (New York: Basic Books, 1986), 113.

emergence of a militant labor movement showed how little effect nineteenth century policies had on the attitudes of the urban poor.[13]

By the early-twentieth century, social reformers had significantly increased the public's role in the care and protection of children. The expanded role of government in the lives of poor families fueled an expansion of social welfare agencies. Progressive Era child savers revamped older child welfare agencies and created new ones to advance their agenda for working with families in their communities. The expanded role of government, in turn, created a demand for a highly skilled and professional workforce. Social workers moved quickly to fill this role with in public and private child welfare agencies.

The historians David Tyack and Elizabeth Hansott in their analysis of American educational reform contend that many Progressive Era reformers were primarily interested in administrative reform. They argue that administrative progressives were primarily concerned with a combination of teaching morals and improving administrative efficiency.[14] Administrative progressives emulated corporate capitalism in its approach to social reform, developing large hierarchical and bureaucratic organizations to deal with social problems.[15]

The use of hierarchical organizations as a means to implement reforms had important consequences for African Americans' relationship to social welfare reform. For the most part, administrative reformers were uncritical in their understanding of structural factors that supported racism in American society,

[13] Katz, In the Shadow of the Poor House, 113.
[14] David Tyack and Elizabeth Hansot, Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1980 (New York: Basic Books, 1982), 106.
[15] Tyack and Hansot, Managers of Virtue, 106.

generally believing that the structure of American society was fair and progressive.[16] Social inequality was justified by the notions that bureaucratic organizations promoted equal opportunity and meritocracy.[17] The fact that most administrative progressives were rarely self-conscious about their values made it easy for them to overlook or accept racial segregation.[18]

The reform agenda of the administrative progressive concerned not only how Americans should be governed but who should be allowed to govern. Many Progressive Era reformers saw the world as a rational and orderly affair and were convinced that it operated by a set of rational laws.[19] It is not surprising, therefore, that they supported a bureaucratic approach to social welfare reform. For example, Progressive reformers and their supporters among the middle-class developed reform strategies that stressed the needs for constant supervision and management.[20] An important consequence of their reliance on bureaucracy was that it led to a consolidation of power into large centralized organizations. Administrative progressives distrusted politics, which they saw as dominated by corrupt political bosses.[21] The eventual control of public policy by bureaucratic institutions allowed political decisions to become administrative issues.

Reformers preferred instead to trust decision making to trained experts. This elitist approach to reform favored by administrative progressives limited the

[16] Tyack and Hansot, Managers of Virtue, 107.
[17] Tyack and Hansot, Managers of Virtue, 111.
[18] Tyack and Hansot, Managers of Virtue, 6.
[19] Robert Wiebe, The Search for Order 1870-1920, (New York: Wang and Hill, 1967), 107.
[20] Wiebe, The Search for Order 1870-1920,145.
[21] Tyack and Hansot, Managers of Virtue, 107.

ability of African Americans to contest the racialized basis of the scientific knowledge used in forming the goals of social welfare reform. Bureaucratic organizations insulated experts from political pressures by limiting who could challenge their decisions. For the professionals who ran these organizations, technical training was a defining character.[22] As experts their performance could only be judged by other experts. In the view of administrative progressives, the general public did not have the knowledge or experience to adequately assess the complicated conditions that influenced American society.[23]

This mindset made it difficult for African Americans to challenge the scientific assumptions about their character. As individuals or as a group they had little standing in the eyes of experts. The racial attitudes of the experts that ran large institutions tended to reinforce the notions developed in early-twentieth -century social science. That is, blacks upset the social order and were therefore treated as clowns or barbarians.[24]

Consequently, early-twentieth-century professionalism played an important role in the modernization of longstanding racial stereotypes. The importance that the American public placed on scientific knowledge as a basis for professional practice helped increase the influence of social sciences in defining the color line at the start of the twentieth century. Many professionals in their role as educators of the public promoted racial stereotypes as though they were scientific facts. As a result, using their status as respected experts, professionals

[22] Robert Wiebe, Self Rule: A Cultural History of American Democracy (New York: Wang and Hill, 1995),144.
[23] Wiebe, Self Rule,144.
[24] Wiebe, The Search for Order 1870-1920, 58.

allowed racism to continue to be part of the scientific discourse on who was capable of self-governance.[25] Scientific competence made the research findings of social scientists appear more authoritative and less open to question by the society at large. Social science discourse provided the authority needed to change the epistemological basis of racism. Scientific inquiry moved the basis of racial stereotypes from a mixture of pseudoscience and religion to being purely scientific.

Social Work and Child Welfare Reform

The decision to focus this study on the profession of social work stems in large part from the importance of social work as a profession to child welfare reform in the early twentieth century. Social work's evolution into a modern profession is integrally related to the creation of a modern American child welfare system. In the early twentieth century, child welfare reformers counted among its leaders most of the nation's leading social workers. Social work pioneers such as Jane Adams, Zenobia Breckenridge, and Grace and Edith Abbott all played important roles in the development of modern child welfare. These women, in turn, were among the primary supporters of the 1909 White House Conference on dependent children. The conference helped set the agenda for Progressive Era Child welfare reform. In particular, its proposal that children not be removed from their homes without sufficient reason had far-reaching effects on child welfare policy.[26]

[25] Jacobson, Whiteness as a Different Color, 87.
[26] Trattner, From Poor Law to Welfare State, 216.

The United States Children's Bureau, which quickly became a major center for child welfare reform, was largely staffed and managed by social workers. The historian Robyn Muncy, in her discussion of the relation of women to Progressive Era reform, has documented the close relationship between the Children's Bureau and graduate schools of social work. The bureau became a conduit for women graduates to jobs in child welfare and to a network of like-minded reformers. The interlocking relationship between the Children's Bureau and social work became part of the foundation of Progressive Era child welfare reform.[27] The Children's Bureau's promotion of public policies that required professional social services further increased social work's influence over child welfare reform.

Social Work and the Rise of the Professional Managerial Class

At the beginning of the twentieth century, a new middle class was taking shape. Alongside the more traditional proprietary professions such as law or medicine, a new form of professional was emerging. Organizational professionals were the technical experts and managers who worked in the large corporate and bureaucratic organizations that emerged in response to the rise of corporate capitalism and urbanization of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-centuries. This professional managerial class (PMC) was dependent on organization for its

[27] Muncie's primary interest is in demonstrating the degree to which Progressive Era women were able to carry out child welfare reform as a distinctively female dominion of reform. In making this case, Muncy also demonstrates the degree to which social work as a female-dominated profession became an important element in making child welfare a female dominion of social reform. In particular, the third chapter in her book deals with the relationship between the Children's Bureau and graduate schools of social work. Robyn Muncy, A Dominion of Their Own: Women and Reform Politics,1890-1930, (New York: Basics Books, 1984).

professional status.[28] Its autonomy was based on the ability to function independently within the organization. The rise of the PMC helped shift the definition of professionalism, making it more closely defined as the use of professional or technical knowledge.[29]

Members of the PMC were among the strongest supporters of Progressive Era reforms. They brought to politics new ideas about social policy and justice.[30] As mentioned, most Progressive reformers perceived of the world as an orderly place that operated according to rational laws. As a result, most reform initiatives attempted to see social problems as a disruption in these laws.[31] This view of reform fit well with the PMC's idea of reforms as a social process that returned rationality and regulation to society.[32] Specifically, they tended to see reforms in terms of the bureaucratic functions of monitoring and management.[33] Finally, it is not surprising that this new part of the middle class would support reforms that would increase their own influence over society.

Social work was one of the new organizational professions that emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century. Social work's development as a profession was a direct consequence of the urban-industrial growth that occurred at the start of the century.[34] As mentioned, social work grew out of the perceived need for social order. The social disruption caused by urban and industrial

---

[28] William Sullivan, Work and Integrity, 46.
[29] Brint, In the Age of Experts, 5.
[30] John Ehrenreich, The Altruistic Imagination: A History of Social Work and Social Policy in the United States, (Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), 30.
[31] Robert Wiebe, The Search for Order, 1877-1920, (New York: Hill and Wang Books, 1967), 62.
[32] Ehrenreich, The Altruistic Imagination, 30.
[33] Wiebe, The Search for Order, 1877-1920, 112.
[34] Wiebe, The Search for Order, 1877-1920, 112.

growth required professional workers who were highly trained and committed to the values of professionalism.[35]

Older methods of treating people in need proved ineffective in the face of the increased complexity of the social problems caused by urbanization and industrialization. To meet this need for a more technical and scientific approach to social problems, social workers transformed themselves from friendly visitors to caseworkers.

Social work's trajectory into professionalism demonstrates the degree to which professionalism at the start of the twentieth century was contested terrain. In 1915, Abraham Flexner produced a report for the Carnegie Foundation on the nature of professionalism that asserted that social work could not be considered a profession. He concluded that social work lacked a unique methodology and a foundation in scientific knowledge.[36] In Flexner's view, social workers were mediators, not the initiators of action, and the primary responsibility was the marshaling of resources.[37]

Flexner's assessment of social work haunted the profession for several decades. Social workers were aware that Flexner's assessment undercut their cultural authority. To address the problem of credibility, they made a deliberate effort to establish casework as the basis for the profession's claim to scientific method.[38] Casework's claim to scientific authenticity was boosted in the 1920s

[35] Trattner, From Poor Law to Welfare State, 234.
[36] Lunbeck, Psychiatric Persuasions: Knowledge, 25.
[37] Trattner, From Poor Law to Welfare State, 251.
[38] Regina Kunzel, Fallen Women, Problem Girls: Unmarried Women and the Professionalization of Social Work, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 40.

with the inclusion of psychoanalytic theory into casework method. The incorporation of knowledge produced by other disciplines made casework a flexible and adaptable tool for social workers in their efforts to sustain their professional status. That is, it allowed them to demonstrate that the profession had the skills necessary for social welfare agencies to carry out their work.

One of the consequences of the professionalization of social work was that it largely rejected its role as advocate for social reform. Instead, it asserted its ability to help individuals adjust to societal norms. In the 1920s, social work became part of the movement by professional groups to help define a set of national social norms. Specifically, it helped modernize traditional social roles by medicalizing what had previously been considered moral behavior[39] It helped to develop social science as a means to scrutinize the everyday behavior of individuals.[40] Among the social norms that social work helped create and enforce were the racial norms associated with the conservative racial ideology of the early twentieth century.

Social Work Literature and Racial Attitudes

Social work exemplified the way racial attitudes were incorporated into professional practices and theory as the attitudes of professional social workers towards African Americans reflected the dominant view of American society. At the same time, many of the leading advocates of the social work profession were advocates for civil rights. Jane Adams, for instance, was on the board of the

[39] Lunbeck, Psychiatric Persuasions, 76.
[40] Lunbeck, Psychiatric Persuasions, 74.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Edith Abbott and Florence Kelly made efforts to expand social services to African Americans. However, the profession as a whole showed little interest in addressing the problems of blacks with many believing that African Americans could not benefit from casework services.[41]

Not surprising, therefore, most of the social work literature reflected the conservative racial ideology that was prevalent in the first decades of the twentieth century. Co-Operation, a journal published by the Chicago Board of Charities from 1900-1908, clearly reflected the conservative views of many whites. In enthusiastically supporting the conservative approach to race relations, it frequently quoted Booker T. Washington and printed anecdotal stories of how some blacks, through hard work and self-sacrifice, became successes in society.[42] Co-Operation also discussed scientific explanations of race. The journal promoted theories that treated African Americans as though they were a lower order of human beings. In one issue, it published a report supporting the segregation of prisoners in the Georgia prison system by condoning the prison's decision to assign blacks to only outdoor labor. It stated that outdoor labor was "… better adapted for the Negro convict population which has to be outside when it works."[43]

[41] Mary Russell, "The Possibility of Casework with Colored Families," The Family 2 (May 1921): 59.
[42] Steven Diner, "Chicago Social Workers and Blacks in the Progressive Era," Social Service Review 44 (Dec. 1970): 395.
[43] Diner, "Chicago Social Workers and Blacks in the Progressive Era," 395.

The enmeshment of professional opinion and popular opinion can also be seen in Co-Operation's favorable review of Joseph Telinghast's The Negro in Africa and America. The journal's acceptance of Telinghast's premise that African Americans coming from an uncivilized continent could not compete with the world's most advanced race is indicative of how well accepted the emphasis on group traits in determining social stature had become in American society. Putting a paternalistic spin on Telinghast's work, Co-Operation argued as follows, "To realize that many of the characteristics of the American Negro are part of an inheritance from Africa, and were bred into the race through long generations, may perhaps strengthen the patience and forbearance of those who seek to expedite his progress."[44]

The social work literature in the 1920s reflected the same conservatism and paternalism seen in the articles printed in Co-Operation. The basic theme was that the African American family was inadequate. Mary Russell, in an article on casework with black families, challenged the widely held belief among social workers that blacks were not sophisticated enough to benefit from casework. Russell's article, while admirable in its intent, remained loyal to the official story of black inadequacy. In arguing for extension of casework to blacks, Russell makes the following observation, "The Negro is teachable though his reaction to moral and ethical influence is not yet stable and constant as it may eventually become."[45]

[44] Diner, "Chicago Social Workers and Blacks in the Progressive Era," 395.
[45] Russell, "The Possibility of Casework With Colored Families," 221-225.

Corinne Sherman used genetics to explain the instability of the black family. In an article titled “Racial Factors in Desertion,” she connected the science of genetics with the popular belief in black degeneracy and black attitudes towards marriage and family. Sherman argued that black men desert their families because of inborn racial traits and contended that as a result of their African American heritage, “Negro men and women after the love making stage can get along well without each other.”[46] Genetics played a dominant role in social work discussions about black character. Russell used mental traits to explain criminality, arguing that black criminality is best explained by the fact that most blacks arrested were mentally deficient.[47] Sherman is more explicit in her application of genetics. She used genetics to argue for greater white supervision of blacks. Sounding very much like a middle-class southern white attempting to keep blacks in their place, Sherman states “... the present day Negro in rural districts, brought up without the plantation discipline of his grandfather, seeing less of whites than the latter are drawn to cities ... and often slip back into their primitive ways.”[48]

The social work literature at the time reflected the ways in which contemporary social problems were cast in terms of race. In the 1920s, many whites were increasingly anxious about black migration north and rising urban crime rates. Reframing social issues into racial problems provided an explanation

[46] Corrine Sherman, “Racial Factors in Desertion,” The Family 4 (Jan 1923): 221-225.
[47] Russell, “The Possibility of Casework with Colored Families,” 221-225.
[48] Sherman, “Racial Factors in Desertion,” 221.

that was consistent with national initiatives and probably reduced the anxiety of many Americans about the changes taking place in American society.

Social Work Practice and Racial Attitudes

Racial attitudes in the social work profession can also be seen in the way the profession treated black social workers. To its credit, the social work profession was more accepting of African Americans than other professions in the early twentieth century. Eugene Kinckle Jones, director of the Urban League, in a 1928 journal article described the treatment of black social workers in the following way, “There is probably no profession in which Negro members are on as cordial relationship with white members as that of social work”[49]. As early as 1911, the social work profession recognized the need for African American caseworkers. In discussing the attitudes of white social workers with black clients Robert Dexter wrote the following, “They either insist in the standards of family and social life which they consider those of normal white people; or they believe that because their clients are Negroes they cannot be expected to have much in the way of standards.”.[50]

In response to the demand for black workers, African American educators in New York organized the Committee on Urban Conditions Among Negroes. Part

[49] Eugene Kinckle Jones, “Social Work Among negroes” The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CXL (1928) 278.
[50] Robert Dexter, “The negro in Social Work” Survey, XLVI (June 25,1921), 439-440.

of this committee's mission was to train African American social workers. By 1912, Howard, Fisk and Paine College had started social work programs.[51]

The development of the Dependent Colored Children's Bureau in Chicago is another example of how the beliefs of white social workers conflicted with African American culture. Under the auspices of the Cook County Board of Visitors, after the Amanda Smith Home burned down, social welfare experts and community leaders met to develop a plan for delivering child welfare services to African American children.[52] Included in this group were Edith Abbott and Sophonisha Breckenridge, white women who were major figures in the professionalization of social work. Abbott, in particular, played a major role in creating the Colored Children's Board. The committee recommended to the Cook Count Board of Visitors that childcare institutions be abandoned in favor of foster care. This recommendation was made despite the fact that the African American members of the committee were proposing the creation of a new children's home. When Abbott learned about their plans, she used her influence to have the plan tabled.[53]

Many people in the black community favored institutional care over foster care. Most blacks saw child placing as unnecessary given the informal care giving that already existed in the black community. Besides, within the black

---

[51] George Haynes, "Cooperation with Colleges in Securing and Training Negro Social Workers for Urban Center" (paper presented at National Conference of Corrections and Charities, Boston, MA, 1911).

[52] The Amanda Smith Home was a privately run children's home for African American children. The home was severely underfinanced and could only provide substandard care for children. The home caught fire, leaving the city without an adequate placement for black children.

[53] Sandra Stenho, "Public Responsibility for Dependent Black Children: The Advocacy of Edith Abbott and Sophonisha Breckenridge," Social Service Review 62 (Sept. 1998), 498.

community, childcare institutions were considered to offer a better chance of acquiring vocational training.[54] The end result of the decision by the Board of Visitors was to take control over the care of dependent black children. Prior to the move to foster care, much of the child welfare services for black children were delivered by agencies created and supported by the black community.

Abbott's actions are indicative of the way in which race complicated the delivery of child welfare services. On the one hand, Abbott's actions were atypical of many social workers in that she was advocating that African Americans receive the most up-to-date forms of treatment. Beginning in the 1890s, Progressive Era child savers had argued that institutional care was too regimented and could never recreate the experience of living in a family. Since the 1909 White House Conference on Dependent Children, child savers had advocated for the placement of children in families rather than institutions.

Abbott's actions also served to underscore Sandra McDonnell's observations about the relationship of white child welfare reformers and African Americans. McDonnell noted that one of the primary rationales for ignoring the input of African Americans was the belief among white reformers that African Americans were uninformed about the most modern methods of child welfare practice.[55] Abbott's outmaneuvering of African American leaders indicates that she did not take the perspectives of the African American community seriously. In ignoring the desire of the African American community, Abbott's actions reflect

[54] Sandra O'Donnell, "Care of Dependent African American Children in Chicago: The Struggle Between Black Self-Help and Professionalism," Journal of Social History (Summer 1994), 769.
[55] O'Donnell, "Care of Dependent African American Children in Chicago," 769.

the patronizing and heavy handed approach that Progressive Era social workers often used in dealing with African Americans.[56]

What makes Edith Abbott's actions so poignant is that she was a strong advocate for civil rights. For example, she had earlier in her career co-authored a study with Zenosophisa Breckenridge on the housing problems facing Africans Americans in Chicago. The actions she took in establishing the Colored Children's Board were not acts of overt racism; rather they reflected the inherent contradiction about race that was entwined in Progressive Era child welfare reform.

Conclusion

Clifford Geertz suggests that to understand what science is you should look not at theory, but at how practitioners use it.[57] It is for this reason that it is important to understand the connection between the work of professionals and the development of scientific theory. It is in part through the work of professionals that ideology becomes hegemonic. The role that modern society has given professionals embodies a form of cultural authority that can legitimize specific social practices. Thus, in modern society, professionals have assumed the role of interpreter of meaning for forces that affect everyday life.

The growth of the helping professions at the start of the twentieth century was related to a desire of many for social order. Social work's development into a

[56] Karen Tice has written an excellent case study that illustrates the attitudes of white social workers towards black clients; see "Mending Rosa's Working Ways" in Bad Mothers: The Politics of Blame in Twentieth Century America, (New York: New York University Press, 1995).
[57] Clifford Geertz, The Interpretations of Culture: Selected Essays of Clifford Geertz (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 5.

modern profession, in particular, was a direct consequence of the social disruptions caused by the increased industrialization and urbanization of American society. Its trajectory towards professional status demonstrates the degree to which professionalism was a contested terrain in the early-twentieth-century and how the emergence of the PMC helped social workers overcome the objections of its detractors.

With regard to race relations, social work's early history is mixed . It was one of the most welcoming professions for black professionals. Moreover, most of the profession's leadership was out spoken advocates for African American civil rights. At the same time many social workers were comfortable with the existing racial hierarchy. Both casework and administrative practice easily incorporated racial ideology into its work. Social work's incorporation of scientific racism provides a clear example of how the work of professions often serves a broader social and political purpose. The discussion about race that took place in the social work literature demonstrates the degree to which the profession's early practitioners uncritically accepted the racial beliefs of the larger society, proceeding from the assumptions of scientific racism to argue that African Americans were not amenable to casework services. In this way, the profession of social work perpetuated the potent symbol of the innately primitive African American who cannot fit into a modernizing industrial society.

The profession's attitude towards African Americans demonstrates how professional development is influenced by important social and political forces. Social work's leaders were among the most racially progressive of any early

twentieth century profession, but at the same time, as the efforts of Abbot and Breckenridge shows, these leaders were comfortable in operating within existing racial parameters. The ambiguity of social work's approach to racial justice illustrates the degree to which race complicated the terrain the Progressive Era professions had to navigate.

Chapter 3

Self-Help and Self-Reliance: African American Social Thought in the Early Twentieth Century

In many respects the Progressive Era was one of the worst of times for African Americans, Overt racism circumscribed every aspect of their lives.[1] However, in discussing black history it is important not to underestimate their resilience. In his work on black culture, Lawrence Levine points out that African Americans have been able to find the means to sustain a far greater degree of self-pride and group cohesion than the system they lived under intended them to have.[2] This chapter examines African American social thought during the Progressive Era. Specifically, it examines how African Americans thought about family and child rearing. This chapter explores how African Americans attempted to counteract negative images of blacks with a positive interpretation of family. It also examines how class biases affected black thinking about family and childhood.

In discussing African American social thought this study chose to focus primarily on the social uplift movement. This decision was based primarily on the recognition of social uplift's preeminent role in early twentieth century African American social welfare reform. Unquestionably, social uplift was among the most important influences on African American social thought of the early twentieth century. Social uplift remained a part of the debate over social reform

[1] Diner, A Very Different Age, 125.
[2] Lawrence Levine, Black Culture and Black Consciousness: Afro-American Folk Thought from Slavery to Freedom (London: Oxford University Press, 1977), xi.

for at least thirty years. It was not until the 1930s with the advent of the New Deal that Social Uplift finally fell out of favor. In discussing social uplift it is important to note that it was not the only influence on African American thought. Black Nationalism and grass roots social activism also had an influence on African American thought and reform agendas. Moreover, it is important to acknowledge that social uplift did not preclude involvement in direct political action. For instance, many of the church women who believed that respectability was an important element in racial progress also participated in boycotts and petition drives.

The influence of social uplift among poor and working class blacks varied over time. It was most widely accepted in the first part of the twentieth century. However, the Great Migration promoted class stratification within the black community. And as working class and middle class blacks became distinct groups within African American society the influence of social uplift began to wane. By the 1920s differences over religious practices and the role of the informal economy within the black community helped erode social uplifts influence among working class blacks.

Faced with a constant barrage of negative stereotypes, African American were eager to find methods to disrupt the negative images of African Americans held by most whites. In an effort to get whites to recognize their basic humanity, African Americans developed their own values and cultural norms around family and childrearing. African American social beliefs were intricately connected to

strategies that promoted racial empowerment.[3] Blacks were well aware that an assertion of their right to equal social status with whites was a political act. Paradoxically, this connection between social propriety and racial empowerment led many African American to embrace traditional or conservative views on family.

African American conceptions of family life were part of the larger social uplift reform movement. Black social thought in the early decades of the twentieth century was aimed at providing a rationale for the moral and economic uplift of poor and uneducated blacks. Philosophically, the uplift movement has part of its origins in laissez-faire economics and social Darwinism. Many African Americans believed that in order to win the acceptance of whites, they would have to prove that they could run the race of social Darwinist competition.[4] The acquisition of wealth became a part of winning equal social and political status.

The politics of social uplift also placed a great deal of emphasis on public deportment. In the eyes of many African Americans, assimilation meant closely conforming to middle-class standards of social propriety. The preoccupation with propriety led most African American leaders to vacillate between criticizing American society for its failure to live up to its stated values and criticizing the values and lifestyles of African Americans who transgressed middle-class social

[3] There is a growing body of literature that connects African American social thought to racial empowerment. In my opinion Victoria Wolcott, Remaking Respectability: African American Women in Interwar Detroit (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001) offers one of the best critiques of the relationship between social thought and political action.
[4] August Meier, Negro Thought in America, 1880-1915: Racial Ideologies in the Age of Booker T Washington 5th ed. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1970), 26.

norms.[5]

The Great Migration of African Americans from the South to northern cities after the Civil War exacerbated class divisions within the black community.[6] In most northern cities, members of the African American middle-class felt it necessary to distinguish themselves from working-class and poor African Americans.[7] Fearful of a loss of standing in the white community, middle-class African Americans used social respectability to separate themselves from new migrants. They became critical of the lifestyles of poor African Americans and thought that it was their own responsibility to reform their behavior.

An editorial published in 1916 in the Cleveland Advocate expressed the views of many middle-class blacks, "A heavy responsibility rests upon us. These newcomers must be urged to shun the vices of our metropolitan cities. We cannot stand aloof – it is our duty to throw the mantle of protection around them. They must be urged to go to church and lead Christian lives."[8] Underlying middle-class concerns for migrants was the fear that they would be seen in the same light as the new migrants. George Haynes argued in the AME Church Review 1911 that there were "dregs" among the black population. He went on to say, "… and it is these dregs, their indolence, violence and crime that endanger the whole of their race among us. The whole race is too often judged by the best, or their

[5] Evelyn Higginbotham, Righteous Discontent: The Women's Movement in the Black Baptist Church, 1880-1920 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 19.
[6] Kenneth Kusmer, A Ghetto Takes Shape: Black Cleveland, 1870-1930 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978), 91-92.
[7] Kusmar, A Ghetto Takes Shape, 99.
[8] Cleveland Advocate, "Our New Citizens," 19 November, 1916, 8.

average, but by their worst members."[9] In another editorial, the Cleveland Advocate in 1916 argued that unless crime was brought under control Jim Crowism and segregation would result.[10]

The African American Church and Childrearing

It is difficult, if not impossible, to discuss the relationship between social propriety and African American social thought without acknowledging the important role of the African American church. African American Protestantism served as the reference point for much of African American life. Evelyn Brooks-Higgenbotham has described the black church as an important public space within the black community. In the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-centuries, the black church supported and provided space for a large number of social activities. Churches were involved in setting up everything from social centers to day care.[11] The church was also a central institution in developing and promoting African American social reform activities. This was especially true of African American women reformers, who, unlike their white counterparts, maintained a close association between reform and religious belief. Black women depended on their church affiliation to help organize specific reform initiatives.[12]

The church-sponsored press became one of the primary tools by which religious denominations attempted to influence the debate on social mores within the black community. Responding to the rise in African American literacy, black

[9] George Haynes, "Dealing with the Dregs," African Methodist Church Review (October 1911).
[10] Cleveland Advocate, "It's Up to Us, Get Busy" 24 June, 1916, 7.
[11] Higgenbotham, Righteous Discontent, 8.
[12] Deborah Gray White, Too Heavy a Load: Black Women in Defense of Themselves 1894-1994 (New York: W.W. Norton Co., 1999), 71.

churches took the lead in publishing general periodicals for African Americans, and during the first part of the twentieth century, church publications were widely circulated throughout the black community. Church publications unequivocally endorsed the themes articulated in the social uplift movement. The black church could easily identify with the movement's message of racial progress though prosperity and morality. Many black churches taught that material success was an indication of good moral and religious character.[13] Therefore, it is not surprising that these same themes would find their way into discussions about childrearing. James Gilmore in a 1907 essay on child training wrote, "We want good, honest, cultured, religious, industrious, economical and prosperous race, but we cannot have it without the process of good child training."[14]

The social uplift movement adopted many of the Progressive Era's assumptions about childhood, many uplift advocates believing that children represented the best opportunity for progress for racial equality. As a result, African American publications often defined parenting in terms of encouraging racial uplift and moral responsibility.[15] In discussing the role of parents, religious publications reflected the class bias that was inherent in the uplift movement. Reliance on middle-class propriety created a circular form of logic within black reform. The acquisition of middle-class standards for behavior was often used by

[13] Litwack, Trouble in Mind, 141.
[14] James Gilmore, "Child Training," African Methodist Church Review (October 1907): 173.
[15] Licia Morrow Calloway, Black Family (Dys)Function in the Novels by Jessie Fauset, Nella Larsen, and Fannie Hurst (New York: Peter Lang, 2003), 17.

uplift advocates as proof of racial progress, and progress was defined largely in terms of acquiring middle class values.[16]

A constant theme in the black religious press was that was that black parents were neglecting their responsibilities to their children. At times, this criticism appeared to be harsh and extreme. For example, in an essay published in 1902 in the AME Church Review, mothers were subjected to the following criticism, "That it is a sad fact that so many of our mothers are such in name only. Mothercare and oversight mean nothing to them."[17]

The African American Secular Press

Further evidence of the importance of church influence may be seen in the way in which its rhetoric was adopted by the black secular press. For example, in an article in the Cleveland Journal, entitled "Child Training," Ms I. N. Ross asserted in 1905 that being Christian is essential to child training. The article went on to articulate a common theme found in religious publications: that public sentiment was sending young men and girls to a life of sin.[18]

Further, a regular theme in the black secular press was that African American parents were failing to set good examples for their children. This criticism was consistent with the moral emphasis of the uplift movement and is indicative of the class bias of this movement. The criticism of African American parents in the secular press reflected the general anxiety of the African American middle class. Many feared that whites would see them in the same light as new

[16] Kevin Gaines, Uplifting the Race: Black Leadership, Politics, and Culture in the Twentieth Century (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 20.
[17] "Cheerful Mothers Make Good Sons," African Methodist Church Review (July 1902): 6.
[18] Mrs. I. N. Ross, "Child Training," Cleveland Journal, 25 February, 1905, 9.

African American migrants. In the course of condemning poor black parents for their behavior, members of the black middle-class stigmatized the poor as pathological and immoral. It based its own claims of moral superiority on stereotypes that demonized the race.[19]

An article on homeless young men provides an example of how middle-class African Americans saw the behavior of poor and working-class blacks, "I do not see how parents can hope for their children to be truthful unless they refrain from telling untruths. An editorial in the Kansas City Call was even more harsh, "Let the father who breaks the law, by buying intoxicating liquor for hilarity's sake, understand that his son will someday stand in the prisoner's dock because of the indifference for the law which he learned at home."[20] The anxiety of middle-class blacks over what they perceived to be a lack of morals is clearly evident in these articles, envisioning dire consequences for poor and working-class black children.

Fear of Urbanization

The idea that public sentiment was leading African American youth astray reflected the anxiety that many African Americans felt about the impact of urban life. The African American sociologist E. Franklin Frazier echoed the concerns of many blacks when he asserted that migration to the cities had undermined traditional sources of African American authority. In particular, Frazier and others

[19] Gaines, Uplifting the Race, 45.
[20] Kansas City Call, "Bringing up a Generation Without Moral Strength," 11 November 1925, 5.

saw the decline of the influence of the church and family contributing to increases in deviant behavior among black youth.[21]

The anxiety about the welfare of children translated into a concern that parents were not living up to their responsibilities. The concern about parenting was part of larger anxiety on the part of African American elites about increased migration of poor blacks from the South. Black leaders in most large cities believed that it was their duty to instruct new migrants to the city on how they should behave. Black elites were often distrustful of black migrants, viewing their behavior as crude and backward. The advice on parenting found in most black newspapers was part of this attempt to lift up the moral and behavior of the black masses.[22]

Another concern expressed in the black press was that African American youth were too easily influenced by consumerism and materialism. Black youth did easily adjust to the consumer culture of the early twentieth century. Their participation in consumer culture was facilitated by two factors. First, they retained greater control over wages than their immigrant counterparts.[23] Jacqueline Jones, in her work on African American women, noted that civil rights activist Mary Ovington criticized black youth for being self-indulgent in their spending habits. Ovington further asserted that the lack of frugality led African American children to ignore the needs of their parents and siblings.[24]

---

[21] Kusmer, A Ghetto Takes Shape, 225.
[22] Grossman, Land of Hope, 145.
[23] Jones, Labor of Love Labor of Sorrow: Black Women, Work and Family From Slavery to the Present (New York: Vantage Books, 1995), 163.
[24] Jones, Labor of Love Labor of Sorrow, 164.

The fact that young African Americans worked at jobs in the service industry that required long and irregular hours also served to loosen parental control over the spending habits of African American youth.[25] The changing commercialized urban environment further complicated the issue of the influence of urban life on the moral development of African American youth. The increased opportunities for unsupervised hetero-social activity was seen by many in the black community as a threat not only to the morals of black youth but also to the image of respectability and refinement that middle-class African Americans sought to portray.[26] An article in the Ohio Monitor in 1919 expressed the beliefs of many African American leaders: "The influence of social dance as a cultural, uplifting, and moralizing factor is eminently questionable. This fact is beyond dispute. If eminently questionable, it naturally becomes a strong probable liability towards the demoralizing of the social order."[27]

The concern over the influence of consumerism led the black press to publish advice articles for young women on how to choose a marriage partner. For example, in 1916, The AME Church Review gave young women the following advice, "One can make a grand marriage in the eyes of the world, but in reality it may be a poorer and more wretched than the marriage of a couple of beggars, rich in nothing but love for each other."[28]

Black Masculinity

[25] Jones, Labor of Love Labor of Sorrow, 164
[26] Victoria Wolcott, Remaking Respectability, 100.
[27] Ohio Monitor, 12 December 1919, 4.
[28] "What Sort of Husband Do Women Want," African Methodist Church Review (July 1906), 57.

The concern within the black community about the impact of urbanization was evident in the advice provided to parents on how to raise sons. African American interpretations of masculinity were similar to those found in the dominant culture: Boys were portrayed as energetic, rugged, and under-socialized. This view of boyhood led many African Americans to conclude that raising boys required special care and attention. Rev. J. S. Jackson expressed the views of many African Americans when in 1903 he wrote "that as a result of their love of sport and activity boys tended to gravitate to the wildest boy in the neighborhood."[29]

Part of the critique of the impact of urban life on African Americans was that city life encouraged young African American men to remain immature. Black leaders were concerned that the large number of singe black women combined with the increased opportunity for unsupervised hetero-social activity encouraged young black men to avoid the responsibility of marriage and family. The anxiety over black men remaining bachelors led the Cleveland Journal in 1906 to remind young men that bachelorhood had led to the decline of the Greek and Roman Empires.[30] Remarks published in other parts of the black press were far more pointed than those made by the Cleveland Journal. For example, the Southern Workman made the following observation about young black men in 1900, "It is common knowledge that our boys are not at work, for one of the crying evils among us is that our women in large numbers are supporting worthless men and

[29] Cleveland Journal, 25 April 1903, 2.
[30] Rev. H. P Smith, "Bachelors a Menace to Society," Cleveland Journal, 14 April 1906.

boys."[31] The Chicago Defender made a similar observation about young African American men in an editorial asserting that black families are too forgiving of their wayward sons, while far more demanding of good behavior from their daughters.

The advice to young men in black newspapers emphasized the importance of material success. The idea that good character was a necessary condition for material success led many African Americans to set strict standards of behavior. In 1916 George Meyer wrote in the Cleveland Advocate, "If he should hold his reputation as a priceless treasure, and feels the eyes of the world are upon him, that he must not deviate a hair's breadth from truth and right. If he would take such a stand at the outset, he would come to have the unlimited confidence of mankind and for all such things there is a constant demand."[32]

African American Reform and the Sheltered Family

The focus on propriety was for many African Americans a double-edged sword. On the one hand, it gave African Americans a way to contest the dominant white narratives of black inadequacy: We are equal to you. At the same time, the narrative about moral propriety devalued the contributions of poor and working-class African Americans to African American culture.

Higginbotham and Victoria Wolcott have pointed out that African American reformers had difficulty accepting the contributions of jazz and the blues to African American culture.[33] It is my impression that the middle-class bias goes

[31] J.H.N. Waring, "What to Do With Our Boys," Southern Workman (April 1908), 138-139.
[32] Cleveland Advocate, 10 October 1916, 4.
[33] Higgenbotham, Righteous Discontent, 200; Wolcott, Remaking Respectability, 100.

deeper than the rejection of cultural productions. Middle-class bias also devalued the resilience of working-class black families. In asserting that the sheltered family model was only acceptable means to assimilation African Americans, reformers disregarded other types of family structure that existed within the black community.[34] Specifically, in adopting the sheltered family as the standard of propriety within the black community, reformers ignored longstanding traditions of using kinship networks and reciprocal community relationships as means to raise children.[35]

The application of a sheltered family structure to African American families of the early twentieth century is problematic in a number of ways. The concept of a sheltered family structure developed in response to changes in the national economy. As market production shifted away from the home, women and children were perceived as nonparticipants in the family economy.[36] The role of children in particular was redefined from being participants in the family economy to providing psychological value to a family.[37]

In sheltered families, men's social status was connected to their economic status. This link between occupation and social status placed African American

[34] The term sheltered family is taken from the work of David McCloud. It refers to the intact two-parent family model. For a detailed explanation of variations in types of African American families, see Andrew Billingsley, Climbing Jacob's Ladder: The Enduring Legacy of African American Families (New York: Touchstone, 1992). A discussion of the importance of two-parent family to early twentieth century African American reformers may be found in Kevin Gaines, Uplifting the Race.

[35] A discussion of the importance of kinship networks and use of reciprocal relationships among neighbors may be found in Carol Stack, All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1974).

[36] Elizabeth Clapp, Mothers to All Children: Women Reformers and the Rise of the Juvenile Court (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989), 11.

[37] Vivanna Zelizer, Pricing the Priceless Child: The Changing Social Value of Children (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 8.

men in a no-win position. Skilled employment in the first part of the twentieth century was associated with whiteness. The American factory system taught new immigrant groups to measure their social mobility by comparing the work they were assigned to that assigned to African American men. Blacks were assigned and kept in the lowest paid and dirtiest jobs in the factory. The closer his job was to the work done by black men, the less the social status of the worker.[38]

Chronic unemployment and underemployment of African American men made the achievement of sheltered family structure unrealistic for most black families. The economic assumption in the sheltered family model was that men would be the sole economic support for their families while women and children remained within the home led to marital tensions within many working-class black families.[39] Working-class black families had to reconcile the contradiction between the societal assumption that women working outside the home were a threat to male authority and the necessity that working-class women find employment outside the home. Conflicts over authority became a frequent source of quarreling, domestic violence, and desertion in black families.[40]

The fact that the aspirations of black men were constantly being frustrated clearly exacerbated tensions within black families. By the 1920s, differences in the levels of professional attainment between black men and women further aggravated tensions. The number of African American women college graduates was growing, and their willingness to accept the domineering attitude of working-

[38] James Barrett and David Roediger, "The Inbetween People: Nationality and the New Immigrant Working Class," Journal of Ethnic American History 16 no. 3 (1997):3.
[39] Litwack, Trouble in Mind, 350.
[40] Litwack, Trouble in Mind, 350.

class black men was diminishing.[41] In working-class families, because of employment discrimination, there was a continued need for black women to continue to work outside the home. By 1920, the percentage of black women working outside the home was double that of white women.[42] Black women often wished that they could stay at home and raise their children.

W.E.B. Du Bois recognized the harsh price that black families paid because of the clash between the ideal of the sheltered family and the reality of the need for African American families to have dual incomes. He noted that a frequent result of this clash between spouses was broken families.[43] Most African American reformers appear not to have recognized the impact of this clash of culture and reality. In most cases, they seemed to attribute family problems to poor African Americans' lack of standards. An article in the AME Church Review on childrearing epitomizes the attitude of most African American reformers. In this article the author states, "The danger now is, the masses of parents are so rough and tough as to be unable to train others. It is therefore our special work to civilize, Christianize, and educate them until by education their children shall have reached a higher plane of manhood and womanhood."[44] This statement reflects a lack of appreciation and understanding of the reality of many migrants' lives.

Conclusion

[41] Giddings, When and Where I Enter, 196.
[42] In 1920, 17.2% of white women worked outside the home compared to 38.9% of black women. These statistics can be found in Giddings, When and Where I Enter, 196.
[43] Giddings, When and Where I Enter, 197.
[44] "Child Training" AME Church Review 24 No. 2 (Oct., 1907), 173.

In the early twentieth century, African American social thought reflected primarily the influence of the social uplift movement. While not the only influence on African American social reform, social uplift was able to remain an important part of the reform debate for thirty years. Uplift saw individual reform as part of paradigm for advancing civil rights. Advocates of social uplift asserted that advancing civil rights required blacks demonstrate that their values were similar to those of whites. Uplift leaders often expected blacks to live up to a strict moral code. Over time the emphasis on respectability led to class conflicts within the black community that eroded black working class support for social uplift. The influence of social uplift can also be seen in the childrearing advice published in religious and secular publications. African American newspapers and periodicals often defined parenting in terms of racial uplift and moral responsibility. Many among the black elite saw parenting as a means of developing a prosperous business class, viewing good character as a prerequisite for material prosperity. This was especially true of the advice given about raising boys. The advice provided to young men emphasized the connection between good character and material success.

The advice provided in African American publications also reflected the anxiety of the black-middle class. The Great Migration of African Americans to northern cities intensified class tensions within African American communities. Most members of the black middle class were aware that most whites saw blacks as a homogenous group and feared being viewed in the same light as the wave of poor and illiterate blacks migrating from the South. In an effort to protect their

own status, members of the African American middle-class set about reforming the morals of African American migrants. At times this effort led black elites to be harsh in their criticisms of new migrants. Phrases like “the dregs” or “the worst of the race” were not uncommon in middle-class criticisms of black migrants. With regard to parenting, the dominant criticism of migrants was that they failed to set a good example for their children. The religious and secular press frequently chided black parents for their own poor behavior.

Black middle-class anxiety can also be seen in their reactions to African Americans becoming urbanized. For example, they saw commercial entertainment as a threat to the own moral authority. E. Franklin Frazier’s comments on the effect of urbanization represent those of many middle-class African Americans. Frazier saw urban life as undermining the authority of the family and the church. Concerns about urbanization may also be seen in the anxiety over the behavior of young black men. The general view was that the freedom offered by city life was allowing young black men to act irresponsibly.

The first Great Migration of African Americans corresponded to changes in the structure of the American family. Specifically, the transition to a sheltered family model was occurring at the same time as African Americans were migrating to American cities. The sheltered family was predicated on the ability of men to be the sole financial support for their families. Employment discrimination made it difficult for African American families to adapt to this form of family structure. Thus, the fact that black men were restricted to the lowest paying jobs made it difficult for them to be the sole provider for their families.

The clash between the ideal of a sheltered family and the reality of the economic circumstances of most African American migrants appears to have received little notice by most African American reformers. In many cases, black reformers saw uplift as migrants replicating their own experience of self-improvement. In other words, improving the lives of poor and working-class blacks meant replicating the middle-class standards that African American reformers ascribed to.

Chapter 4

Meet Me in St. Louis: African American Life in Progressive-Era St. Louis

This chapter will examine how African American cultural, educational, and political institutions affected the trajectory of the first great African American Migration to St. Louis. It will explain how these institutions helped make St. Louis a desirable city for black migration. It will also explore how, as black migration grew, concerns about white privilege limited the ability of these institutions to contest racial segregation.

St. Louis made a good first impression on many African American migrants. Most African Americans traveled to St. Louis by train, so their first encounter with the city was the integrated Union Station. Roy Wilkins recalled that his father had declared the train station to be a miracle.[1] The boxer Henry Armstrong's family had a similar first reaction to the train station. Armstrong was not only impressed with the freedom of the train station, but also with how his relatives looked and acted. He declared that his relatives "dressed better and walked and talked as if they meant more to themselves and the world."[2]
St. Louis was a North-South border city. The confluence of different racial attitudes led to a lack of white consensus on how to apply racial segregation. Although segregation remained a central factor in the lives of St. Louis African Americans, the lack of rigid racial boundaries made its application uneven.

[1] "Roy Wilkins," Ain't But a Place: An Anthology of African American Writings about St. Louis, ed. Gerald Early (St. Louis: St. Louis Historical Society Press, 1998), 65.
[2] "Henry Armstrong," Ain't But a Place, 71.

American Studies scholar Joseph Heathcott described St. Louis's African American community as an archipelago – a social and cultural space surrounded by racial hostility, in which blacks created political and civic institutions that could contest St. Louis's system of racial apartheid.[3] Indeed, the early development of a functioning black community in St. Louis helped shape the course of race relations in the early-twentieth-century.[4]

African American migrants who came to St. Louis found a dynamic African American community. By the mid-nineteenth century, black St. Louisans had already developed several important civic and cultural institutions. In contrast to southern cities, which did not develop black churches till after the Civil War, by 1863 St. Louis had established six black churches,[5] the first of them started in the late 1820s. In the late 1850s, J. Richard Anderson, the pastor of Second Baptist Church, boasted that he led a congregation of 1,000 members.[6]

St. Louis was also a place where black entrepreneurship was allowed to develop. At one point, African American businessman James Thomas was among the wealthiest men in St. Louis, his wealth estimated at $400,000.00.[7] Thomas used his income from his barbershops and bathhouses to purchase both real estate and railroad stock.[8] What is most remarkable about Thomas's rise to

[3] Joseph Heathcott, "Black Archipelago: Politics and Civic Life in the Jim Crow City," Journal of Social History 38 no. 3 (Spring 2005), 706.
[4] Lawrence Christensen, "Race Relations in St. Louis, 1865-1916," Missouri Historical Review 78 no. 2 (1983), 123.
[5] Christensen, "Race Relations in St. Louis,1865-1916," 25.
[6] Christensen, "Race Relations in St. Louis,1865-1916," 25.
[7] Loren Schweninger, "Within the Lowest Caste: The Financial Activities of James P. Thomas in the Nineteenth South," Journal of Negro History 63 no. 4 (Oct. 1978): 357.
[8] Schweninger, "Within the Lowest Caste," 357.

wealth was his ability to obtain loans to speculate in real estate.[9] But Thomas was not alone in his ability as a black man to acquire property. In the 1850s, African Americans had established a thriving business community in St. Louis. Indeed, in the years prior to the Civil War, there were enough African American property owners in the city for Cyprian Claymorgan to publish *The Colored Aristocracy of St. Louis.*[10]

Within the segregated spaces of St. Louis civic life, African Americans were able to create their own distinct culture. Thus, black creativity found its way into music, dance and sports. Nowhere was this creativity more evident than in popular music, and St. Louis had a reputation for being a city where black musicians could find work.[11] For example, some of the first ragtime music was written and performed in the black saloons of St. Louis.[12] Honest John Turpin's Silver Dollar Saloon became a favorite gathering spot for traveling black musicians. In order to attract customers, Turpin would sponsor piano contests among these traveling musicians. It was out of these contests that ragtime was born.[13] Later, after the king of ragtime Scott Joplin moved to the city, St. Louis became known as the home of ragtime.[14]

Sports were another area of St. Louis civic life where there was a degree of integration. The St. Louis Giants, the city's black baseball team, played

---

[9] Schweninger, "Within the Lowest Caste," 357.
[10] Schweninger, "Within the Lowest Caste," 356.
[11] George Lipsitz, Sidewalks of St. Louis: Places, People, and Politics in an American City, (Columbia, Mo: University of Missouri Press, 1991), 55.
[12] Rose Nolen, Hoecakes, Hambone, and All That Jazz: African American Traditions in Missouri, (Columbia, Mo: University of Missouri Press, 2003), 77.
[13] Nolen, Hoecakes, Hambones and All That Jazz, 77.
[14] Lipsitz, Sidewalks of St. Louis, 55.

in citywide tournaments, winning the 1912 city league championship.[15] Indeed, they developed such a good reputation that in 1921 they played an eight-game series against the city's white professional team, the St. Louis Cardinals. The Giants won three of the eight games.[16] The Giants were disbanded in 1922 and replaced by the St. Louis Stars, which continued the reputation for a high level of play.[17] The Stars played for nine seasons, folding when the Negro League folded in 1931. Prior to that, they won the Negro National League pennant in 1928 and 1930.[18] Among the many great players who played for the Giants and the Stars was James "Cool Papa" Bell, who was both a prolific hitter and base stealer. Commenting on Bell's speed, the great Satchel Paige once said that Bell was so fast he could turn out the light and be in bed before it got dark.[19]

Black Education in St. Louis

Early in their history, African American St. Louisans were active in establishing schools. Despite an 1847 Missouri law prohibiting teaching African Americans to read or write, several black and white churches set up freedom schools for blacks.[20] By 1864, these schools were so well established that they started to receive money from the St. Louis School Board.[21] And in 1865, when

[15] Joel Walsh, "Shining Stars: Negro Leagues in St. Louis," Gateway 3 (Winter 2004-05), 12.
[16] Walsh, "Shining Stars," 14.
[17] Walsh, "Shining Stars," 12.
[18] Walsh, "Shining Stars," 12.
[19] Walsh, "Shining Stars," 14.
[20] Elinor Mondale Gersman, "The Development of Public Education for Blacks in Nineteenth Century St. Louis, Missouri," Journal of Negro Education 411 (Winter 1972), 35.
[21] Gersman, "The Development of Public Education for Blacks in Nineteenth Century St. Louis, Missouri," 35.

the Missouri state constitution allowed the creation of black schools, St. Louis blacks created three elementary schools.[22]

In contrast to the education policies of the South, St. Louis provided greater access to elementary and secondary education for black children. By 1903, the St. Louis Board of Education had established 13 schools and was employing 130 African American teachers for 5,000 students.[23] In 1916, The New York Age described the St. Louis schools as follows, "It is generally known that St. Louis school system as a whole ranks among the best in the country. But the fact that schools for colored children, for they have separate schools in St. Louis, is conducted on the same plane in every particular as those for white children."[24] Throughout the early-twentieth-century, the St. Louis School Board continued to address the needs of African American students. At the height of the Great Migration in the 1920s, the board converted Lincoln Grade School and Pope Elementary School to African American schools to accommodate the increased number of black students.[25]

African Americans held the St. Louis schools in high regard, partly because of Sumner High School. The South offered African Americans few opportunities to attend high school, using a variety of tactics to limit African American access to education. For example, in Mississippi African American

[22] Gersman, "The Development of Public Education for Blacks in Nineteenth Century St. Louis, Missouri," 35.
[23] St. Louis Palladium, "A Negro on the School Board," 8 April, 1903, 1.
[24] James L. Usher, "St. Louis Schools a Potent Influence," New York Age, 14 December, 1916, 1.
[25] "The Crisis," Education, November 1920, 36.

boys above the age of eight were permitted to go to school four months a year.[26] Letters from black migrants to *The Chicago Defender* demonstrates the importance of education to African American families. One man from New Orleans expressed his frustration with education in the South in the following way, "… Our poll tax paid state and parish taxes yet with these donations we cannot get schools."[27] This man's feelings were shared by other African Americans in the South. For example, a man from Alexandria, Louisiana, wrote, "I have been here all my life but I would be glad to go where I can educate my children. Where they could be a service to themselves, and this will never be here."[28]

The history of Sumner High School illustrates the commitment of St. Louis African American community to education. Sumner was established in the 1870s after the state legislature was informed that it was legally obligated to provide funds for a black high school.[29] The process of creating Sumner required continuous vigilance on the part of St. Louis African American community to ensure that black children were provided an adequate education.

One of the first issues addressed by African Americans was the quality of teachers in black schools. In 1877, African Americans were able to get the school board to agree to ensure that teachers in black schools pass the board's teacher exam. But first they had to get the board to agree to allow black teachers to sit for

[26] Litwack. Trouble in Mind,165.
[27] Letter to Chicago Defender 5-9-1917, Journal of Negro History 4 no. 4 (Oct. 1919): 434.
[28] Letter to the Chicago Defender 4-23/1911, Journal of Negro History 4 no. 4 (Oct. 1919): 434.
[29] Gersman, "The Development of Public Education for Blacks in Nineteenth Century St. Louis, Missouri," 37.

the exam.[30] The board started hiring black teachers for black schools in 1877.[31] The St. Louis school superintendent was able to declare in 1903 that Sumner High School was equal to any white high school.[32]

A continued concern for black parents was the location of Sumner High School. Many black parents worried about the safety of their children as they walked to and from school. In the 1870s, the St. Louis School Board chose Washington Elementary School as the site for Sumner High. Located close to downtown, the new Sumner High School was far away from most African American neighborhoods. As a result, black children had to walk long distances and past the city jail and the stockyards to get to high school.[33] Blacks began to petition for a new high school in 1896. The new high school was finally built in 1910.[34]

Sumner was an important asset to the St. Louis African American community. It had a national reputation for academic excellence. In 1916 *The New York Age* lauded Sumner for inculcating and fostering the proper desire for higher education.[35] The article went on to attribute Sumner's success to the school board's desire to make Sumner equal to white high schools.[36] In 1920,

---

[30] Gersman, "The Development of Public Education for Blacks in Nineteenth Century St. Louis, Missouri," 38.
[31] Gersman, "The Development of Public Education for Blacks in Nineteenth Century St. Louis, Missouri," 38.
[32] Gersman, "The Development of Public Education for Blacks in Nineteenth Century St. Louis, Missouri," 44.
[33] Gersman, "The Development of Public Education for Blacks in Nineteenth Century St. Louis, Missouri," 36.
[34] Gersman, "The Development of Public Education for Blacks in Nineteenth Century St. Louis, Missouri," 45.
[35] Usher, "St. Louis Schools: A Potent Influence," New York Age, 14 December, 1916, 2.
[36] Usher, "St. Louis Schools: A Potent Influence," New York Age, 14 December, 1916, 1.

Ormond Forte praised Sumner in *the Cleveland Advocate.* His editorial made the following observation, "I saw eleven hundred faces – children of Ethiopia – in whose faces I discerned the sign of awakened consciousness. A new bearing was theirs – a bearing of righteous pride."[37]

The Committee for Social Services with Colored People

While St. Louis made an effort to accommodate the educational needs of black students, it did little to help with other aspects of African American life. Social services for African Americans were strictly segregated, and as a result limited. The operation of the Committee for Social Services with Colored People (CSSACP) illustrates the problems faced by African Americans to secure social services.

The CSSACP was created in April of 1910.[38] The committee was composed of fifteen members; five white members from the social service conference, five members from the National Association of Colored Club Women, and five members of African American fraternal organizations. The CSSACP was a racially progressive organization. It defined its mission as "the removal of discrimination against colored people in any public or private agency for social betterment."[39] While its stated aim was the elimination of discrimination in the delivery of social service agencies, the committee operated within the city's segregated social welfare system. There is no evidence that the CSSACP

[37] Ormond A. Forte, "St. Louis Colored High School Students Furnish New Hope for Race in America," Cleveland Advocate, 4 December, 1920, 1.
[38] The CSSACP later became the St. Louis chapter of the Urban League.
[39] Minutes of Meeting of Committee for Social Service Among Colored People, nd, Special Collections, Washington University, St. Louis.

attempted to pressure the majority of social service agencies to accept African American clients, rather the committee worked with those agencies and hospitals that already accepted African American clients.

Improvement in the delivery of services from public agencies already dealing with African Americans was a major focus for the CSSACP. Its goals included: to secure adequate provisions for African American boys at the state industrial school, secure state provision for the care for delinquent African American girls, and improve the conditions for blind African American children at the state school for the blind.[40]

The one exception to this policy was CSSACP's advocacy for African American children with the St. Louis Board of Children's Guardians, a publicly funded agency child placement agency established in 1912 to assist public and private agencies with foster care placements. In January of 1914, the CSSACP's committee on child welfare noted that the Board of Children's Guardians was not placing African American children in foster care. The committee responded by writing a letter to the Board of Children's Guardians to request that the agency start accepting black children.[41] When the Board of Children's Guardians did not respond, the CSSACP formed a committee to speak to the Board's administrator. In July of 1914, the Board of Children's Guardians agreed to accept African American children for placement.

[40] Committee for Social Service Among Colored People, Plans for 1911-1912, Special Collections, Washington University, St. Louis.
[41] Minutes of Committee for Social Service Among Colored People January 14, 1914, Special Collections, Washington University, St. Louis.

The Committee for Social Services Among Colored People took an active role in advocating for better treatment for African American boys at the State Industrial School for Boys at Booneville, Mo. In 1910, Sarah Young, chairwoman of the child welfare committee, reported on the poor conditions for African American boys at the school. Among her concerns were that the boys lacked adequate clothing and that their living conditions were unsanitary. Young also noted that African American boys were excluded from learning skilled trades.[42] In response to Young's concern, the CSSAP drafted letters to the Governor and the Head of the State Committee on Corrections and Charities. [43] The actions of the CSSACP appeared to have helped in improving the conditions for African American boys at Booneville. However, implementing the needed changes took great persistence on the part of groups like the CSSACP. Committee minutes for January 1912 indicate that the managers of Booneville had not spent the $10,000.00 allocated by the state legislature to improve the conditions of the boys' cottages at the industrial school. The committee decided to have its secretary look into the matter.[44]

The foot dragging by the managers at Booneville and the response of the St. Louis Board of Children demonstrate the limited influence of the CSSACP. While both these institutions agreed to improve services for African American

[42] Minutes of Committee for Social Service Among Colored People February 7, 1910, Special Collections, Washington University, St. Louis.
[43] Chairman of Committee for Social Service Among Colored People to Wm T Cross Secretary State Board of Charities and Corrections, December 29,1910, Special Collections, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.
[44] Minutes of Committee for Social Service Among Colored People, January 16, 1912, Special Collections, Washington University, St. Louis.

children, their follow-through was poor. In the case of Boonville, it took more than two years to get the industrial school's administrators to spend the money allocated for improvement in the boys living conditions. The same pattern of passive-aggressiveness can be seen in the response of the Board of Children's Guardians. Indeed, the CSSACP's own records document the lack of follow through by the Board of Children's Guardians. In discussing the future of the St. Louis Colored Orphans Home, several members of the committee complained of the lack of a child placing agency for African American children. This discussion took place three years after the Board agreed to accept African American children. The Board of Children's Guardians continued to resist accepting African American children for placement. In 1916, the Board of Guardians handled 1,416 cases. Of these, only 19 were African American children. [45]

St. Louis Provident Association

For the most part, the delivery of social services in St. Louis was segregated. Most white social service agencies did not accept African American clients. The expectation was that African Americans would use services from African American agencies or go without. The major exception to this rule was the St. Louis Provident Association (SLPA), the city's oldest and most influential social welfare agency. Established in 1860 to help provide relief to the city's poor, the SLPA exercised a great deal of control over the delivery of social services in St. Louis by the twentieth century.

[45] Ruth Chavis, "Poverty and Relief Among Negroes of St. Louis" (Masters Thesis University of Missouri, 1919) Appendix A.

Throughout the early-twentieth-century, the primary focus of the SLPA was providing assistance to St. Louis's poor. The goal of the SLPA was the efficient and scientific management of assistance to the poor that would reduce incidences of fraud and duplication. The goal of charitable organizations was not only to provide assistance but also to diagnose and treat the individual causes of poverty.[46] African Americans were regular recipients of assistance from the SLPA.

Table 4.1 documents a 20-year history of welfare assistance provided to African Americans.[47] The information in Table 4.1 demonstrates that the percentage assistance provided by the SLPA to African Americans was relatively constant over the twenty years depicted. The gradual increase in the number of blacks receiving assistance can be explained by the increase in St. Louis's African American population, which more than doubled in this period of time.

In fact, as a percentage of the city's African American population, the number of African Americans receiving assistance was very small. It was not until 1916 that the number of African Americans seeking assistance from the SLPA reached 1% of the total African American population. This low percentage is quite remarkable given the high rate of poverty among St. Louis's African American community.

[46] Trattner, From Poor Law to Welfare State, 92.
[47] The data in this chart was drawn from information provided in a Chavis, "Poverty and Relief Among Negroes of St. Louis". The reason 1909 is blank is that this master's thesis did not have data for 1909.

Table 4.1. Welfare Assistance Provided by the SLPA to African Americans 1897-1916

Year	Total No. of Aid Recipients	African Americans Receiving Aid	Percent of African Americans Receiving assistance .
1897	3148	447	14.2
1898	2446	430	16.3
1899	1975	261	13.2
1900	1697	212	12.5
1901	2091	472	22.5
1902	1941	435	22.4
1903	1618	248	17.5
1904	1777	330	18.5
1905	1706	298	16.9
1906	1706	309	18.1
1907	2339	356	15.6
1908	2026	423	20.8
1909			
1910	1919	355	18.5
1911	5146	1044	20.3
1912	3363	418	23.7
1913	4847	738	15.0
1914	10443	2736	26.2
1915	4473	753	17.1
1916	3667	652	17.7

African Americans often used welfare assistance as a stopgap measure. A review of fifty cases of African Americans seeking assistance from the SLPA supports this contention. Thirty-seven of the fifty cases reviewed were requests for clothing, food, and coal.[48] African Americans were strategic in their use of welfare agencies. They used them to get the material assistance they needed, but often resisted the efforts of caseworkers to intrude into their lives. Once their immediate needs were met, many found ways to resist the interventions of their caseworkers,[49] frequently falling back on their own traditions of mutual aid in times of crisis. These patterns of mutual exchange allowed them to expand their family boundaries in times of crisis.[50]

The SLPA also used its wealth and influence to assist in the development of some African American social welfare organizations. For example, it took over the management of the Mound City Settlement, the city's only African American settlement, in 1915. Mound City was established in 1913 to help African Americans assimilate into St. Louis society. After several years of operation, the settlement's board of directors requested that the SLPA to take over management. The SLPA incorporated Mound City's existing board, which included African Americans as a standing committee within the SLPA. The SLPA also housed the St. Louis Urban League until it became its own agency in 1919.

[48] Chavis, "Poverty and Relief Among Negroes of St. Louis", 23.
[49] Tice, "Mending Rosa's 'Working Ways', 36.
[50] James Bochert, Alley Life in Washington D.C.: Family, Community, Religion and Folklife, 1850-1970, (Urbana,Ill,: University of Illinois Press, 1980), 85.

African American Political Influence in St. Louis

Because of its long history, by the early-twentieth-century, St. Louis's African American community had developed the political skill and leadership to thwart efforts to impose Jim Crow-style laws.[51] Missouri had a long history of competitive elections. The fact that neither party had a stronghold on power meant that interest groups played an important role in determining the outcome of elections.[52] Blacks could not control elections, but in close elections their support could be crucial.[53] St. Louis's political divisions date back to the Civil War. James Thomas described the city's political sentiments in the following way, "Most of St. Louis old wealthy families were southern in their sentiments. A good many Northerners and some foreigners joined their ranks to be classed as aristocrats. Most German immigrants were free soil and opposed to slavery."[54]

St. Louis's German immigrant support for the Republican Party was greater than was in other American cities.[55] During the Civil War, the city's German immigrant population was among the most radical of the Radical Republicans, strongly supporting the elimination of slavery and the enlisting of black soldiers in the Union Army.[56] Further, in the presidential election of 1860,

[51] Christensen, "Race Relations in St. Louis, 1865-1916," 23.
[52] Katherine Colbert and Mary Seematter, "No Crystal Stair: Black St. Louis, 1920-1940," Gateway Heritage 8 no. 2 (Fall 1995): 84.
[53] Corbett and Seematter, "No Crystal Stair," 83.
[54] "James Thomas" Ain't But a Place, 49.
[55] Kristen Anderson, "German Americans, African Americans and the Republican Party in St. Louis, 1865-1872," Journal of American Ethnic History 28 no. 1 (Fall 2008): 34.
[56] Anderson, "German Americans, African Americans and the Republican Party in St. Louis 1865-1872," 34.

Lincoln received approximately 80% of the St. Louis German immigrant vote.[57] German American support for the Republican Party remained constant throughout most of the nineteenth century, but after the Civil War its support for the radical faction of the party began to wane.[58] An important factor in their decreased support for Radical Republicans was the issue of black suffrage. In 1868, Radical Republicans proposed an amendment to the state constitution guaranteeing African American suffrage. Many German immigrants feared that blacks would side with nativist elements within the Republican Party and, therefore, voted against the amendment.[59]

The fight over black enfranchisement provides one of the first examples of black political activism. In 1867, under the leadership of J. Milton Turner, black St. Louisans organized the Missouri Equal Rights League to pressure Radical Republicans to allow an amendment on black suffrage.[60] The league sponsored both a rally and a parade to promote black suffrage. The group had enough influence that the rally attracted as speakers both the Republican governor and the speaker of the house.[61] However, although pressure from black groups helped get the amendment on the ballot, blacks could not get the amendment passed.[62]

---

[57] Anderson, "German Americans, African Americans and the Republican Party in St. Louis, 1865-1872," 34.
[58] Anderson, "German Americans, African Americans and the Republican Party in St. Louis, 1865-1872," 36.
[59] Anderson, "German Americans, African Americans and the Republican Party, 1865-1872," 41.
[60] Christensen, "Race Relations in St. Louis,1865-1916," 130.
[61] Christensen, "Race Relations in St. Louis,1865-1916," 130.
[62] Christensen, "Race Relations in St. Louis,1865-1916," 130.

The defeat of the amendment points to a pattern that would define African American political activism in the early-twentieth-century. That is, African American political influence was limited when the issue at hand involved a significant redefinition of white privilege. In the case of voting rights, conservative politicians exploited racial fears by accusing the state's Republican leadership of going too far in support of racial equality.[63] Accusations of pandering to blacks would follow Republican leaders for most of the early-twentieth-century. Democrats used the issue of race in elections to fan the fears of white voters.[64] Republicans often found themselves in the position of trying to keep African American political support without alienating white voters. As a result, blacks often had to settle for less than they expected for their support.[65]

As mentioned, St. Louis's African American politicians were adept at using their leverage to block the state legislature from passing Jim Crow forms of legislation. In the first decade of the twentieth century, rural Democrats made two attempts to mandate segregated rail travel. The first attempt, in 1903, was backed by Republican lawmakers.[66] The second attempt occurred in 1907. In this case, a coalition of Republicans and urban Democrats prevented the legislation from passing.[67] The importance of the black vote in St. Louis can be seen in the

[63] Anderson, German Americans, African Americans and the Republican Party 1865-1872," 36.
[64] Lawrence Christiansen, "Black St. Louis: A Study in Race Relations, 1865-1916" (PhD Dissertation, University of Missouri, 1972), 125.
[65] Lorenzo Greene and Gary Kreamer, Missouri's Black Heritage (Columbia, Mo: University of Missouri Press, 1993), 106.
[66] Christensen, "Race Relations in St. Louis, 1865-1916," 132.
[67] Greene and Kreamer, Missouri's Black Heritage, 110.

fact that two Democratic state senators, with black voters in their districts, chose to walk out of the chamber rather than vote for this legislation.[68]

In the 1900 elections, St. Louis's Democratic machine made a concerted effort to attract African American voters, attempting to take advantage of black disappointment with the Republicans over a lack of patronage jobs.[69] African American politicians formed an independent political organization that was amenable to Democratic overtures. This organization was able to sway some black voters into supporting Democratic candidates in the elections of 1900 and 1901.[70] But the introduction by rural Democrats of a railroad segregation bill in 1903 ended the alliance between African American St. Louisans and the St. Louis Democratic machine.[71]

By 1915, African Americans constituted an important voting bloc in the Republican Party. Black support for the Republican Party made sense on a practical level. The Republican machine dominated mayoral races for most of the first two decades of the twentieth century.[72] Black politicians made the decision to maximize their influence on a local level, recognizing that their influence on state and national elections was minimal.[73] For example, they used their

[68] Christensen, "Race Relations in St. Louis, 1865-1916," 132.
[69] Greene and Kreamer, Missouri's Black Heritage, 112.
[70] Greene and Kreamer, Missouri's Black Heritage, 110-111.
[71] Greene and Kreamer, Missouri's Black Heritage, 110-111.
[72] St. Louis had a Republican mayor from 1909-1924.
[73] Mary Welek, "Jordan Chambers: Black Politician and Boss," Journal of Negro History 57 no. 4, (1972): 353.

influence in the local Republican Party to elect their first city official in 1918, when Charles Turpin was elected constable.[74]

An important turning point in St. Louis politics occurred in 1923. The reform wing of the Democratic Party wanted to pass a bond issue for infrastructure repairs, the largest bond issue in the city's history. Sensing African American dissatisfaction with the Republican Party after the passage of the residential segregation ordinance in 1916, reform Democrats and their business allies actively courted the black vote.[75] As part of their effort to win black support, the Democrats promised to include in the bond issue money to build a new hospital for African Americans.[76] A modern hospital to replace the decrepit City Hospital #2 had long been a priority for black leaders. Consequently, the promise of a million dollars to build a new facility was a strong inducement for black voters. Helped by large margins in the city's black wards, the bond issue passed.[77] Unfortunately, after the election, white politicians went back on their promise to build a new hospital, proposing instead to make improvements to the existing City Hospital #2.[78]

African Americans' experience with the 1923 bond issue demonstrates the limitations of black political power. In many ways, blacks were still limited to what white politicians thought that they deserved. Political alliances produced results that were tentative and often short lived. One other point has to be made about

[74] Corbett and Seematter, "No Crystal Stair," 84.
[75] Heathcott, "Black Archipelago," 723.
[76] Lipsitz, Sidewalks of St. Louis, 55.
[77] Heathcott, "Black Archipelago," 723.
[78] Lipsitz, Sidewalks of St. Louis, 52-53.

the building of a new black hospital. African Americans were tenacious about getting their needs met. It took another thirteen years of agitation before the Homer G. Phillips Hospital was built, but it did happen.[79]

Housing as a Form of White Privilege – 1916 Referendum on Residential Segregation

The clearest example of the limitations of African American political influence was seen in their inability to defeat the 1916 referendum on residential segregation. The historian Grace Elizabeth Hale notes that modern segregation attempted to counter a world in which people frequently moved beyond the local by creating racial identity anonymously as well as through spatially grounded signifiers. Hale's emphasis on the importance of spatial signifiers in the creation of a modern American system of segregation helps explain why residential segregation became a central feature of American apartheid. In this new system of segregation, the color line signified the division between white belonging and black difference.[80] As America became increasingly urban, the city neighborhood became an important signifier of white privilege. Residential segregation sought to ground the changing city landscape into a code that would be recognizable to new migrants.[81]

In the early-twentieth-century, the transient nature of city life made neighborhoods unreliable markers of racial privilege. Middle- and working-class

[79] Lipsitz, Sidewalks of St. Louis, 53.
[80] Grace Elizabeth Hale, Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890-1940 (New York: Vintage Books, 1999), 135-136.
[81] Gretchen Boger, "The Meaning of the Neighborhood in the Modern City: Baltimore's Residential Segregation ordinances 1910-1913," Journal of Urban History, 35 no. 2 (Jan 2009): 234.

whites discovered that due to the increased mobility of African Americans, the racial character of a neighborhood could change within a short period of time.[82] In many cases, middle- and working-class whites were moving into neighborhoods that more affluent whites had recently left. Part of the decision on where to move was based on acquiring the status of these neighborhoods. For many whites, maintaining the social status of city neighborhoods meant keeping them white.[83] Thus, whites used residential segregation as a way to protect their social and financial investment in whiteness.

St. Louis was not the first city to attempt to enforce residential segregation by city ordinance. The St. Louis ordinance was based on a similar ordinance passed in Baltimore.[84] In 1911 and 1912, white neighborhood associations introduced a Baltimore-type ordinance to the St. Louis Municipal Assembly. In both cases, fearing the anger of black voters, the ordinance was blocked by Republican councilmen.

Frustrated by their lack of success in the Municipal Assembly, the St. Louis Real Estate Exchange organized the United Welfare Association (UWA) to unify neighborhood groups favoring residential segregation.[85] After a 1914 change in the city charter that allowed for initiative and referendum, the UWA collected the signatures needed to place residential segregation on the ballot.[86]

---

[82] Boger, "The Meaning of the Neighborhood in the Modern City," 234.
[83] Boger, "The Meaning of the Neighborhood in the Modern City," 234.
[84] Carl Nightingale, "The Transnational Contexts of Early Twentieth Century American Urban Segregation," Journal of Social History 39 no.3 (Spring 2006), 667.
[85] Christensen, "Race Relations in St. Louis, 1865-1916," 128.
[86] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 228.

St. Louis's African American population was not large enough to determine the outcome of an election, their support could be critical in close elections. In 1916, there were approximately 10,000 African Americans registered to vote in the city.[87] Blacks at this time were still dependent on alliances with white voters. Since the size of St. Louis's African American electorate was small, much of the battle against the initiative fell to the city's white leaders.[88] The dependence of blacks on white support placed St. Louis's city leaders in a difficult position. The pressure to work with blacks in defeating this initiative ran against their core beliefs about the role of blacks in American society. The city's white leaders were largely opposed to any form black advocacy, favoring the gradualist approach advocated by Booker T. Washington that blacks should avoid political activism.[89] As a result, St. Louis civic elites responded to the initiative by offering tepid and minimal opposition. Most of the city's civic organizations and newspapers came out against the initiative, but their opposition came too late in the campaign to make much of a difference. They also avoided working directly with African American groups opposing the law.[90]

The response of St. Louis civic leaders was similar to that of other American cities. Carl Nightingale, in his article about Baltimore's residential segregation ordinances, suggests that Baltimore's elite's passive opposition allowed the city's middle and working class to act out their beliefs without risking

[87] D. Kelleher, "St. Louis 1916 Residential Segregation Ordinance," Missouri Historical Society Bulletin 27 (1970): 242.
[88] Kelleher, "St. Louis 1916 Residential Segregation Ordinance," 242.
[89] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 235.
[90] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 260.

much of their own status.[91] A similar pattern can be seen in St. Louis. A case in point is the role played by St. Louis Catholic Archbishop James Cardinal Glennon. Despite several requests by opponents of the initiative for a statement opposing the initiative, he remained silent.[92] Only after the initiative passed did the cardinal make a statement indicating that the ordinance was inconsistent with Catholic teaching. In the same statement, Cardinal Glennon excused Catholics who had voted for the initiative by insisting that they were acting as homeowners.[93] Glennon's attributing the actions of St. Louis Catholics to their status as homeowners seemed to validate the main argument of initiative supporters that housing integration would drive down home values. The archbishop also did little to restrain Catholic priests who actively supported residential segregation. For example, both Father Shields at St. Matthews and Father O'Rourke at St. Marks promoted residential segregation in their parishes.[94]

Much of the rhetoric used by the initiative proponents reflects how African American migration created a sense of racial panic in the city. As the campaign progressed, overt appeals to white superiority became more common. A letter from the head of the Real Estate Exchange Felix Lawrence expressed the views of many white St. Louisans, "How can we afford to let the Negro whip the white

[91] Nightingale, "The Transnational Contexts of Early Twentieth Century American Urban Segregation," 684.
[92] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 260.
[93] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 260.
[94] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 141-142.

man in this election. Shall such a report as that go out over the nation."[95] African Americans moving out of their assigned racial position was also a common theme. For example, Father O'Rourke at St. Marks described the idea that blacks could live in the same neighborhoods as whites as a sign of their impudence.[96]

African American leadership was divided over the issue of political activism.[97] Urban migration had created a new type of black leadership, who rejected Booker T. Washington's admonition to avoid political activism.[98] In St. Louis, men like George Vashon and Homer G. Phillips used black political influence to advance the interests of the black community. In contrast to these men were St. Louis's ministerial community, who promoted Washington's view that African Americans focus on for self-reliance and self-help.[99]

This conflict over activism affected the way advocacy was practiced in St. Louis. The St. Louis chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) was slow to develop, and for most 1910 it was poorly organized and ineffective. In 1914, the national office of the NAACP received a message from St. Louis stating that the chapter had disbanded.[100] NAACP headquarters was so concerned over receiving this news that it sent Katherine Johnson from the office in New York to coordinate opposition to the initiative. Even after Ms. Johnson's arrival, the NAACP and church groups continued to

[95] Kelleher, "St. Louis 1916 Residential Segregation Ordinance," 224.
[96] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 242.
[97] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 235.
[98] Welek, "Jordan Chambers," 353.
[99] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 254.
[100] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 236.

find it difficult to work together.[101]

These conflicts led to a delay in organizing against the initiative to legalize residential segregation. Black groups did not meet until 1915 to coordinate their actions.[102] The outcome of the election was that the initiative passed in February of 1916 by a three-to-one margin.[103] However, the ordinance never went into effect. Shortly after it passed, the United States Supreme Court struck down a similar ordinance in Louisville, Kentucky. Nevertheless, the defeat of the ordinance was by no means a victory for advocates of racial integration. St. Louis achieved the same level of residential segregation through the use of restrictive covenants.[104]

Housing Conditions for African American St. Louisans

At the start of the twentieth century, most St. Louisans considered housing to be a scarce commodity. The growth of business and industry pushed many working class St. Louisans out of their old neighborhoods.[105] At the same time as the amount of land available for residential development decreased, the city's population increased. From 1890-1910, the population of St. Louis increased by 200,000.[106] Table 4.2 compares the percentage growth in St. Louis's white and nonwhite population over a 30-year period.

[101] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 254-255.
[102] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 236.
[103]Heathcott, "Black Archipelago," 716.
[104] Heathcott, "Black Archipelago," 717.
[105] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 133.
[106] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 133.

Table 4.2. Percentage Population Changes for St. Louis's Whites and Nonwhites 1900-1930[107]

Year	White Population	% Change	Nonwhite Population	% Change
1900	575,238		35,516	
1910	687,029	19%	43,960	24%
1920	772,897	12%	69,854	59%
1930	821,960	6%	93,580	34%

It is clear from Table 4.2 that the city's nonwhite population grew at a much faster rate than the white population. In this time period, the city's black population grew by 67%, while the white population grew by only 12%.[108] Yet the amount of land available for black settlement did not increase.[109]

Blacks faced white opposition regardless of what area of the city they tried to move into.[110] Resistance was most intense when African Americans tried to move into the west-central corridor of the city. In the early-twentieth-century, the west end of the city had grown at a phenomenal rate. Over a twenty-year period, the western wards grew from 12.9% of the city population to 27.1%.[111] Most of this expansion was due to whites moving out of the crowded eastern areas of the city. The white population in the west-central corridor expanded from 44,736 to 68,381.[112] In this same time period, the black population expanded from 4,025 to

[107] This chart was taken from Heathcott, "Black Archipelago," 709.
[108] Heathcott, "Black Archipelago," 707.
[109] Heathcott, "Black Archipelago," 707.
[110] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 137.
[111] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 139.
[112] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 139.

7,428.[113]

Despite the vigorous opposition of whites, the boundaries of St. Louis's African American neighborhoods gradually moved north and westward.[114] The most common method of white resistance was the formation of neighborhood associations. Developed with the help of the Real Estate Exchange Board, neighborhood associations were intended to protect neighborhoods from the "immanent Colored invasion."[115] These groups served a number of purposes, including intimidating blacks who had recently purchased houses in predominantly white neighborhoods into selling their property.[116] Neighborhood associations became a formidable force in city politics, making up the backbone of the 1916 residential segregation initiative.[117]

Neighborhood associations also attempted to block further expansion in neighborhoods where blacks were already settled. This was especially true in the Ellardsville neighborhood. Ellardsville, also called the "ville" by local black residents, was one of the few black neighborhoods in the western wards of the city. Black settlement in the area dates back to the 1870s.[118] Over time, the ville became the home of St. Louis's African American professional and managerial class. It also became the site of several important African American institutions in

[113] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 139.
[114] Corbett and Seematter, "No Crystal Stair," 83.
[115] Heathcott, "Black Archipelago," 717.
[116] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 145.
[117] Heathcott, "Black Archipelago," 717.
[118] Sandra Schoenberg and Charles Bailey, "The Symbolic Meaning of an Elite Black Community: The Ville in St. Louis," Missouri Historical Society Bulletin 33 (1976): 94.

the city, including Sumner High School, Antioch Baptist Church, St. James AME Church, and Poro College of Beauty and Culture.[119]

In 1908 white neighborhood groups attempted to block further black expansion into the ville by preventing the building of a new Sumner High School in the area. White neighborhood groups proposed building a public park on the land slated for Sumner High School.[120] This proposal was defeated, and Sumner was built in the ville in 1910.

Having failed in that arena, whites attempted to isolate the ville by restrictive covenants.[121] Most blacks lived in the eastern and river wards of the city.[122] These were St. Louis's oldest and densest neighborhoods. In the first decade of the twentieth century, the St. Louis ghetto was a multiethnic community, where African Americans shared neighborhoods with Italian and Jewish immigrants.[123] However by 1910, the process of residential segregation was in full swing, and by 1920 racial isolation was the norm. In a short time, St. Louis's central corridor was transformed into the "Negro District."[124]

The amount of space available for black settlement did not keep pace with the exponential growth of St. Louis's African American population. In the first decades of the twentieth century, St. Louis's black population tripled, but the amount of land available for settlement remained relatively unchanged.[125] The

[119] Schoenberg and Bailey, "The Symbolic Meaning of an Elite Black Community," 95.
[120] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 140.
[121] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 140.
[122] Schoenberg and Bailey, "The Symbolic Meaning of an Elite Black Community," 96.
[123] Heathcott, "Black Archipelago," 709.
[124] Heathcott, "Black Archipelago," 709.
[125] Heathcott, "Black Archipelago," 709.

inability of blacks to expand into new neighborhoods made over crowded neighborhoods a severe problem for African Americans. City planners estimated the population density of black neighborhoods to be 81 people per acre, whereas the city average was 12 per acre.[126]

A 1908 survey by the Civic League found that the average lot size in ghetto neighborhoods was 25 ft by 125 ft. On these lots, landlords built two to three multi-story wood structures.[127] The survey went on to note that over 50% of these structures were unfit for human habitation.[128] The Civic League was most concerned about the buildings' lack of adequate ventilation, sanitation, and drinking water.[129] In order to accommodate all the new migrants, landlords constructed flimsy wood huts between the buildings.[130] In many cases, black housing spilled into the alleys. Places like Clabby Alley developed a reputation as a center of crime and disease.[131]

In what can only be considered a bitter irony, African Americans paid higher rents for less adequate housing. For example, the average rent in 1908 for a single room was $4.36 for whites and $4.49 for African Americans. The same pattern held true for apartments. A one-bedroom apartment for whites rented for $14.00 a month, while African Americans paid $18.00.[132]

---

[126] Greene and Kreamer, Missouri's Black Heritage, 113.
[127] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 152.
[128] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 153.
[129] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 152.
[130] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 153.
[131] Greene and Kreamer, Missouri's Black Heritage, 113.
[132] Christensen, "Black St. Louis," 157.

Conclusion

St. Louis's African American community's dynamic history affected the course of race relations in the city in the early twentieth century. As a North-South border city, St. Louis provided African American the space needed to develop civic institutions and leaders that contested attempts to impose Jim Crow-style segregation. Consequently, the application of segregation by whites in St. Louis was incomplete. Areas of St. Louis civic life remained integrated. The lack of total segregation helped make St. Louis a desirable site for migration. Thus, black migrants to the city could immediately tell the difference between St. Louis and the Deep South. Access to integrated public transportation and libraries along with the new assertiveness of their friends and family made a positive impression for most African American migrants to St. Louis.

One of the most important consequences of St. Louis's long-standing black community was that African Americans developed a history of advocacy with white elites. By the early twentieth century, St. Louis's black community had developed the political skills needed to press whites to address their concerns. African American politicians were skillful in using the competitive political environment to prevent new forms of segregation from becoming law. African Americans frequently charted an independent political course. For example, when it was to their advantage, African Americans periodically abandoned their allegiance to the Republican Party to support Democratic candidates and causes.

The relatively small size of St. Louis's black population severely limited its ability to influence the outcome of elections. The fact that they were dependent on alliances with sympathetic whites made African Americans vulnerable to the whims of white politicians. In cases where political issues involved a significant redefinition of white privilege, white elites could not be counted on for support. The 1916 initiative on residential segregation is one of the clearest examples of how traditional white allies abandoned African Americans. By 1916, housing had become emblematic of white privilege. In the face of intense white support for residential segregation, the city's white elites offered only half-hearted opposition to the initiative. They attempted to stay above the fray, while allowing middle- and working-class whites to act out their beliefs.

Even in cases where privilege was not at stake, African Americans could not always count on white support. When in 1923, white politicians went back on their agreement to provide funds for a new African American hospital, for example, blacks were powerless to stop their betrayal. At the same time, this event demonstrates how, when an issue was important to them, African Americans could be determined in their continued efforts to meet the needs of their community. Thus, it took another thirteen years, but St. Louis's African American community did get its hospital.

The one area where African American advocacy was most effective was education. As early as the 1840s, African American St. Louisans were organizing schools. St. Louis's black leadership effectively lobbied both local and state agencies in support of black education. The effectiveness of black advocacy may

be seen in the fact that a large number of black teachers were employed in the St. Louis city schools and the fair treatment they received there. Sumner High School was another example of the effectiveness of black advocacy. Started in the 1870s, Sumner was one of the first black high schools west of the Mississippi. It developed a national reputation for academic excellence.

In the area of child welfare, African American advocacy was less effective. The history of the CSSACP demonstrates the limited success African American had in dealing with white child welfare institutions. The relationships with the State Industrial School for Boys and the Board of Children's Guardians were more ephemeral than real. These institutions were slow to implement changes that would benefit African American children, and only did so after persistent pressure from African Americans.

The passive-aggressive approach taken by many white child welfare institutions suggests that they were comfortable with St. Louis's system of racial segregation. Unlike the school district, which was legally obligated to support African American education, most child welfare funding came from private sources. Had St. Louis philanthropists been opposed to segregation, they could have used their influence to change the system. The clearest example of this unwillingness was the inability of the CSSACP to improve the conditions at the Colored Orphans Home.

African Americans did have access to welfare benefits through the SLPA. The Provident Association treated all its clients equally. However, it employed a pattern of segregation in the delivery of welfare services. That is, black

caseworkers were limited to working with white clients and they were paid less than their white coworkers.

Racial segregation remained a central factor in the lives of African American St. Louisans. Nowhere is this more evident than in the area of housing. In part because of the increased demand for adequate housing, race became an important factor in organizing where people lived. The lack of adequate housing led to housing becoming a part of white privilege, with white neighborhoods becoming a spatial signifier of white privilege. When the residential segregation ordinance was ruled unconstitutional, white homeowners turned to racial covenants to keep African Americans from moving into their neighborhoods. This proved to be a highly effective way to maintain residential segregation.

The effectiveness of white resistance to black settlement resulted in St. Louis's blacks being forced to live in overcrowded and substandard neighborhoods. With the exception of the ville, African Americans ended up living in the oldest and densest areas of the city and in substandard housing.

Life for African Americans in St. Louis was not easy. On a daily basis, they had to endure the insults that come with racial segregation. Yet, life in St. Louis was better than the areas they had left behind in the Deep South. Historians of black migration describe this phenomenon in terms of blacks being both pushed and pulled north. The pull to St. Louis came in a variety of forms. The uneven nature of racial segregation in St. Louis allowed for a greater degree of personal freedom than existed in the South. Further, black families had greater opportunities to educate their children and greater access to cultural events.

Black saloons produced ragtime and the blues, and black baseball games were equal in quality to those played by white teams. The increase in freedom and improved opportunities helps explain why St. Louis remained an important site for black migration in the first decades of the twentieth century.

Chapter 5

A Tale of Two Homes:

St. Louis's African American Children's Institutions

Progressive Era child welfare reform was part of a larger narrative about nature of racism in America. . Many Progressive Era reformers feared that urban poverty was undermining children's future commitment to democratic ideals.[1] This chapter examines how concerns for social order , the modernization of child welfare practices, and racial ideology interfaced in St Louis efforts to reform its child welfare system. It emphasizes the role that organized philanthropy played in modernization. Specifically, it explores how the racial beliefs of St. Louis child savers affected their decisions about philanthropy. This chapter also looks at how St. Louis's two African American children's institutions coped with modernization.

The confusion over racial identity in the first decades of the twentieth century created a political crisis for America. The Naturalization Act of 1790 had made naturalization available to any free white person.[2] By the 1890s, the large influx of immigrants from Southeastern Europe and Russia confused what it meant to be white. Many of the nationalities that immigrated in this period were classified by many American scientists as belonging to different races. Thus,

[1] For a discussion of the relationship of child welfare to citizenships see Ashby, Saving the Waifs, 16-26.
[2] Haney, White By Law, 1.

European immigration in the late-nineteenth to early-twentieth century's challenged the idea of a monolithic form of whiteness.[3]

In the first part of the twentieth century, the fragmentation of the concept of whiteness was resolved through the development of a hierarchical arrangement of differences within the notion of whiteness.[4] This became the basis for assimilation of European immigrants into American society. It also became a method of defining African Americans as unsuitable, less capable of exercising the rights and responsibilities of full citizenship even though African Americans were guaranteed full citizenship rights through the Fourteenth Amendment.

Race and Social Welfare Policy

In most cases, Progressive Era child savers reinforced the color line by simply ignoring the needs of African American children. Ivan Pollock expressed the views of many Progressive reformers when he made the following observation in 1911 about the relationship between blacks and the child welfare system. "Little attention is paid to colored children by public officials and institutions, and loose moral and marital lives among colored people similar to the conditions that bring white children into the court are largely overlooked as being common among colored people and not very serious."[5] Pollock made this observation as part of his explanation of the St. Louis City Juvenile Court's approach to dealing with cases of desertion. Pollock's comments also make clear

[3] Jacobson, Whiteness of a Different Color, 43.
[4] Jacobson, Whiteness of a Different Color, 43.
[5] Ivan Pollock, "The Parental and Home Conditions of One Thousand Neglected Children" (Master's Thesis, Washington University, 1911), 8.

the determination of St. Louis Progressive Era child savers to marginalize African Americans and to focus on European immigrant children.

Because of the large numbers of immigrant children, Progressive reformers believed they posed a greater threat to the social stability than African American children.[6] While it is true that these reformers were anxious about the size and impact of immigration, this explanation for their interest in immigrant children is inadequate. Specifically, it ignores the relevance of race to the creation of national stability. George Lipsitz argues that American social welfare polices were developed in order to promote a positive investment in whiteness, contending that racial discrimination in social welfare programs not only materially hurt African Americans but also materially benefited those who were considered white.[7]

Throughout the twentieth century, political support for social welfare programs has hinged on an unequal distribution of benefits. Racial boundaries were an important factor in the creation of the social welfare programs of the New Deal. For instance, the exclusion of jobs held by large numbers of African Americans, such as farm workers and domestics, from the Unemployment Insurance Act is one of many examples of how New Deal welfare policies were

[6] Linda Gordon, Heroes in Their Own Lives; The Politics and History of Family Violence Boston,1880-1960 (New York: Penguin Books, 1988) 27-28.
[7] George Lipsitz, "The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: Racialized Social Democracy and the "White" Problem in American Studies," American Quarterly 57 no. 3 (1995): 369.

constructed along racial lines. Southern politicians demanded the exclusion of these jobs as a condition of their support for New Deal Programs.[8]

Jill Quadagno, in her study of the welfare programs of the Great Society, clearly documents the salience of race to the American social welfare state. Specifically, Quadagno points to the dramatic decrease in popular support for social welfare programs when services are delivered on an equal basis.[9] Quadagno's position is supported by other contemporary scholars. Theda Skocpol and Gary Orfield have written extensively about the influence in the 1970s of white backlash against welfare program as they became more equitable.[10]

Modernization of Child Welfare Service Delivery

The political marginalization and the segregation of African Americans in St. Louis severely limited their opportunity to become part of the city's emerging child welfare network. The late-nineteenth-century saw the first attempts to create an integrated a national child welfare system. As part of their reform efforts, Progressive-Era child savers stressed the importance of professional control and standardization of methods and administrative practices.[11]

---

[8] Charles Noble, Welfare as We Knew It: A Political History of the American Welfare State (New York: Oxford Press, 1997), 62.
[9] Jill Quadagno, The Color of Welfare: How Racism Undermined the War on Poverty (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995) provides a clear description of how race affects the popular support given to social welfare programs.
[10] See Theda Skocpol, Missing Middle: Working Families and the Future of American Social Policy, A Century Foundation Book (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2000), and Gary Orfield, "Race and the Liberal Agenda: The Loss of the Intergrationist Dream 1965-1974" in Politics of Social Policy in the United States, ed. Margaret Weir, Ann Shola Orloff, and Theda Skocpol (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988), 313-357.
[11] LeRoy Ashby, Endangered Children: Dependency, Neglect, and Abuse in American History (New York: Twayne Press, 1997), 81.

Over the next forty years, child welfare reformers encouraged and cajoled public and private child welfare agencies to accept standardization as part of developing an efficient and centralized system of child welfare service delivery. The attitude of many child welfare reformers about centralization is seen in a report published by the Children's Bureau on the work of the Board of Guardians in Cleveland, Ohio. The Bureau described the work in Cleveland in the following way, "Under the guidance of the Children's Bureau in Cleveland the institutions of the city are acquiring a new value in the scheme of child welfare."[12] The report continued to promote reform by suggesting that institutions of the city should meet the special needs of children by offering specialized services.[13]

The rapid growth of child welfare services in the latter part of the nineteenth century disrupted the relationship between local philanthropists and child welfare agencies. Thus, the increased number of institutions and funding sources made the process of supporting social welfare institutions more impersonal.[14] The creation of umbrella organizations allowed private networks of influential individuals to direct the activities of an expanding welfare state. These networks consisted of people who occupied influential positions and who shared similar worldviews and interests.[15] The net result of the influence of these private networks was that they allowed administrative progressives to act in concert politically, ideologically, and programmatically with the most powerful people and

[12] Mary Mather Leete, The Children's Bureau of Cleveland, U.S. Dept. of Labor. Children's Bureau (Washington, D.C. GPO:, 1927), 35.
[13] Leete, The Children's Bureau of Cleveland, 35.
[14] Kenneth Cmiel, A Home of a Different Kind: One Chicago Orphanage and the Tangle of Child Welfare (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 34.
[15] Tyack and Hanset, Managers of Virtue, 107.

groups in American society.[16] In doing so, Progressive reformers extended the hegemony of a conservative racial ideology over an emerging segment of American culture.

The desire on the part of Progressive Era child savers to centralize services reflected the belief that large centralized agencies delivered services more efficiently and at a lower cost. Philanthropists' interest in improving social conditions led to the development of new forms of charitable organizations.[17] It is not surprising that they would follow the model of the formal bureaucratic organizations they saw in the corporate world. One important effect of the increased bureaucratization of child welfare services is that it centralized decision-making in the hands of professionals while distancing decision-making from the public at large.[18] Many experts during the Progressive Era held a low opinion of the general public and, therefore, wished to insulate decision-making from public influence. An important feature of Progressive Era professionalism was the belief that the public should not interfere with the operation of bureaucratic organizations. Experts knew what was best for society and should be allowed to act without interference.[19] Under the guidance of professional

[16] Tyack and Hanset, Managers of Virtue, 206.
[17] William Sullivan, Work and Integrity, 50.
[18] David Rothman argues that Progressive reformers started with the best of intentions, and in the name of doing good developed public policies that relied on administrative discretion. Many Progressive administrators saw themselves as part of a group of experts. They believed that public policy should be left to experienced experts. In insisting that public policy should be above politics, Progressive reformers turned many political decisions into administrative ones. For a more detailed discussion of the attitudes of Progressive reformers see David Rothman, Conscience and Convenience: The Asylum and its Alternatives in Progressive America (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1980) and Tyack and Hanset, Mangers of Virtue.
[19] Tyack and Hanset, Managers of Virtue, 123.

administrators, the centralization and standardization of child welfare service made the exclusion of African Americans easier and more effective.

The relationship between umbrella organizations and children's institutions was ambiguous. Central agencies for social service had no authority to demand the adoption of reforms. Reformers had to depend on developing relationships with private institutions that could promote the kinds of changes they wanted to see. In this regard, the process of reform was slower in St. Louis than in other cities. In the late 1920s, the number of children in St. Louis's asylums was greater than the national average. According to a report by the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA), in 1927, there were 2,707 St. Louis children in thirty-four institutions.[20] The large number of children institutionalized meant that most St. Louis asylums were at or above their bed capacity. The report by the CWLA made the following statement on overcrowding in St. Louis's children's institutions, "Ordinarily we do not have to take such measurements [measurements of institution dormitories] because of the regulations and careful inspections provided by the state or municipal authorities. The absence of such supervision in Missouri made this step necessary."[21] The lack of either state or local regulation reflected the limited support that child welfare reforms had statewide. The inability of umbrella agencies in St. Louis to enact local regulation or to persuade children's institutions to reduce their census demonstrates the

[20] Child Welfare League of America, Report on the Child Welfare Work of St. Louis, Missouri and Recommendations Leading to the Development of a Community Plan in Children's Work, Report, 1928, 13.
[21] CWLA, Report on Child Welfare Work in St. Louis, Report, 1928, 30-31.

lack of influence reformers had on a local level. These two factors in large part explain the slow pace of child welfare reforms in St. Louis.

One important outcome of the new system of service delivery was the assimilation of Jewish and Catholic child welfare agencies into local child welfare systems.[22] For most of the nineteenth century, Jewish and Catholic groups were upset at the proselytizing by Protestant child welfare organizations and developed their own child welfare systems. Most sectarian groups had resolved their mutual feeling of distrust and animosity by the 1880s, and by the turn of the new century, in most large urban areas a spirit of cooperation and respect had taken hold.[23] Without the rapprochement between sectarian agencies the opportunity for the creation of a nationalized system for implementing child welfare policy would not have been possible.

The development of separate child welfare systems by Jewish and Catholic groups was a complex and at times contradictory process. In addition to their desire to protect their children from proselytization, Jewish and Catholic leaders were concerned about their own social status. By the end of the nineteenth century, wealthy Catholics and Jews had gained a degree of social acceptance within the larger society. Catholic and Jewish leaders were concerned that the negative image of new immigrants would undermine their social status. In order to protect their status, Catholic and Jewish groups looked for ways to address the need for the assimilation of new Immigrant groups. Thus,

[22] Eric Schneider, In the Web of Class: Reformers and Delinquents in Boston, 1830s-1930s (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 126.
[23] Schneider, In the Web of Class, 121.

they undertook the task of mediating the process of assimilation for their immigrant coreligionists.[24] In this way, religious orphan asylums played an important role in the Americanization of immigrant children. That is, these institutions helped new immigrants understand and adopt the norms of the national culture. Assimilation also included the preparation of immigrant children to join the work force as semi- or unskilled labor.[25]

The St. Louis Colored Orphans Home

The same kinds of opportunities were not available to the children at the St. Louis Colored Orphans Home (COH). As an institution, the COH was never in a position to mediate assimilation of African American children into the broader American culture. For most of its early history, the care provided at the COH was at a subsistence level. In contrast to other children's asylums, COH's staff determined whether children could attend public school based on whether they could provide the child with the appropriate attire.[26] In ignoring the basic needs of black dependent and neglected children, St. Louis child welfare reformers helped ensure that African Americans would remain on the margins of society.

The creation and development of the COH differed from that of other African American children's homes. In many cases, black asylums began when African Americans took abandoned or dependent children into their own homes. In Knoxville, the Colored Orphans Home was started when Betty and Randolph

[24] There have been a number of works that have critiqued the relationship of status conscious upper middle-class Catholics and Jews to child welfare reform, See Halloran Wayward Children, Schneider, In the Web of Class and Gary Polster, Inside Looking Out: The Cleveland Jewish Orphanage,1868-1924 (Kent, Oh.: Kent State University Press,1990).
[25] Schneider, In the Web of Class, 93.
[26] CSSACP, Report of the Activities of the St. Louis Colored Orphans Home, March 1914, 2.

Thompson took children into their home.[27] Susan Cook did the same in Washington, D.C.,[28] and the same process for establishing African American children's asylums occurred in larger cities as well. For example, the Amanda Smith Home and the Louise Home in Chicago were started by women taking neglected children into their homes. Given the lack of public support, the operation of these children's homes took a great deal of determination and dedication. Elizabeth McDonald, the founder of Louise Home, used her own income to cover 75% of the home's expenses.[29]

In St. Louis, the COH was started in 1888 by Sarah Newton when she took in a young orphan girl.[30] As a member of the Harper Chapter of the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), Ms. Newton persuaded the WCTU to establish a permanent home for black children. These women established the COH, after learning that neglected and abandoned black children were placed in the city's alms house, The St. Louis House of Refuge (HOR). Black children were placed in the HOR, because none of the city's children's homes would accept black children.[31] By the beginning of the twentieth century, the practice of placing children in alms houses was roundly condemned as alms

[27] Edward Clopper, "Child Welfare in Tennessee: An Inquiry by the National Child Labor Committee for the Tennessee Child Welfare Commission," Tennessee Child Welfare Commission, 1920, 573.
[28] Hasting H. Hart, Child Welfare in the District of Columbia: A Study of Agencies, Institutions for the Care of Dependent and Delinquent Children (New York Russell Sage Foundation, 1924), 82.
[29] Ashby, Endangered Children, 85.
[30] Katherine Corbett, In Her Place: A Guide to St. Louis Women's History (St. Louis: Missouri State Historical Society Press, 1999), 240.
[31] Ms. Frank Pitts, "St. Louis Colored Orphan Home," Proceedings of the National Convention of the National Association of Colored Women Richmond, Va., 1896 (microfilm), 85.

houses had come to be viewed as vile catchalls for victims of misfortunes.[32] Poor houses contained the mentally ill, petty criminals, and destitute people. Despite this criticism, placing children in alms houses was a routine practice in Missouri. For instance, in 1901 the HOR housed ninety children under the age of 5.[33] Cost was most likely the reason for lack of referrals to private institutions. In this period, the COH received only three children from the juvenile court.[34]

For most of the first two decades of the twentieth century, the HOR remained a part of St. Louis's system of dealing with dependent and neglected children. In 1910, the HOR housed sixteen children between the ages of 3 and 16.[35] The primary sources for commitment of children to the HOR were police courts, the St. Louis Circuit Court, and the mayor's office. In 1912, police courts placed twenty-seven children, the circuit court placed thirteen children, and the mayor's office placed thirteen. These same agencies had an aversion to placing children in private asylums. In the same period, they placed only five children in private agencies.[36] The reason for the continued placement of children in the HOR was most likely financial. Placement in private institutions meant paying for the children's care, whereas the HOR was operated by the city. It is also likely that a considerable number of the children committed to the HOR were African American. The Board of Charities and Correction made the following observation when discussing the care of dependent children in St. Louis: "Colored children

[32] Trattner, From Poor Law to Welfare State, 113.
[33] Missouri Board of Charities and Corrections, Biannual Report 1901-1903, 50.
[34] Missouri Board of Charities and Corrections, Biannual Report 1911-1912, 23.
[35] Missouri Board of Charities and Corrections, Biannual Report 1909-1910,181.
[36] Missouri Board of Charities and Corrections, Biannual Report 1911-1912, 36.

are placed in public institutions altogether. There are no private institutions of any importance for the care of colored children."[37] A 1904 U.S. Census Bureau survey on children in detention indicated that there were 159 children at the HOR, and of this number 50 were African Americans.[38]

Role of Race in Funding of Children's Institutions

St. Louis did not develop a unitary system of philanthropy until the creation of the Community Chest in 1922. Up until then, most private social welfare institutions relied on direct donor appeals for a significant part of their yearly operating budgets. The strong competition for private donations led to a sense of donor fatigue among St. Louisans. The president of the city's largest social service agency, The Provident Association, complained in 1913 that it was hard to arouse the sympathies of the public.[39] He went on to complain that the frequent requests for funds had made St. Louisans more skeptical of requests for donations.Private social service agencies attempted to deal with this problem by creating Council of Social Agencies, the Charity Registration Board, and the Chamber of Commerce Charities Endorsement Committee.

Under this system the COH was certified as a reputable charity, but did not have access to white donors. The relationship between the COH and St. Louis's white community closely approximated the relationship of African American children's institutions had to white philanthropy in many other Southern

[37] Missouri Board of Charities and Corrections, Biannual Report 1905-1906, 90.
[38] Prisoners and Juvenile Delinquents in Institutions 1904. The Bureau of the Census (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1907), 253.
[39] Dorothy Lemond, History of St. Louis Provident Association" (Master's Thesis, Washington University, 1933), 59.

cities. Howard Rabinowitz in his study of the urban South after Reconstruction points out that in most Southern cities that black dependent children fared worse under the new system of segregation. He points out that in many Southern cities dependant and neglected black children were often denies access to public and private funds. Excluded from local sources of funds black children's institutions were often left to fend for themselves. [40]In the case of the COH it was not excluded but marginalized. The end result was the same, the COH was left to depend exclusively on support from the black community. The lack of access to white donors left the home at a competitive disadvantage. Unlike many white agencies it was not able to develop partnerships with important social institutions to help in fund raising . A case in point is the St. Louis Provident Association. In the early 1921s, the Provident Association worked with Protestant ministers to arrange for a special collection for the benefit of the agency. The Provident Association on one Sunday raised $6,000.00.[41].

. The lack of access to funding sources had far-reaching consequences for orphan asylums operated by African Americans. The lack of white support not only blocked one of the most common avenues for assimilation, it also blocked African American institutions from receiving adequate funding. The attitude of white philanthropists towards African American institutions reflected the deep-seated racism of Progressive-Era American society that African Americans were

[40] Sandra O'Donnell, "Care of Dependent African American Children in Chicago, 366.
Sandra O'Donnell, "Care of Dependent African American Children in Chicago, 366.

not capable of managing social welfare institutions. In particular, child savers believed, blacks were believed incapable of managing the finances of social welfare institutions.[42] In many cases, black child welfare institutions agreed to white supervision of their finances. For example, the Colored Orphan Asylum of North Carolina was required to have an auditing committee consisting of two white men. In other black child welfare institutions, the board of directors had majority white members. Margaret Reeves in her report on training schools states that three of the eight schools studied had all white boards.[43]

The problems associated with a lack of adequate funding were evident from early in the COH's history. Almost from the beginning, the women who managed the home reported problems in fundraising. Mrs. Mary Pitts in a 1896 report to the National Association of Colored Women (NACW) Convention made the following observations about the homes financial condition: "We pray that the time is not far distant when the Saint Louis Colored Orphanage will not be allowed to struggle on without an endowment fund."[44] One year later Mrs. Pitts's tone was far more somber when, with regard to the home's finances, she reported, "As to our resources, we have none. All our expenses are met by donations or entertainments."[45] She went to report that the managers hoped that the home would prove its necessity in the community so that the creation of an

[40] Sandra O'Donnell, "Care of Dependent African American Children in Chicago, 366.
[43] Margaret Reeves, Training Schools for Delinquent Girls (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1929), 58.
[44] Pitts, "St. Louis Colored Orphans Home," 24.
[45] Pitts, "The Colored Orphans Home," 85.

endowment would “relieve us of the outside and humiliating work of securing money.”[46]

The significance of Mrs. Pitts’s statement lies in the fact that after eight years of operation, the COH was still living a hand-to-mouth existence. Moreover, black women found the task of asking whites for donations a demeaning process.

The COH did receive some financial assistance from public and private sources. Thus, the home’s 1915 annual report lists funds from the Inmate Board and St. Louis County Board making up approximately 25% of the home’s budget for the year. The lack of financial records from the COH makes the level of support from private white citizens difficult to determine. Based on a notice in the Crisis magazine, it is known that the COH received a $1,000.00 bequest for the estate of August Busch.[47] There is also an indication that the home relied on white donors in times of crisis. For example, the St. Louis Argus reported in January of 1915 that the home relied on donations from wealthy white St. Louisans to avoid being sued for nonpayment of bills.[48]

The hope that the COH would develop an endowment did not diminish with time. The St. Louis Argus in a 1916 editorial pleaded with the public to come forth and help create an endowment. The Argus based its plea to African Americans on both the importance of the home and on racial pride.[49] In another editorial, the Argus recognized the limitation of the St. Louis black community to support the COH and called on the state legislature to allocate funds for the care

[46] Pitts, “St. Louis Colored Orphans Home,” 24.
[47] “The Crisis,” Education, November 1914, 166.
[48] “Orphan Home Board Appeals for Charity,” St. Louis Argus, 29 January, 1915,4.
[49] “Four Hundred Dollars Wanted,” St. Louis Argus, 15 September, 1916, 5.

of black orphans and the elderly. Specifically citing the actions of the Pennsylvania legislature, the Argus suggested that the Missouri State Legislature follow suit. [50]

The Argus's demand for state aid was not out of the ordinary. In an effort to maintain segregation, many states provided funds to black institutions. In addition to Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C., Virginia, and North Carolina provided public funding of black children in private institutions.[51] This is not to say that the COH did not receive any public funds. The COH received money from the city and county boards as well as the Inmates Board.[52] Though these sums were small, they represented an important portion of the home's revenue; it approximated 20% of the COH revenue for 1915. In the same year, the COH received $564.94 in public funds.[53] To put this figure in perspective, it is helpful to compare it with the home's income from donations. For the same year, the COH received $538.63.[54] The only reason public funds played such an important role in the COH's operating funds was that the overall budget for 1915 was $2,416.23.[55] In reality, all the children in the COH would have been eligible for public assistance from the Board of Guardians. The fact that it paid for only a few children it placed at the COH is evidence of the child welfare systems decision to ignore the needs of black children.

---

[50] "State Aid for Old Folks and Orphans, St. Louis Argus, 9 June, 1916, 5.
[51] For a partial list of states and localities that provided public funds for African American children's institutions see Reeves, Training Schools for Delinquent Girls and Hastings, Child Welfare in the District of Columbia.
[52] "Orphan Home Report," St. Louis Argus, 21 January, 1916, 5.
[53] "Orphan Home Report," St. Louis Argus, 21 January, 1916, 5.
[54] "Orphan Home Report," St. Louis Argus, 21 January, 1916, 5.
[55] "Orphan Home Report," St. Louis Argus, 21 January, 1916, 5.

Support for COH in the St. Louis African American Community

The importance of the COH to the African American community can be seen in the large number of donors. In 1919, the COH reported having between 1,500-2,000 donors.[56] However, due to impact of discrimination in employment, the size of the contributions was relatively small, as reflected in the annual reports for 1915. The report lists the amount of contributions at $538.63. Though the annual report does not list the number of contributors, it is reasonable to assume, based on Chavis's findings, that the amounts donated were relatively small.[57]

The broad support for the COH can also be seen in the involvement of black fraternal and social organizations in putting on fundraising events. News stories in the city's largest black newspaper, the Argus, documents that black organizations were routinely involved in arranging fundraising events for the COH. From 1915-1917, the Argus reported on a band concert sponsored by Black Knights and a spring festival sponsored by the Women's Reading Club.[58]

The most successful types of entertainments in terms of fundraising were those that required only a small expenditure from patrons. Low ticket prices allowed a greater part of the black community to participate. Admission for these events ranged from 16 cents for a band concert to 35 cents for the spring festival. The return on the entertainment events was one reason why they were a

[56] Chavis, "Poverty and Relief Work Among St. Louis Negroes," (Master's thesis, University of Missouri, 1919), 9.
[57] "Orphan Home Report," St. Louis Argus, 21 January, 1916, 5.
[58] "Orphan Home Benefit Concert," St. Louis Argus, 16 Sept., 1916, 5, and "Spring Festival and Pageant of Flowers Tonight," St. Louis Argus, 1.

continual part of the COH's fundraising strategy.[59] For example, the Orphan Home Days for 1916 grossed $637.00 and cost only $153.00 to put on.[60]

The COH's problems in securing adequate funding can be seen by comparing the operating budgets of the COH with other St. Louis asylums of similar size. Table 5.1 compares the yearly budgets of three other homes. The COH was considered to be a midsize institution. Midsize institutions were considered to house between twenty and sixty children.[61] The population of the COH fluctuated between 22 and 60 children.[62]

Table 5.1. Comparison of Revenues and Expenses for Children's Institutions of Similar Size[63]

Institution	Population	Annual Revenues	Annual Expenses
COH	30	2,766.00	2,503.00
Epworth School For Girls	22	5,225.04	5,171.80
Jewish Shelter Home	36	8,579.03	11,416.97
St. Louis Protestant Orphan Home	49	17,987.18	14,815.65

[59] "Orphan Home Benefit Band Concert," St. Louis Argus 16 Sept. 1916, 5 and "Spring Festival and a Pageant of Flowers Tonight," St. Louis Argus 1.
[60] "Orphan Home Day a Success," St. Louis Argus, 24 May 1918, 5.
[61] Timothy Hasci, Second Home: Orphan Asylums and the Poor Families of America (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1997).
[62] These numbers come from several sources. They include the Child Welfare League of America, Child Welfare Work in St. Louis 1928, Western Historical Manuscript Archives, University of Missouri at St. Louis, St. Louis, and George Mangold, "Children's Institutions In St. Louis," Bulletin of the Council of Social Agencies 1 (March 1919), 5.
[63] This table was created from data obtained from two reports Charitable and Philanthropic Organization of St. Louis and Children's Institutions in St. Louis.

Though this chart shows that revenues of these homes varied greatly, it still possible to draw several important conclusions. First, compared to the other homes, the COH was grossly underfunded. Its revenues were close to half that of the nearest home, Epworth School for Girls. Since the only substantive difference between the other homes of similar size and the COH was the race of the children, it is safe to conclude that race was a salient factor in the funding of children's institutions in St. Louis.

The second conclusion that can be drawn from these numbers is that for all St. Louis children's homes, revenue and expenses were closely related. With the exception of the St. Louis Protestant Orphans Home, the expense incurred either matched, or in the case of the Jewish Shelter Home, exceeded the incoming revenue. This has important meaning for the COH. Unlike the other institutions in the table, the COH did not have great access to white philanthropists. This means that the COH truly lived on a shoe string budget with no extra funds for unanticipated expenses or for making long range plans.

Subsistence Level of Care for African American Children

The neglect of the COH by St. Louis's child welfare community directly affected the home's ability to meet the needs of the children under its care. The lack of funding left the COH in a constant state of crisis, and as a result, the care provided was at a subsistence level. Often there were periods where the COH could not provide the basic needs for the children under its care. The basic diet for the children was meager. Their regular diet consisted of the following:

Breakfast of milk, bread, and oatmeal. Lunch was usually bread and syrup, while dinner was meat (one to four times a week), gravy, soup, or bread.[64]

The physical condition of the COH was also an ongoing challenge. In 1905, the COH moved from its original location at 1247 N. Twelfth Street to a building at 4316 Natural Bridge Road.[65] Over time, the building at Natural Bridge also fell into disrepair. By 1919 the building was old and in need of repairs. It lacked adequate heating and plumbing.[66]

A 1913 report by the Committee for Social Service Among Colored People (CSSACP) described the condition of the COH in the following way: "Prior to our visit some painting had been done, and the screens had been left out and there was an influr [infestation} of flies. The morning of our visit the rooms were very filthy, flies were very thick, and there was no ventilation."[67] The CSSACP chose to visit the COH in response to complaints about the quality of care. The committee members were shocked at the condition of the COH and reported back to the whole committee that the conditions were worse than first reported.[68]

This report reviewed every aspect of the COH's operation. In addition to the physical condition of the building, the report was very critical of other aspects of the home's operation. Among other things, the report was concerned with the COH's difficulty in providing an adequate education for the children. The children

[64] Francis McLean, Survey of Charities of St. Louis: A Summary of Important Findings and Recommendations, 31 August, 1916, Western Historical Manuscript Collection – University of Missouri at St. Louis, St. Louis, 199.
[65] Anne Valk, "St. Louis Colored Orphans Home" in In Her Place: A Guide to St. Louis Women's History, ed. Katherine Corbett (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1999), 142.
[66] Valk, "St Louis Colored Orphans Home", 142.
[67] CSSACP, Report of the Investigation of the Activities of the St. Louis Colored Orphans Home, March 1914, 1 Washington University Archives, St. Louis.
[68] CSSACP Minutes, April 1913.

form the COH attended the local public elementary school. The CSSACP report indicated that five children from the COH had not been attending school for some time. The reason for their lack of attendance was "the lack of sufficient wearing apparel."[69]

It is important to note that the CSSACP report was not critical of the staff of the home. It described the matron, Mary Covley, as capable and anxious to keep the place in good condition and also commended the home's maintenance man. They noted that the yard and basement, which were his responsibilities, were the best maintained areas of the home.[70] The one exception was the report's view of the woman who operated the home's nursery, who was described as being *non compus mentis* (not of sound mind).[71] This woman was the mother of one of the children in the nursery.

The committee report was not as complimentary of the home's board of directors. The CSSACP report noted that infighting and gossip among board members were a problem for the home.[72] Some of the decisions that the COH board made complicated the operation of the home. The COH frequently over-extended itself. This is in large part because the general lack of social welfare services for the African American community forced existing institutions to try to do as much as they could to meet the needs of their community.

---

[69] CSSACP, Report of the Investigation of the Activities of the St. Louis Colored Orphans Home, March 1914, 2.
[70] CSSACP, Report of the Investigation of the Activities of the St. Louis Colored Orphans Home, March 1914, 2.
[71] CSSACP, Report of the Investigation of the Activities of the St. Louis Colored Orphans Home, March 1914, 2.
[72] CSSACP Report of the Investigation of the Activities of the St. Louis Colored Orphans Home, March 1914, 3.

In the case of the COH, this meant that in addition to the operation of the children's home, the COH operated an infant nursery. The COH opened the nursery in 1896 in order to respond to the needs of African American women who lacked adequate child care.[73] The nursery part of the COH was in the same state of disrepair as the rest of the home. The CSSACP report stated that the ventilation of the nursery was in such bad condition that the investigators could not enter the nursery till the windows were open.[74]

The report's primary recommendation was that management of the home be turned over to the Negro Business League.[75] In 1916, the Council of Social Welfare Services went further when it recommended that the COH be temporarily closed. While recognizing the importance of the COH to St. Louis, it thought that the COH needed to be reorganized and brought under white auspices.[76] By 1919, St. Louis's white social welfare network could no longer ignore the problems of the COH. The COH was finally closed in 1920, after the building on Natural Bridge was condemned.

The temporary closing of the COH was in large part the result of the systematic neglect it received from St. Louis's child welfare and philanthropic communities. On the surface, it appears that there was no difference in how St. Louis's child welfare system treated the COH compared to other child welfare

[73] Ms F. Pitts, St. Louis Chapter Conference of National Association of Colored Women, Boston, 1898.
[74] CSSACP, The Report of the Investigation of the Activities of the St. Louis Colored Orphans Home, March 1914, 1.
[75] CSSACP, Report of the Investigation of the Activities of the St. Louis Colored Orphans Home, March 1914, 3.
[76] McLean, Survey of Charities in St. Louis, 201.

institutions. However, a closer look reveals that what appears to be racially neutral was in fact an investment in whiteness. Whiteness depends on making social investments in being white appear to be a natural phenomenon. In this way, these investments continued unquestioned and unchallenged.[77] In the case of child welfare institutions in St. Louis, race neutrality served this purpose by providing a façade of fairness, while white children's institutions reaped the majority of the benefits from the consolidation of child welfare system.

Reorganization of the COH

A local entrepreneur, Annie Malone, assumed the presidency of the COH board of directors in 1919. Under her leadership, the COH was able to raise the needed funds and erect a new building for the COH. Little is known about how Ms. Malone came to be chosen as president of the COH. It is likely that part of the reason was that she had a reputation as a business manager. She was a wealthy business woman and a philanthropist, who made her fortune in manufacturing and selling cosmetics for African American women. By 1924, Annie Malone was one of the richest women in Missouri.[78]

Ms. Malone used part of her wealth to support local and national African American institutions. Among the beneficiaries of Annie Malone's generosity were Howard University Medical School, black land grant colleges, Provident Hospital, and the COH.[79]

---

[77] Lipsitz, A Possessive Investment In Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997).
[78] Corbett,"Annie Malone" In Her Place: 240.
[79] Corbett,"Annie Malone" In Her Place, 240.

Shortly after the COH closed, Annie Malone pledged $10,000.00 towards the building of new COH facilities. St. Louis's African American community responded to the closing by initiating a subscription drive to raise funds for a new building. Within a nine day period, St. Louis African Americans raised $66,000.00 for the building of new facilities for the COH.[80] The cornerstone for the COH was laid in May of 1922. Thirteen months later, on June 1, 1923, the COH reopened at the corner of Goode, Kennerly, and Cottage Avenue.

The reopening of the COH marked a change in the relationship between the COH and St. Louis's child welfare system. When the home reopened, it became a member of the First Community Fund of St. Louis. In this period the COH was able to develop cooperative relationships with other child welfare agencies. In fact the CWLA, in a 1928 report on child welfare in St. Louis, praised the COH for its ability to work with other child welfare agencies.

In the 1920s the COH did not have its own caseworker. It addressed the problem by referring the children to other casework agencies.[81] Further evidence of the home's acceptance into the child welfare community can be seen in the 1928 decision to include the COH in plans to develop a citywide service delivery network. The CWLA recommended that the COH become part of a group of asylums who access casework services through a centralized casework agency.[82]

---

[80] "Social Progress," Crisis, February 1921, 177.
[81] Child Welfare League of America, Report on the Child Welfare Work of St. Louis, Missouri, 14.
[82] CWLA, Report on Child Welfare Work in St. Louis, Missouri, 18.

It is difficult to pinpoint the exact reasons for the inclusion of the COH in the St. Louis child welfare network. One likely reason is the increased migration of African Americans to the city. St. Louis was one of the major destination points in the Great Migration of African Americans to the North. At the same time that black migration was increasing, European immigration was on the decline. World War I and the Immigration Act of 1924 served to severely limit the number of immigrants coming to the United States. The increase in St. Louis's black population increased the need for segregated institutions. The change in attitude towards the COH can be seen in the 1916 survey of charities. In discussing the problems of the COH, this report states, "A home like this is an absolute necessity for the proper placing of Negro children is almost impossible."[83]

A second possible reason for the inclusion of the COH in the St. Louis child welfare network is that in reopening the COH, the African American community demonstrated its desire to have an orphan asylum for black children. Throughout the Progressive Era, the general assumption was that each ethnic group would take care of its own children. It is likely that white St. Louisans saw the fundraising efforts of the black residents as their making accommodations for their own children.

St. Francis Home

St. Francis Home (SFH) was opened in 1887 by the Oblate Sisters of Providence, a Catholic order of nuns, to serve African American girls ages 2 to 12. The Oblates were a teaching order dedicated to the education of black

[83] McLean, Survey of Charities in St. Louis, 199.

Catholic children and were one of the few American orders to accept African American women as novitiates. At the invitation of the Jesuits, the Oblates had come to St. Louis in 1880 to establish an elementary school for black children.[84]

The original plan for St. Elizabeth School was that it would operate as a day school. However, from its inception it served as a day school, boarding school, and orphanage.[85] The popularity of St. Elizabeth as an orphan asylum is most likely attributable to the need among black parents to find temporary care for their children. Placing children in institutions to help with family crisis was a common during the Progressive Era. Often working-class families would place their children in asylums and then retrieve their children once the crisis had passed.[86]

Applications for admission to SFH reflect a similar pattern of use by black parents. A common factor cited by the parents was the conflict between working and caring for their children. The application for 6-year-old Camille Brown is an example of the type of request received by SFH. Camille's mother, Sandra, requested admission because she did not have anyone to care for her daughter while she worked.[87] Poor health was another prominent reason cited by parents for placing their children. Ms Clark, the mother of three daughters, wrote the mother superior of SFH requesting she accept them as residents at SFH. Ms. Clark wrote, "Mother Superior I am writing to you in regards to taking my three

[84] The Mission in St. Louis, 6 Missions Record Group, Oblate Sisters Archive, Baltimore, Maryland.
[85] The Mission in St. Louis, 10.
[86] Schneider, In the Web of Class, 118.
[87] Brown Application Correspondence file, Oblate Sisters Archive Box 45 file no 3.

little girls. I am broken in health. I have a heart trouble and would like to put my daughters where they will be brought up in their faith we are Catholics."[88]

By 1887 it was clear that St. Elizabeth could not continue to operate as both a school and an orphan asylum. The Oblates received permission from the St. Louis Archdiocese to build SFH and purchased the "Old Taylor Mansion" on the city's northwest side.[89] From its beginnings, SFH benefited from its relationship with the St. Louis Archdiocese. Bishop Ryan, the co-adjudicator for the St. Louis Archdiocese, personally donated $25.00 to the building of the orphanage and encouraged other Catholics to contribute.[90] The Oblates' relationship to the church hierarchy also allowed SFH to receive an initial contribution of $1,000.00 from the church's Colored and Indian Mission Fund.[91]

SFH and the St. Louis Archdiocese

SFH and the St. Louis Archdiocese maintained a good relationship throughout the Progressive Era. The continued support by the archdiocese ensured that SFH received continued support form Catholic social organizations and from prominent St. Louisans. The Catholic Church's response to the needs of black Catholics was complicated by a number of social and political factors.

The rise of Catholic politicians within the Democratic Party made most large cities sites of the "politics of charity."[92] The religious orders that ran social

---

[88] Mrs. Ann Clark to Mother Mary Elizabeth, November 13, 1927, Correspondence file Oblate Sisters Archive, Baltimore, Md.
[89] The Mission in St. Louis, 11.
[90] The Mission in St. Louis, 10.
[91] The Mission in St. Louis, ,10.
[92] Dorothy Brown and Elizabeth McKeown, The Poor Belong to Us: Catholic Charities and American Welfare (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1997), 4.

welfare institutions could count on Catholic legislators to look out for their interests. Thus, both on local and state levels, Catholic politicians made it a point to see that Catholic institutions were part of any reimbursement plan and that general welfare legislation was not in conflict with church teachings.[93]

Catholic support for racial equality would have undermined its influence within the Democratic Party. During the Progressive Era, most African Americans supported the Republican Party. Therefore, in a practical way, support for racial equality would have been tantamount to support for the Republican Party. By the Progressive Era, Catholic voters had a longstanding connection to the Democratic Party. In the nineteenth century, Catholics were attracted to the Democratic Party because of its opposition to nativism.[94] Catholics also benefited from the Democrats' promotion of northern white egalitarianism. By the 1850s, the Democrats had helped in creating a relationship in the North between democratic ideology and extreme racism.[95] By the start of the twentieth century, the link between northern white egalitarianism and social and economic privilege was well established. In fact, in the minds of most Catholic immigrants, the Democratic Party was synonymous with white hegemony.[96]

The operation of white egalitarianism was evident in the practices of northern labor unions. The segregation of unions also directly benefited Catholic immigrants. Within the factory system of the early twentieth century, for example,

---

[93] Brown and McKeown, The Poor Belong to Us, 4.
[94] Frederickson, The Black Image in the White Imagination, 91.
[95] Frederickson, The Black Image in the White Imagination, 99.
[96] Grossman, Land of Hope: Black Southerners and the Great Migration (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991) 236.

a worker's social and economic status was determined by proximity of his work to the work done by African Americans. African Americans were trapped in the lowest paid and most menial jobs.[97] Blacks had no opportunity to move into skilled labor jobs. Work that resembled that done by African American workers was considered to be low status jobs. [98] Through their participation in unions, new immigrants learned about the salience of race in American society. Thus, unions acculturated new immigrants to the importance of race by teaching new workers that African Americans were a threat to their livelihood. Not only were blacks strikebreakers, union members believed that their willingness to work for lower wages held down wages.[99]

The general racial beliefs of most Catholics were similar to those of the public at large. The Catholic Church's commitment to segregation can be seen in the decision of Catholic dioceses to maintain segregated parishes. Further, the opinion of the church can be seen in the defense by John Gillard, SJ, of the practice of segregated parish boundaries. Fr. Gillard used a familiar form of racist logic that segregation was to the benefit of African Americans, arguing that blacks preferred their own parishes because they were made to feel inferior in integrated parishes.[100] Gillard extends this logic to suggest that segregated

[97] Grossman, Land of Hope, 214.
[98] Barret and Roediger, "Inbetween Peoples," 16.
[99] Barrett and Roediger, "Inbetween Peoples," 24.
[100] John Gillard, SSJ, The Catholic Church and the American Negro (Baltimore: St Joseph's Society Press, 1929), 71.

parishes protected both races from the sense of aversion blacks and whites feel in an integrated environment.[101]

Parish boundaries in Northern American cities represented more than just a geographic space. Parishes became the source of the cultural and social life of many of the ethnic groups. Catholic parishes in northern cities developed largely along ethnic lines. For example, within one square mile of Chicago, there were two Polish, one Lithuanian, one Italian, two German, one Slovak, one Croatian, two Irish, and one Bohemian Catholic church.[102] The parish boundaries helped to define the ethnic cultural and social identity of its parishioners.[103] By integrating the neighborhoods' religious, educational, and social communities, the parish served to define the boundaries of the parishioners' social contacts.[104] The strength of parish life was evident in the fact that it became the way in which Catholics identified the part of the city in which they lived. More importantly, parish boundaries defined the parameters of church members' social and cultural connections.[105]

Living in these homogenous sets of dense social networks affected the way lay Catholics responded to African Americans. Urban Catholics just accepted the idea that African Americans would have their own parishes.[106] Conversely, Catholic ethnic groups feared the encroachment by blacks on their

---

[101] Gillard, The Catholic Church and the American Negro, 71.
[102] John McGreevy, Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth Century Urban North (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 10.
[103] McGreevy, Parish Boundaries, 10.
[104] McGreevy, Parish Boundaries, 21.
[105] McGreevy, Parish Boundaries, 21.
[106] McGreevy, Parish Boundaries, 30.

own parish boundaries. Violence by ethnic groups against African Americans was a frequent response to the movement of African Americans into ethnic neighborhoods. If this tactic did not work, the inclusion of African Americans within a parish often meant wholesale abandonment of the parish to African Americans.[107]

The St. Louis Archdiocese operated a system of segregated parish boundaries. For most of the early-twentieth-century, St. Elizabeth parish was the only parish open to African American Catholics.[108] The archdiocese's commitment to segregation extended to its colleges. In 1921, St. Louis University, the city's Jesuit University, refused to play Wisconsin Polytechnic in football because Wisconsin had a black player. St. Louis University's athletic director stated, "I believe playing against Negroes might not be approved of by some players and spectators. The fact that Eastern schools permit this has no effect on St. Louis University."[109]

SFH's connection to the archdiocese ensured that the home would operate within existing racial norms. The connection to a hierarchical social and religious system helped ease the worries of white benefactors about the home's aims. That is, SFH was intended to address the needs of black Catholic children without disrupting existing race relations. In this regard, SFH was an extension of what was expected of most Catholic orphan asylums. The church-run asylums saw their role as helping children find a place in the existing social order. A

[107] McGreevy, Parish Boundaries, 35.
[108] By the 1920s, a second black parish was established in Normandy, Mo.
[109] "Negro Star not Permitted to face St. Louis University Team," Our Colored Missions, 12 December, 1921, 182.

common belief in many Catholic orphan asylums was that their children should not get ideas past their present position in life.[110] For African American girls, this meant being trained to be domestics. The SFH *Twentieth Anniversary Review* described their mission as follows: to "endeavor to teach the children to their true situation."[111]

The Oblate sisters recognized that their support from St. Louis's white community was contingent upon their ability to convince white St. Louisians that SFH was preparing their girls for their proper place in society. Throughout the first three decades of the twentieth century the sisters produced a series of *Annual Reviews.* These booklets were intended to help the sisters in their fundraising efforts. Through pictures and text, these reviews served to reinforce the idea that the aim of the home was to produce self-reliant domestics. Most Progressive Era whites would have been reassured by these booklets' representations of black women. In the 1905 *Annual Review,* most of the pictures were of the girls learning how to be domestics, including learning how to cook and sew.[112] Even the pictures that depicted daily life at SFH were true to racial stereotypes. For example, the 1905 booklet shows a picture of the SFH girls

[110] Brown and McKown, The Poor Belong to Us, 114.
[111] The Oblate Sisters as a method of fundraising published a series of annual reviews that explained the goals of and detailed the current operations of SFH. SFH did not publish annual reports; these reviews in many respects resemble an annual report on the home's operation. One problem with the reviews is that some of them do not have page numbers. On each page there were subheadings detailing the operation of the home. Oblate Sisters, Twentieth Anniversary Review, 1908.
[112] Oblate Sisters, Annual Review for 1902, Education subsection.

working in the home's garden. This picture closely resembles pictures taken of blacks doing field work.[113]

As the century progressed, the booklets included were fewer pictures of the girls from SFH learning to be domestics. Instead, the pictures were mostly of the girls receiving religious instruction. There are pictures of the girls' first communions and confirmations. In these later booklets the text still reinforces the idea that SFH's mission was to prepare the children to be domestics. In the 1912 *Review,* the Oblates describe the girl's education as a "rudimentary common school education along with training to be domestics." There is no further mention of the children's academic preparation, but two pages are devoted to describing the home's domestic education classes.[114] This pamphlet describes SFH's aim as trying to "fit them useful and practical careers as domestics and housekeepers."[115] The home's rudimentary education of the girls continued through the 1930s. A 1934 report prepared by National Catholic Charities describes the education at SFH's as questionable.[116]

SFH as Inclusive Institution

Timothy Hasci has argued that children's institutions during the Progressive Era fell into one of three descriptive categories. Protective institutions saw their role as protecting children from the evils of an urban society. The managers of these institutions saw themselves as temporary surrogates for

[113] Oblate Sisters, Annual Review for 1902,
[114] Oblate Sisters, Annual Review for 1912, 10.
[115] Oblate Sisters, Annual Review for 1912, 11.
[116] Alice Paddgett, The Catholic Program in St. Louis for the Care of Dependent and Delinquent Children,1934, St. Louis, Mo., Western Historical Manuscript Archive, University of Missouri at St. Louis, 11.

the child's family. These institutions specifically wanted to protect the ethnic and religious values of their families.[117] Managers of protective institutions believed that children should be returned to their families. The operation of protective institutions was intended to be consistent with the needs of any poor families.[118]

Inclusive institutions shared many of the same features as protective institutions. They were equally concerned with protecting children and developing their moral character but differed in that their assumption was that the role of the institution was to replace the child's parents. The values and beliefs of the asylum managers were superior to those of the child's family. Inclusive institutions were organized around the principle that almost every aspect of the child's life needed to be controlled.[119]

SFH's management included many elements of the inclusive approach as evident in the assumption that the girls would remain at SFH until they could be self-supporting domestics. In the Twentieth Anniversary Review, the sisters describe the home's aim as follows, "It is our purpose to teach our wards to be self reliant and self supporting, it is our practice to place them in good Catholic homes as soon as they are competent."[120] In 1912 the age of competence meant that children remained in SFH till they were 14 or 15 years old.[121] By

[117] Timothy Hasci, A Second Home, 57.
[118] Hacsi, Second Home, 57.
[119] Hacsi, Second Home, 58.
[120] Oblate Sisters, Twentieth Anniversary Review, 7.
[121] Oblate Sisters, Annual Review for 1912, 10.

1920, SFH had expanded the age of maturity to 17.[122] The home gives little indication that it thought the girls in its care should return to their families.

The tight control that the Oblates kept on parental visitations also indicates that SFH saw its role as providing long-term care for the children in the home. In 1912, SFH's visitation process limited contact between parent and child. According to the home's policy, parents could occasionally take the children out for the day. The outing would need to be prearranged through with the home's mother superior.[123] For most of the first two decades of the twentieth century, visitation was limited to a half hour on Sunday and two hours on Thursday.[124] By 1920, the visiting hours had been extended to two hours on Sunday and still two hours on Thursday.[125]

It was not only face-to-face contact that SFH tried to regulate. The home's policy for writing parents was that children could occasionally write their parents or guardian, but they had to get approval from the sisters before they could write their parents.[126] The fact that these practices were still in place in the 1920s signifies the degree to which SFH had resisted the movement to modernize children's institutions. As early as the 1890s, children's institutions were modifying their policies with regard to family and contact with the world outside the institution.[127] In order to address the criticism of child welfare reformers,

[122] Oblate Sisters, Annual Review for 1920, 14..
[123] Oblate Sisters, Annual Review for 1912, 15..
[124] St. Francis Home, Annual Review for 1908 and 1912.
[125] St. Francis Home, Annual Review for 1920, Rules section.
[126] St. Francis Home, Annual Review for 1912,17..
[127] Cmeil, A Home of a Different Kind, 14.

children's institutions began to become integrated into the life of the community.[128]

SFH's policy of controlling family contact served another purpose of the home. Its limitation on access to family members allowed the Oblates the opportunity to convert the girls under their care to Catholicism. Unlike other Catholic children's homes, SFH did not limit its admissions to Catholic girls. In fact many of the girls admitted to SFH were not Catholic. However, most girls converted to Catholicism during their stay at the home. SFH's admissions log provides evidence of this process. It shows that most girls at the home were baptized while residents of the home. This log is sporadic in its providing consistent information about the girls, but is meticulous in listing the dates of the girls baptism and first communion.

The third kind of institution, isolative institutions, had little interest in placing out children in their care. SFH was explicit in its opinions on placing children. The home's view of placement reflects a lack of interest in finding homes for children and a sense of pessimism about the future prospects of the children. The Annual Review for 1912 gives the following explanation for not placing children, "All the children placed in our care such that they have nothing to look forward to, except that what they make of themselves through their own labor, therefore we aim to train them from early years to be self reliant domestics."[129]

[128] Hacsi, Second Home, 67.
[129] St. Francis Home, Annual Review for 1912, 14..

This sense of pessimism affected the way SFH viewed placing children in families. This connection is also evident in its views about adoption. In discussing SFH's approach to adoption, the Annual Review for 1908 observed, "We seldom permit a child to be adopted because there are so few practical Catholics of our race, and the few own children that there is scant room for a stranger."[130]

Placing out Children

SFH saw its role in placing children as finding the girls suitable positions as domestics. Its goal was to place the girls as domestic in good Catholic homes.[131] To their credit, the Oblates attempted to protect the girls from the worse aspects of the live-in form of domestic service. Sexual exploitation and non-compensation for extra work were common problems faced by live-ins. To help prevent situations like this, the sisters continued to supervise the girls after they were placed. They also insisted that the girls be compensated for any additional work.[132]

SFH's commitment to placing their girls as live-in domestics at a time when this form of domestic service was declining in popularity among domestics is another indication of how the home was out of touch with the girls' need for family and a social life. Live-in domestic service declined in popularity because it was too restrictive. Women working as domestics had little time to spend with their own families. For young women, life as a live-in domestic prevented them

[130] St. Francis Home, ANNUAL Review for 1908,Placing Out Section.
[131] St. Francis Home, Annual Review for 1912,14.
[132] St. Francis Home, Annual Review for 1920.14.

from having much of a social life.[133] Their time away from their employer's home was limited, and their behavior was closely scrutinized by their employer.[134]

The sisters encouraged the girls to see SFH as their family.[135] The decision to promote the idea of institution as one family led to a blurring of boundaries within the institution. The confusion over boundaries can be seen in the home's decision to count the children's wages as income for the home. In the early twentieth century, the girls' wages were recorded as income on SFH's monthly income statements. In its November 1904 monthly statement, SFH lists the wages of four girls, Olivia, Betty, Iris and Mary, for a total of $28.00.[136] A similar entry was made in SFH's income statement for 1907. The wages of three girls, Cassie, Cora, and Mary Alice were listed as income for the home.[137]

The extent of this practice is difficult to gauge, because the home's financial records for this period are sporadic. (There is approximately a ten-year gap in the home's financial records.) The later records do not list the girls' wages. Catherine Hagen, who was a resident at SFH in the 1930s, described how the home used her wages, "… We could go out on Saturdays and work in people's homes and that's what we did. That was our little spending money, but I don't remember ever getting to spend that money."[138] Given the early income

---

[133] David Katzman, Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1978), 234.
[134] Katzman, Seven Days a Week, 176.
[135] Our Mission in St. Louis, 18.
[136] St. Francis Home Income Statement for February 1904, Ledger Monthly Accounts 1898-1909 Oblate Sisters Archive, Baltimore, Maryland.
[137] St. Francis Home Income Statement for February 1907, Ledger Monthly Accounts 1898-1909, Oblate Sisters Archive, Baltimore, Maryland.
[138] Catherine Hagen, Oral History, Completed by Mary Seematter on March 21, 1999, 5.

statements and Ms. Hagen's remarks, it is safe to conclude that SFH's practice of counting the girls' wages as income was a longstanding practice.

Catholic institutions were slower and more cautious about making changes. Catholic children's homes' resistance to outside demands for change was rooted in their tradition of caring for the poor.[139] The job of the church was the amelioration of misery, not reforming either the child or society. Modernization often seemed irrelevant to their mission.[140] This is not to say that Catholic organizations did initiate their own reform programs. Starting with the formation of the National Council on Catholic Charities, Catholic lay and religious leaders began to pressure institutions to modernize.[141]

Women's religious orders operated children's asylums within the hierarchical and patriarchal of the Catholic Church. In many respects, the women who operated children's asylums were an anomaly within the Catholic Church and society as a whole, which did not consider management of large institutions a proper role for women. The women who ran these institutions, while following the orders of their bishops, worked hard to shape their institutions response to the children of the poor.[142] These institutions did not conform to the pattern of management established in most secular and Protestant homes, where women ran the institutions, but men handled the finances.[143]

---

[139] Halloran, Boston's Wayward Children, 77.
[140] Halloran, Boston's Wayward Children, 80.
[141] Brown and McKown, The Poor Belong to Us, 6.
[142] Brown and McKown, The Poor Belong to Us, 44.
[143] Hacsi, Second Home, 7 9.

In large part, Catholic children's asylums reflected the worldview of the orders that ran them. In many cases, the sisters attempted to recreate for the children the environment that was modeled after convent life. Organizing a children's asylum around the values of orderliness, cleanliness, conformity, and obedience led to the development of organizations that were overly structured and at times humorless.[144] This was certainly the case at SFH. The sisters created an environment that was a closed system. The home operated like a nineteenth century institution in the face of a modernizing world.

SFH's resistance to change can be understood in part by the fact that St. Louis Archdiocese lagged behind other cities in its efforts to modernize its children's institutions.[145] St. Louis Catholic Charities remained ineffectual in centralizing and coordinating the efforts of the city's Catholic charitable institutions; for example, it did not establish a children's bureau until 1928. Prior to this date there were no centralized intake or casework services available for the city's Catholic children's institutions.[146] The creation of the Catholic Charities children's bureau led to SFH modernizing. Its admissions requests were investigated by a caseworker from catholic Charities. The changes at SFH came

[144] Halloran, Boston's Wayward Children, 69.
[145] Alice Padgett, " Catholic Programs in St. Louis for the Care of Dependent, Neglected and Delinquent Children," 1.
[146] Padgett "Catholic Programs in St. Louis for the Care of Dependent, Neglected and Delinquent Children,"1.

in part because the home began to receive regular contributions from Catholic Charities' orphans Board.[147]

Characteristics of St. Francis Home Population

The official policy of SFH was to accept girls ages 2-12. Actual admissions at the home show that SFH accepted girls as old as 16. A review of the admission records for SFH indicates that the home admitted a small number of girls above the age of 12. The home's records from 1918-1926 show that SFH admitted twenty-three girls over the age of 12 were admitted to the home. The largest group admitted was 13 years olds. Ten of the over-age twenty-three girls admitted were 13 years old.[148] Most of the children admitted were of early- and middle-latency age.[149] Children ages 5-10 constituted ninety-eight of the admissions examined. Children ages 11 to 16 made up only forty-six admissions.[150]

SFH also allowed girls to stay past age 12. In fact, by 1920 the sisters had extended the age to 17.[151] The extended stay for girls can in part be explained by SFH's policy of removing girls from unsatisfactory domestic placements and allow them to return to the home.[152] Catherine Hagan reports that she was at SFH until she was 20.[153]

---

[147] Henry McGinnes, "A History of St. Francis Home" (Master's Thesis, St. Louis University, 1951), 98.
[148] Data were compiled from St. Francis Home Vital Statistics Log 1918-1926.
[149] Latency as a psycho-social stage of development encompasses children ages 5-12. Since this classification covers a large period of a childhood development, it has been subdivided into early latency (5-7), middle latency (8-10), and late latency (11-12).
[150]Data were compiled from St. Francis Home Vital Statistics Log 1918-1926.
[151] Oblate Sisters, Annual Review for 1920, 8.
[152] Oblate Sisters, Annual Reviews 1920,7.
[153] Hagan, Oral History, Completed by Mary Seematter on March 21, 1999.

It is also important to note that the girls used the home as a safety net. A letter from a former resident, Jane, pointed out how the alumnae of SFH viewed the institution. Jane stated that she is in trouble and would like to return and work at the home. Jane made her request by writing, "Sister as I said once before I wouldn't mind staying here working around the house as Miss Jessie because it's awful hard to have to think of leaving somebody that has been very good to you."[154]

The reasons children were admitted to SFH were similar to those of other children's institutions. Table 5.2 provides a description of the ages children were admitted and the reason given for the admission. Death of one parent was the frequent reason given by families when admitting their children to a children's institution.[155] Parental death was cited as a reason in forty-two SFH admissions.[156] The loss of a parent was a significant factor in the placement of early and middle latency age children. Death of a parent was given twenty-seven times for this age for working parents of school-aged children.[157]

[154] "Jane Cummings to Mother Superior of SFH," 29 June, 1929, Correspondence file Oblate Sisters Archive, Baltimore, Md.
[155] Halloran, Boston's Wayward Children, 79.
[156] This number was derived by adding FD + MD = O = 42.
[157] These data were compiled from St. Francis Home's Vital Statistics Log 1918-1926.

Table 5.2. Ages and Family Composition of Children at St. Francis Home

Age	FD	MD	FDE	MDE	RP	PP	PRP	NR	O	PS	MP	FP
1												
2									1			
3						1		1			2	
4		1	1	2				1		1	2	
5	1	3	2		1	2	2	2		1	1	
6	2	1	1	1	1	1		3			2	1
7	6	2	2		2			1			4	
8	3	1	2	1		1				1	3	
9	1	6	1		1	2					3	
10			2	1	1						2	1
11	1	3	1	1	1	1					3	
12	1		1		2						4	
13		3	1	2	2	1					3	
14	2	1							2			1
15				1						1	1	
16		1			1						1	
TOTAL	17	22	14	9	12	9	2	8	3	3	31	3

FD = father deceased, MD = mother deceased, FDE = father deserted, MDE = mother deserted, RP = relative placement, PP = placement by both parents, PRP = placement by professionals, NR = no reason given, O = orphans; both parent deceased, PS = parents separated, MP = mother placed, FP = father placed.

The higher rate of placement of children in this age group relates to the need to find a stable living situation. The incidence of placement of children at SFH because of the death of a parent was smaller than that for the city as a whole. A 1928 report by the Child Welfare League of America on St. Louis's children's institutions found that 23% of admissions were due to the death of the

mother, 19% were due to the death of the father, and 8% were due to the death of both parents.[158] By comparison, the percentages for SFH were as follows; 17% of admissions were due to the death of the mother, 12% were due to the death of the father, and less that 1% was the result of the death of both parents.[159]

Desertion was also a significant factor in the placement of children at SFH. Here again, family desertion was greatest for latency-age children. The desertion by fathers was in particular greatest in this age group. The desertion by the father was given as a reason for placement in nine cases of latency-age children. Desertion by both parents does not seem to have been a significant factor in the placement of children at SFH. The admissions records indicate that parental placement occurred only nine times. [160]

The death of a parent was also an important factor in the admission of older children. Thus, the loss of a parent was cited as the reason for admission in six of the twenty-three over-age admissions. Desertion was less of a factor in these admissions, cited in only four cases of over-age admissions. Placement by one parent without other explanation was an important reason in the placement of over-age admissions, accounting for six of the admissions to SFH. It is likely that several of these placements involved girls who were beyond parental

[158] Child Welfare League in America, Child Welfare in St. Louis, 1928, 13a.
[159] These data were compiled from St. Francis Home's Vital Statistics Log 1918-1926.
[160] These data were compiled from St. Francis Home's Vital Statistics Log 1918-1926.

control. In other reports about SFH, the home's decision to take in delinquent and "feeble minded" children was criticized.[161]

SFH admitted only a small number of children under the age of 5. The admissions records indicate that only thirteen children under the age of 5 were admitted to SFH. Placement by mother with no other reason given was a prominent reason in the placement of young children. There is no discernable pattern for this age group. Placement by mother and desertions were the two reasons given most frequently by parents. One of the children in this category was referred by the parish priest at St. Elizabeth's.[162]

St. Francis Home's Financial Status

The Oblates' connection to the diocese ensured that SFH would not have the financial problems that plagued the COH. Like the COH, SFH had a large number of small individual contributors supported the work of the Oblates. The fact that it was under the supervision of the St. Louis Catholic Archdioceses also gave SFH the social capital that eluded the COH.[163] SFH used its social capital to develop relationships with prominent St. Louisians and Catholic social organizations. For example, it counted among its benefactors St. Louis beer baron August Busch and some of the city's founding families, Chouteau and

[161] Padgett, "Catholic Programs in St. Louis for the Care of Dependent, Neglected and Delinquent Children," 3.
[162] St. Francis Home's Vital Statistics Log.
[163] The term of social capital is borrowed from Robert Putnam's work on the nature of community. It refers to the social networks that individuals use to improve their lives. Social networks allow individuals to gain access to resources and contacts that allow them to improve their financial condition and social status. See Robert Putnam, Bowling Alone.

Laclede.[164] The Busch family name first appears in the home's records in 1896. Throughout the Progressive Era, August Busch was listed as benefactor.[165] August Busch also bequeathed $1000.00 to SFH.[166]

Another benefit of being part of the archdiocese was that SFH had access to credit from local banks. For example, SFH maintained rental property on Page Avenue through a loan from Mercantile Trust Co. Mercantile Trust not only loaned the money for these properties, the bank also managed the properties for the home. The sisters' real estate ventures were not always profitable. SFH's income statement for January 1901 indicates that the property financed through the Tedware Mortgage Co. was declining in value. Monthly bank statements from Mercantile Trust Co. show that the income received from the Oblate's rental property was inconsistent. Indeed, bank statements from 1901 through 1903 show that for most months the home's rental properties lost money.[167]

In the first decades of the twentieth century, SFH relied on contributions from Catholics and support from Catholic social organizations. During the first decades of the twentieth century, SFH rarely charged the parents of the children under their care.[168] SFH was able to access donations from Catholic social clubs and orders to pay for the operation of the home For example, the Knights of Columbus (K of C) and the Saint Vincent de Paul Society were consistent

[164] St. Francis Income Statement for December 1899 Ledger-Monthly Account 1898-1909, Oblate Sisters Archive Baltimore, Maryland.
[165] The Busch family name appears in the Annual reviews for 1905, 1908, 1912, and 1920.
[166] The Crisis, "Education," November 1914,166.
[167] Monthly Statements to the Oblate Sisters from Mercantile Trust, Oblate Sisters Archive Baltimore, Maryland.
[168] The financial records of St. Francis Home indicates that by the 1920s the home was regularly collecting payments from the girl's families. However in the first two decades they rarely collected fees from parents.

supporters. SFH's financial records show that the K of C president Emmett Kane was a regular contributor.[169] Under his leadership in 1904, SFH received $2,300.00 from the proceeds of the organization's annual carnival. Similarly, St. Vincent de Paul Society chapters regularly contributed to SFH. For example, the Society took up a special collection for the home in February 1904, that yielded $108.00 for the home.[170]

It should be noted that women's auxiliaries and ordinary citizens also routinely contributed to SFH. The home's financial records show that SFH received support for the Queens Daughters and .St Bridgette's Lyceum.[171] Other Catholic organizations that supported SFH included Calvary Cemetery Association, which donated $250.00 in 1921.[172]

While the Oblate sisters made it clear in their published materials that SFH did not have an endowment fund, the home did receive bequests and monetary gifts. For example, income statements show that in 1904 H. G. Roce bequeathed the home $100.00, and in 1906 Mrs. Beck left the home $500.00.[173] In 1920, SFH received 200 shares of St. Anthony, Donne Oil and Gas Co. with a request that the sisters pray that the company's geologist would pick the right place to drill.[174]

---

[169] Oblate Sisters' Twentieth Anniversary Annual Review.
[170] St. Francis Home Income Statement for June 1904 and 1907.
[171] St Francis Home Income Statement for February 1904.
[172] St Francis Home Income Statement for December 1921.
[173] St Francis Home Income Statements for June 1904 and June 1906.
[174] Frank Tegethoff to Oblate Sisters, 10 September 1920, Correspondence file Oblate Sister Archive, Baltimore Maryland.

SFH's most successful fundraising took place around important Catholic holidays. For example, the Christmas Stocking Appeal was SFH's biggest annual fundraiser. The children would make Christmas stockings, which the Oblates then sent to donors. The donors in turn returned the stockings with cash donations. The following table details the type of appeal and the amount raised.[175]

Table 5.3. Income from Fundraising Events at St Francis Home 1908-1929

Year	Type of Appeal	Amount Raised
1908	Christmas Stocking Appeal	$1,640.09
1921	Christmas Stocking Appeal	$2,528.00
1921	Easter Appeal	$572.00
1929	Christmas Stocking Appeal	$3,690.95

The amounts above show how important these fundraisers were to SFH, especially in the early part of the twentieth century. SFH's expenses for 1905 were $2,926.00. To put things in perspective, the Christmas stocking fund for the closet year, 1908, was $1,640.00.[176] The special holiday appeals became less of a factor in the home's finances as the century progressed. By 1929 SFH collected $3.690.95 in Christmas Stocking Appeal, and the total expenditures for 1929 were $29,599.00.[177]

Conclusion

[175] The information for Table 5.3 was collected from several sources. These sources include St. Francis Home Income Statements for December 1908, January 1922, March 1922, and McGinnes, A History of St. Francis Home, 98.
[176] The information was obtained from St. Francis Home Income Statement for December 1906 and Oblate Sisters, Twentieth Anniversary Annual Review.
[177] McGinnes, A History of St. Francis Home, 96-98.

Conclusion

The history of these two African American children's homes demonstrates the importance of cultural capital to their long term viability. St. Francis Home clearly benefited from its association with the St. Louis Archdiocese. It had access to resources that the Colored Orphans Home did not. As a result of its connections, SFH did not face the problems of providing basic care that plagued the COH in the first decades of the twentieth century. Social capital clearly played an important role in the relationship each of these institutions to the city's child welfare system. The COH was treated as though it were an African American institution. In this regard its relationship to the city welfare system was similar to that of many Southern cities Though the COH was never completely excluded from the city's child welfare network its marginalization came close to constituting a defacto form of exclusion.

Child welfare reformers treatment of the COH suggests that racial assignment did affect the trajectory of social welfare reform in St. Louis. The COH attempted to operate as a modern children's institution It was an integrative that keep the children under its care involved in the community. The children at the COH attended public school and the home encouraged parent involvement in their care. Given these facts it seems reasonable to assume that the city's child savers would have been eager to assist the COH. This was not the case. The COH was largely neglected by child welfare reformers. The COH's survival in the

nearly twentieth century is a testimony to the creativity and determination of St. Louis' African American community. The home did benefit from the continued support if St Louis African American community. Even after it closed St. Louis African American did not abandon the COH. With the help of Annie Malone African Americans raised sufficient capital to reopen the home.

The reopening of the COH provides further insight into the complexity of how race influences reform. The growth of St. Louis black population clearly had an affect on the attitudes of the city's child welfare reformers. Rather than continuing to position the COH as a marginalized institution, child welfare reformers incorporated the COH into a segregated system of child welfare service delivery. Once the COH reopened it was a member of the Community Fund and it developed relationships with other child welfare agencies.

SFH did not have any of the problems of the COH. From the outset it was treated more favorably by St. Louis child welfare reformers. It clearly benefited from the fact that it was seen not only as a black institution but also as a Catholic institution. SFH not only had access to support form other Catholic organizations it also had the support of many of St. Louis's prominent citizens. The acceptance of SFH by St. Louis child welfare reformers is evident in the fact that it regularly received funds from the St. Louis Board of Children's Guardians

The support received by SFH from the city's child welfare system further underscores the influence of race on child welfare reform. SFH was an inclusive institution. It showed little interest in the type of reforms advocated by Progressive Era child savers. Yet there is little evidence that child welfare

reformers had any interest in pressuring SFH home to modernize. SFH benefited from the fact that it honed its image as institution which operated comfortably within the existing system of racial privilege. SFH did not encourage the girls under its care to consider working as anything other than as domestics.

.

Chapter 6

Teaching Respectability: The Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls and African American Maternalism

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, African American educators throughout the South established a number of industrial schools, including both privately and publicly funded. Originally intended to provide training in agriculture and skill trades, the term was also used to cover institutions created for juvenile offenders. Thus, around the beginning of the twentieth century, reform schools adopted the name industrial school in an effort to improve their image. These state-run industrial schools were operated as correctional facilities and the education and training they offered was for the most part rudimentary. The Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls (Tipton),[1] a publically funded correctional facility for delinquent African American girls, was one such institution.

This chapter looks at how African American women used the segregated space of the State Industrial School to create their own version of maternalism. Progressive Era maternalism was not a monolithic phenomenon. Elizabeth Clapp points out that maternalism had two distinct strains. She contends that traditional maternalism closely identified with existing gender norms of motherhood and domesticity, while professional maternalism embraced the language of

[1] It is a common practice to refer to correctional facilities by the name of the town in which they are located. The Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls was located in Tipton, Mo.

professionalism and social science.[2] African American women reformers managed to blend these two aspects of maternalism. African American women asserted a view of womanhood that did not try to isolate gender from race and class issues. It explicitly embraced the value of marriage, sexual propriety, and responsibility for home and children.[3] At the same time, it grounded these values within a culture of social activism. Muncy has chronicled how professional maternalists connected professional practice with social reform. Black maternalism makes a similar connection. It is inseparable from the broader agenda of civil rights. Black maternalisms ultimate goal was to use the construction of gender to challenge white racial attitudes.

African American Industrial Education

African Americans have a long history of supporting industrial education. In the early twentieth century, black support for industrial education was based in large part on their assessment of the political and economic realities of living in an era of extreme racial hostility.[4] The model of industrial education used by African Americans emphasized economic and moral progress while relegating demands for full citizenship to the future. The structure and content of African American industrial education was shaped by the need to keep the support of white southerners and northern philanthropists.[5] That is, recognizing that they

[2] Elizabeth Clapp, Mothers of All Children: Women Reformers and the Rise of the Juvenile Courts in Progressive Era America, (University Park, Pa: Pennsylvania State university Press, 1998),4.

[3] Gordon, Pited But Not Entitles: Single Mothers and the History of Welfare, (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1994),113.
[4] August Meier, Negro Thought in America 1880-1915, 86.
[5] Gaines, Uplifting the Race, 34.

were operating in an environment of extreme racial animosity, African Americans were willing to accept this limited view of industrial education because they saw it as their best chance at social advancement. Blacks hoped that focusing on industrial skills would allow them the opportunity to become farmers and skilled tradesmen.

White visions of racial harmony were closely tied to African American participation in the labor market; thus, most white philanthropists saw the goal of black industrial education as providing a stable semi-skilled work force. The northern philanthropist William Baldwin expressed the view of many white philanthropists when he advised African Americans, "Face the music, avoid social questions, leave politics alone, live moral lives, live simply, learn to work and work intelligently; learn to work hard, learn that any work however menial, if done well is dignified …"[6] White opinions on the nature of African American industrial education fit well with the conservative racial ideology of the early twentieth century. The conception of the purpose of industrial education fit the idea of creating a place at the bottom of the social ladder for African Americans. Their support for a limited and rudimentary form of education in turn allowed white southerners to justify policies of racial exclusion. The paradox for African Americans was that promoting industrial education and social uplift as the means to achieve racial equality meant incorporating some of the racial stereotypes that were used by whites to limit their social progress.[7]

[6] Litwack, Trouble in Mind, 81.
[7] Gaines, Uplifting the Race, 6.

The establishment of Tipton was part of a movement by African American club women to create industrial schools for delinquent African American girls. As a result of exclusion, there were no publicly supported institutions for black girls in the South, and southern courts frequently committed black girls, regardless of age, to adult jails.[8] Black women were concerned about this practice for important reasons. Not only were the young women placed in adult jails at greater risk of physical and sexual assault, they were also being denied any form of moral training.

Educated African American women saw the creation of industrial schools as part of their responsibility in uplifting their race.[9] Throughout the South, then, black women advocated for public funds to support the placement of African American girls in industrial schools operated by African American women. By the late 1920s, there were seven southern industrial schools, either completely state supported or receiving state funds for the care and training of black girls.[10] The creation of state-funded industrial schools for young black women was part of a larger movement to build correctional institutions for delinquent girls. In a ten-year period, from 1910-1920, twenty-three new state institutions for delinquent girls were built.[11] The creation of so many institutions in such a short period of time was the direct result of increased public anxiety over the sexual morals of

[8] Wilma Peebles-Wilkins, "Janie Porter Barrett and the Virginia Industrial School for Colored Girls: Community Response to the Needs of African American Children," Child Welfare 74 (1995): 144.
[9] Floris Bennett Cash, African American Women and Social Action: Volunteerism from Jim Crow to the New Deal (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2001), 36.
[10] Reeves, Schools for Delinquent Girls, 33.
[11] Mary Odem, Delinquent Daughters: Protecting and Policing Adolescent Sexuality in the United States,1885-1920 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 116.

young single women. The large number of young women entering the labor force precipitated a change in the social status of young women. Specifically, their participation in the labor market allowed many young women to have a brief period of autonomy until they left the job market for marriage.[12]

Sexual Delinquency

The increased autonomy of single women led to a reformulation of the definition of female sexuality. At the start of the twentieth century, college-educated women rejected the Victorian interpretation of women as sexually passive and as victims. Acknowledgment of female sexual agency also led many of these women to conclude that young women who engaged in illicit sexual conduct were in need of reform.[13] The creation of the legal and scientific category of sexual delinquent was used by Progressive Era reformers to increase state interest and intervention in the sex lives of young single women. Progressive reformers used the new institutions of the juvenile court and the industrial schools to enforce their definition of sexual propriety.

The juvenile court viewed sexual delinquency as a serious matter. A review of court records for this period demonstrates that a large percentage of the young women brought before the court were there after being accused of some form of illicit sexual behavior. The juvenile records further demonstrate that young women brought before the court were more likely than young men to be committed to an institution. For example, the juvenile records in Chicago, Los

[12] Odem, Delinquent Daughters, 3.
[13] Odem, Delinquent Daughters, 1.

Angeles, Memphis, and Milwaukee all showed high rates of commitments and low rates of probation for delinquent girls.[14]

Young black women did not have the same access to the labor market as young white women, but they did experience the same autonomy as their white counterparts. As in so many aspects of Progressive-Era reform, the racist beliefs of the dominant culture helped shape the responses of social reformers to the needs of African Americans. The difference in the community's attitude towards young black women is evident in that white girls were more likely to have been referred to the court for sexual deviance. The prevalence of sexual stereotypes about black women led many Progressive Era reformers to ignore the sexual activities of young black women. For example, in 1930, 1,458 white girls were adjudicated by the juvenile courts for sex offenses compared to 338 black girls.[15]

African American Maternalism

The seven industrial schools created in this period provided a relatively autonomous site for black women to try to create their own definition of black womanhood. With the exception of the Maryland Industrial School for Negro Girls, these institutions were managed and staffed by black women.[16] Since many if not most whites assumed that African Americans were incapable of being reformed, these institutions operated with little interference by state officials. Black women saw the creation of institutions as way of extending an African American form of maternalism to their community. Like their white counterparts,

[14] Odem, Delinquent Daughters, 115.
[15] Juvenile Court Statistics for 1930, U.S. Department of Labor Children's Bureau (Washington D.C.: GPO, 1932), 13.
[16] Reeves, Training Schools for Delinquent Girls, 42.

African American women often used the rhetoric of maternalism to describe their reform efforts, justifying their involvement in child welfare reform by asserting that they were suited to be involved in reform because of their experiences as mothers.[17]

Maternalism for African American women stemmed from their understanding of their class status. Middle-class black women viewed their class status as the result of their achievements, rather than as a matter of birthright. Many educated black women in turn interpreted their achievements in education as a call to duty.[18] Proud of their achievements, black women, therefore, centered many of their reform initiatives on helping young women reproduce the success they experienced as educated women. Black women considered educational attainment one of the most important avenues for reform. [19]

The issue of race clearly influenced how African American women perceived their role as reformers. The goals of improving the lives of women and improving the status of African Americans in general were often combined based on the belief that in improving the lives of African American women, the entire race was lifted up.[20] Consequently, service to young women became a primary arena for most black women reformers, in particular, protection and shelter.[21] Industrial schools like Tipton were part of a systemized and continuous program

---

[17] Gordon, Pitied But Not Entitled: Single Mothers and the History of Welfare (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press,1994), 126.
[18] Iris Carlton-LaNay and Vanessa Hodges, "African American Reformers Mission: Caring for Our Girls and Women," Affila 3 (2004): 257.
[19] Gordon, Pitied But Not Entitled, 123-124.
[20] Paula Giddings, When and Where Do I Enter: Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America, (New York: Bantam Books, 1985), 55.
[21] Carlton-LaNey and Hodges, "African American Reformers' Mission," 261.

of educational and vocational guidance for young African American women.[22] The management style developed in African American industrial schools reflected the communitarian and Christian values of the women managers.[23] Through private and public institutions, black women stressed academic competence and character building, including the materialist values of morals, manners, and establishing a cultured home.[24] Nannie Burroughs, who ran the National Training School in Washington, D.C, expressed the views of many black women reformers when she stated that her school was based on the three Bs – "Bible, bath, and broom". [25]

The effects of American racism served to reduce some of the emotional and social distance between African American women reformers and the young women they sought to help. A college education did not spare African American women from having to take jobs as unskilled laborers in order to make ends meet. Often their salaries as professional women were not enough to live on.[26] Black women reformers also saw in the young women they tried to help the best parts of themselves. Noted black reformer Fannie Barrier Williams made the following observation about the young black woman, "She is irrepressible. She is insulted, but holds up her head; she is scorned, but proudly demands respect …

[22] Carlton-LaNey and Hodges, "African American Reformers' Mission," 262.
[23] Gunja Sengupta, "Elites, Subalterns, and American Identities: A Case Study of African American Benevolence," American Historical Review 109, no. 4 (2004): 12.
[24] Carlton-LaNey and Hodges, "African American Reformers' Mission," 263.
[25] Evelyn. Higginbotham, "Nannie Helen Buroughs (1879-1961)" eds. Darlene Hine, Elsa Brown, and Rosalyn Turborg-Penn, Black Women in America (Bloomington, Ind: University of Indiana Press, 1993), 201-205.
[26] Jones, Labor of Love, 146.

upon her devolves the marvelous task of establishing the social status of the race."[27]

The emotional connection between the staff and residents of African American institutions reflected the importance of communitarian values to African American interpretations of maternalism. The development of extended kinship and community relationships in child care was an outgrowth of the methods of adaptation developed by blacks during slavery, whereby disruption of family bonds was counterbalanced in slave communities by the use of extended kin and community child care arrangements.[28] The influence of communitarian values of African American maternalism at times placed it in conflict with the developing professionalization of child welfare that valued scientific analysis over emotionalism. For example, Sengupta pointed out that white professionals were often critical of the affective relationships between black matrons and the children under their care.[29] The prevalence of these perceptions among white professionals contributed to the belief that blacks were resistant to modern methods of child welfare practice.[30]

Black maternalism values were an important part in the management philosophy of the industrial school at Tipton. The close person relationship between the girls and the school's staff is evident in letters the girls wrote the superintendent after their parole. The young women who left Tipton often wrote

[27] Carlton-LaNey and Hodges, "African American Reformers' Mission," 261.
[28] Herbert Gutman, The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom, 1750-1925 (New York: Vintage Books, 1977), 217.
[29] Sengupta, "Elites, Subalterns and American Identities," 16.
[30] O'Donnell, "Care of Dependent African American Children in Chicago."

back to say how they were living respectable lives. For example, Carol Saunders wrote since her discharge that she was "Doing fine in school and the rest of the time I stay home and study my lessons."[31] In the same letter, Carol wrote, "When I came home everyone told everybody I was home and the 'niggers' began to flock. I told them in a nice way I was not interested."[32] The girls often used letters to try to explain their behavior to the superintendent. Many letters reflected the anxiety that the girls felt when the superintendent was upset with them. Susan Billing's letter to the superintendent demonstrates how fearful the girls were of losing the superintendent's support. Billings wrote, "I know you wonder why that every time you put the least little bit of faith in me that I let you down. And why you can't help me. Well mother there are reasons I have kept from you and others. I haven't told a soul. I haven't the courage to do so."[33] Another resident, Camille Dawes, wrote, "You have said that I am one of your worst girls, I am trying to be one of your best girls."[34]

These letters also highlight another important aspect of African American maternalism: African American women reformers tended to operate with less distance and condescension between helper and helped than white women reformers.[35] The response of superintendent Elizabeth Bowles to Grace Brown demonstrates this approach to running the institution. Bowles, in her reply to

---

[31] Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls Case File 718.
[32] Ann Brown to Superintendent Bowles, 30 August 1936, Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls Case File 718. Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Mo.
[33] Susan Billings to Superintendent Bowles, n.d., Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls Case File 594, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Mo.
[34] Letter from Camille Dawes to Superintendent Bowles, n.d., Missouri Industrial School for Negro Girls Case File 722, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Mo.
[35] Gordon, Pitied But Not Entitled, 141.

Grace Brown, wrote the following, “Your letter raised me out of the dumps. I was worried sick about you and now I see that there was no need to worry because your development was genuine. I am so proud of you, and rest assured that I will do all that I can to help you out.”[36]

Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls

It is against this background that the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls was established.[37] Tipton was among the four black publicly funded industrial schools. The total cost to build Tipton was approximately $360,000. In 1909 the Missouri state legislature allocated $200,000 for the building of the industrial school, and additional expenditures were allocated over the next six years.[38]

Tipton began operation in May of 1916. The slow pace of construction was not unusual for black industrial schools, including the first black industrial school, the Virginia Industrial School for Colored Girls. The Virginia school started development in 1908 and did not open until 1915. The slow pace in obtaining adequate funding appears to have been the primary obstacle for both the Virginia Industrial School and Tipton.[39] African Americans were involved from the very beginning in the planning and management of the industrial school at Tipton. The enabling legislation established a commission of five members to locate,

[36] Superintendant Bowles to Grace Brown, n.d., Missouri Industrial School for Negro Girls Case File 357.
[37] Reeves, Training Schools for Delinquent Girls, 42.
[38] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo, 1927-1928), 211.
[39] Peebles, “Janine Porter Barrett and the Virginia Industrial School for Colored Girls,” 145.

establish, and manage the school.[40] One year prior to the opening, this commission decided to appoint blacks to fill the jobs at Tipton. This decision was in step with similar decisions made in other southern states. Eight of the nine black industrial schools were staffed exclusively by African Americans.[41] This step did generate some controversy. In an editorial, The Tipton Times argued that in order to prevent recidivism, the management of the industrial school should be given to a capable white woman. This way the girls at Tipton could be sent out as domestics for good white families.[42]

The fact that Tipton was a state-run institution was both a blessing and a hindrance. As a state institution Tipton was guaranteed a reliable source of income and, thus, did not have the problem faced by private institutions of trying to raise money through charitable donations. However, at the same time Tipton lost some of the independence that came with being a private institution. The school had to comply with policy set by the Department of Corrections. For example, most of what was taught at Tipton was mandated by the state department of education.[43] The state did not attempt to alter its policies after Tipton opened. The corrections program at Tipton was identical to that mandated for the white industrial school – The Missouri State Industrial School for Girls.

The industrial school largely served girls from the larger urban areas. By far the largest group of young women at Tipton came from the St. Louis area.

---

[40] Biennial Report for the State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1927-1928), 211.
[41] Reeves, Training Schools for Delinquent Girls, 87.
[42] The Tipton Times 13 August 1915, 3.
[43] The Biennial Reports all mention the need to live up to state education requirements.

Table 6.1 compares the number of commitments to Tipton with the number of commitments from the St. Louis area. This data clearly shows that a large number of young women committed to Tipton were from St. Louis. This stems several factors. First, St. Louis as the state's largest city had the largest black population. Second, St. Louis was an important city in the first large migration of African Americans to the North. It saw its black population dramatically increase over a short period of time. Third, state law required counties to cover the cost of an inmate's stay at Tipton. It is not likely that poorer and more rural counties could afford this expense. Finally, St. Louis had the state's first juvenile court, which enabled the city to have a uniform and routine process for committing young women to Tipton.

Table 6.1. Number of Girls Committed to Tipton From St. Louis[44]

Year	Total Number of Girls Committed to Tipton	Number of Girls From St. Louis
1923	42	18
1924	45	18
1925	44	18

[44] The dated compiled for this table was taken from the Biennial Reports for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls.

1926	41	6
1927	55	27
1928	61	36
1929	70	27
1930	68	35

Family Composition

The family composition of the young women who were committed to Tipton was similar to that of the black children admitted to St. Louis's two orphan asylums. As a result of crowded and unsanitary conditions of many African American neighborhoods, African American adults were more prone to serious illness and premature death. Thus, Tipton's biennial reports for 1921-1930 indicated that 230 of 408 young women committed to Tipton were reported as having one or both their parents as deceased. Table 6.2 demonstrates how the death of parents was a common feature of the families of the young women at Tipton. With the exception of 1927, the number of girls committed to Tipton who were half orphans or orphans remained constant over the nine-year period surveyed.[45]

Table 6.2. Girls with a Deceased Parent Who Were Committed to Tipton

	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930
Mother deceased	5	9	6	5	4	5	9	7	6	2

[45] These data were compiled for the Biennial Reports for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls Dept. of Penal Institutions, 1921-1931.

Father deceased	10	6	12	4	6	4	10	10	4	6
Mother deceased/ remarriage	0	0	1	3	4	4	5	3	0	0
Father deceased/ remarriage	0	0	3	3	2	6	5	2	0	0
Orphans	5	1	5	5	4	7	13	10	9	1
Total	20	16	27	20	18	26	42	32	19	9

The large number of girls listed as having lost a parent is not surprising, given the poor health conditions found in most African American neighborhoods in St. Louis. As the result of segregated housing patterns, African American migrants to St. Louis lived in overcrowded neighborhoods, where the housing was substandard. The poor health conditions in these neighborhoods contributed to high rates of mortality for African Americans.

Table 6.3 provides a comparison of the mortality rates for St. Louis whites and African Americans over a thirty-year period.[46] As illustrated, in this period of time, the black population of St. Louis ranged from 4-8% of the city's population. Yet, the death rates for African Americans were consistently higher than for St. Louis's whites.

[46] The data for this table were collected from two documents published by the U.S. Census Bureau: Charles E. Hall, Negroes in the United States 1920-1932 U.S Census Bureau, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1935) and Negro Population of the United States 1790-1915, U.S. Census Bureau (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1917).

Table 6.3. Comparison of Mortality Rates for St. Louis Blacks and Whites, 1900-1930

Year	Mortality Rate for Whites per 1,000	Mortality Rate for African Americans per 1,000
1900	17.1	30.9
1910	15.1	26.0
1920	13.5	19.9
1930	13.1	20.7

The high death rate from tuberculosis further underscores the damaging health effects of African American neighborhoods in St. Louis. In 1920 the rate of tubercular deaths for African Americans was 249.1 per 1,000,000. By comparison, for whites the rate was 68.1. By 1930, the rate for African American grew to 251.8 per 1,000,000, while the tubercular death rate for St. Louis whites declined to 35.3 per 1,000,000.[47]

Returning to Table 6.2, one of the most notable facts in this table is the large number of girls listed as orphans. This large cohort of orphans is remarkable for a child care institutions in the 1920s. The number of orphans in institutions had begun to decline in the 1880s.[48] The increased number of orphans at Tipton might in part be explained by the higher mortality rates for African Americans in Missouri's two largest cities, St. Louis and Kansas City. Another factor that likely contributed to the high number of orphans was that

[47] Hall, Negroes in the United States 1920-1932, 455.
[48] Cmiel, A Home of a Different Kind, 19.

single mothers were a large cohort within the African Americans who migrated North.[49]

A second factor to consider in explaining the large number of orphans is differential treatment by the social welfare administrators. David Tanenhaus has suggested that with the advent of mothers' pensions that the juvenile court in Chicago developed a two-track system for the disposition of dependent cases, in which the courts used the gender of the parents to track their children.[50] The children of single fathers were placed on the institutional track, while the children of single mothers were usually placed on home-based track. [51] Tanenhaus's analysis can easily be extended to include racial factors. The assumption of most administrators of mothers' pensions was that African American mothers always worked and raised their children and could continue to do so without harming their children. [52] Consequently, the number of African American women eligible for home mother's pensions was small. Administration of the pension program in St. Louis seems to support this interpretation. For example, in 1922, only one black woman is recorded to have received assistance through a pension.[53]

---

[49] Jones, Labor of Love, Labor of Sorrow, 158.
[50] The young women who were committed to Tipton were adjudicated as delinquents. The line between delinquency and dependence has always been vague. This is especially true for African American children. The number of African American children treated by the juvenile courts as dependent has always been relatively small in relation to the number of cases adjudicated as delinquent. In many of these cases, African American children could easily been labeled as dependent. The young women at Tipton could have easily been deemed dependent. David S Tanenhaus, "Growing up Dependent: Family Preservation in Early Twentieth Century Chicago," Law and History Review (Fall 2000), <http://www. historycooperative
[51] David S Tanenhaus, "Growing up Dependent: Family Preservation in Early Twentieth Century Chicago," 2.
[52] Tanenhaus, "Growing up Dependent," 16.
[53] Florence Nesbitt, "Standards of Public Aid to Children in Their Own Homes," U.S. Department of Labor Children's Bureau (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1923), 45.

Academic Instruction

As mentioned, the academic instruction at Tipton was largely rudimentary. For most of the Progressive Era, instruction was limited to grades one through eight. It was not until 1930 that the school added the first and second year of high school.[54] The girls who entered Tipton were tested to determine their highest level of academic achievement.[55] Table 6.4 documents the grade levels of the girls admitted from 1921 to 1930.[56] As illustrated, the educational levels of the girls committed to Tipton gradually increased, with the largest jump occurring in 1927. The number of girls in grades five was nearly twice that of the year before. The data also show that most of the girls committed were in grades four through seven. Finally, in what appears to be a break in the trend of increased educational achievement, the number of girls in the eighth grade dramatically decreased.

Table 6.4. Grade Level of Girls at Tipton, 1921-1930

Grades	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th
1921	2	0	3	4	5	7	3	0
1922	2	3	3	1	4	7	4	2
1923	1	2	4	9	9	3	9	5

[54] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, 1930 Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1929-1930), 276.
[55] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1923-1924), 113.
[56] The data for this table were obtained from Biennial Reports for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions, 1921-1931.

1924	2	0	5	11	7	4	4	5
1925	1	3	5	9	3	6	8	3
1926	0	0	3	4	6	6	12	1
1927	1	1	2	4	11	11	6	4
1928	4	2	5	8	10	4	12	7
1929	2	0	7	13	9	15	10	5
1930	0	2	0	1	2	15	5	1

When examining these figures, it is important to keep in mind that for most of the first half of the twentieth century, the only Missouri high schools for African Americans were located in St. Louis and Kansas City. Given the absence black of high schools in the remainder of the state, opportunity for secondary schooling for African Americans outside these two metropolitan areas was impossible. Economics also played an important role in the decreased number of black girls in the eighth grade. Faced with the need to help financially support their families, many African American youths stopped their schooling to work as low-skilled laborers. The census data on black children attending school bear this out. Starting at age 15, the number of black children attending school dropped precipitously.[57]

The content of the instruction at Tipton followed Missouri's recommended standards. The industrial school's ability to provide the girls with an adequate academic education was hampered by several factors. Tipton employed two full-

[57] The census data for 1920 provides an illustration of the drop in the number of black children attending school after age 15. In St. Louis, 70.2% of black males and 76.5% of black females age 14 are attending school. By age 18 the percentages drop to 14.8% of black males and 19.6% of black females United States Census for 1920 U.S. Census Bureau Department of Labor, (Washington D.C.: GPO,1920),405.

time teachers. Describing the teachers as full time is a little misleading, however. Both teachers had other duties in addition to teaching. One served as a dormitory matron and the other was the school's stenographer.[58] By comparison, the number of children needing instruction ranged between 70 and 120. In addition to the high teacher-student ratio, education at Tipton was hindered by a lack of adequate classroom space. The school had only two classrooms.[59] In contrast, the state's industrial school for white girls, The Industrial School for Girls, Chillicothe, had its own school building. In many respects, the academic program at Tipton closely resembled that of a one-room school house. Given the wide spread of grade levels that existed at the industrial school, it is very likely that in each class there were students representing multiple grades. The comingling of different grades and age groups would have diluted the instruction for each grade.

The age range of the students at Tipton also complicated educational programming. Like many African American institutions in this time period, Tipton served more than one purpose. Not only was it an institution for delinquent girls, it was also as an asylum for neglected and dependent young black girls. The admission age started at age 7. By comparison, the Industrial School for Girls in Chillicothe did not accept children under the age of 11. The number of girls under

[58] The Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions, (Jefferson City, Mo, 1931-1932), 211.
[59] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo 1923-1924), 66.

the age of 11 admitted to Tipton was small. Between 1921 and 1930, thirteen girls under 11 were admitted.[60] Overall, the youngest admissions were age 6.[61]

Vocational Training

One aspect in which the operation of the industrial schools remained constant over time was that they were managed as total institutions. These state-supported schools remained closed organizational systems that maintained minimal contact with the environment outside the institution. The insular nature of the schools is evident in the role vocational training played in the life of the institution. Vocational education within industrial schools had to conform to the basic needs of the institution. Thus, most educational activities were in large measure organized around contributing to the day-to-day operation of the institution. The biennial report for 1931 expressed the importance of inmate labor. The superintendent emphasized that part of Tipton's approach to training was to make it as self-sustaining as possible so as not to be a burden on the tax payers. Thus, the types of activities were directly tied to the needs of the institution.[62]

The training available at Tipton was similar to that offered at other Missouri state industrial schools. The primary aim of the industrial school at Tipton and the industrial school for white girls at Chillicothe was to prepare their inmates to become domestics, laundry workers, farm hands, or seamstresses.

[60] This figure was compiled by reviewing the Biennial Reports of the Missouri Industrial School for Negro Girls for this period of time.
[61] The Biennial Reports for 1925 and 1927 reported admitting 6-year-olds.
[62] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1931-1932).

The major difference between the institutions was with regard to access to resources. In most cases, Chillicothe had greater access to equipment and staff than did Tipton. For example, a comparison of the biennial reports indicates that the beauty shop at Chillicothe had a licensed beautician while Tipton had to rely on a well-trained inmate.[63]

Sewing was one of the oldest departments at Tipton and was viewed as one of the more important forms of training available at the school. The biennial report of 1925 described sewing as "one of the most essential trades of the industrial school teachings."[64] The importance that Tipton placed on sewing stemmed from the market demand for seamstresses. Many of the young women who left Tipton earned their living as seamstresses.[65] The school's administrators echoed the idea of sewing being an important way of earning a living. According to the superintendent, to sew well was a splendid accomplishment in a useful life.[66]

The value of sewing education at the industrial school can be seen in the administration's decision to limit the class size of the sewing classes. Only ten young women were assigned to the sewing department every three months, while the class size in the laundry and housekeeping departments were assigned

[63] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1927-1928), 221.
[64] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1925-1926), 177.
[65] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1923-1924), 114.
[66] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions, (Jefferson City, Mo, 1919-1920), 67.

twenty inmates every three months.[67] The importance of sewing is also evident in the role it played in the young women getting paroled from Tipton. Thus, the industrial school's biennial report for 1921 states that "no girl is allowed to go home until she has learned to make and does make her own outfit."[68] The most produced item in sewing classes were gingham dresses and gowns. In a ten-year period, the sewing classes at Tipton produced 4,637 gingham dresses. The fact that the industrial school produced such a large number of one type of dress suggests that the young women were being trained for work in garment factories. A description of the sewing class as including all the steps in the mass production of clothing further indicates that the young women were being trained to do factory work.

In 1922, Tipton added two new sewing machines to ensure that clothes could be produced on a larger scale.[69] The biennial report describes one sewing room as having ten sewing machines, a cutting table, and an electric iron for pressing the clothes.[70] Many of the items produced in the sewing classes were for use in the institution. Consistently among the largest number of items produced were sheets, towels, sanitary napkins, and pillow cases. Tipton also taught the inmates rug making. The rugs were made from the remnants of material left over from sewing classes. The inmates would dye the remnants and

[67] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions, (Jefferson City, Mo, 1925-1926), 177.
[68] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions, (Jefferson City, Mo, 1919-1920), 67.
[69] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions, (Jefferson City, Mo., 1921-1922), 67.
[70] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo., 1929-1930), 283.

weave them into rugs.[71] The biennial report for 1927 describes the purpose of rug making in the following way, “Minds and hands that are busy with wholesome thought and work tend to make the body rich.”[72]

Initially started as a way to keep the girls busy, rug making developed into a profitable business for Tipton. The rugs gained a reputation for quality. In 1930, the rugs won first prize at the Missouri State Fair. They also sold well in the surrounding communities. The industrial school was able to use the proceeds from rugs sales to purchase a hand-operated loom.[73]

Farming and gardening were also considered an important part of the curriculum at Tipton. The inclusion of agriculture in the curriculum reflects the regional nature of industrial education. State and private industrial schools from large urban states such as Massachusetts and Ohio did not include agricultural training, but other Midwest institutions such as those operated in Kansas did include agriculture. The number of acres under cultivation ranged from sixty-two in 1921 to sixty-nine in 1923. In addition to cultivation, the girls also helped raise livestock.

The fact that agriculture remained a major part of the training at Tipton was indication of the conservative nature of industrial training at the time. Most of the young women committed to Tipton were from St. Louis and Kansas City.

---

[71] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo., 1927-1928), 222.
[72] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1921-1922), 222.
[73] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1929-1930), 280.

Therefore, it was not likely that they would seek employment in agriculture or become the wives of farmers once they left Tipton.

The managers did attempt to individualize vocational training at Tipton. For example, the school started a commercial education division to teach secretarial skills to girls who had completed the eighth grade. The young women in this section learned both shorthand and typing. Commercial education was an area where Tipton had a strong investment. Rather than depend on an inmate to serve as instructor, the industrial school employed a teacher who was certified in shorthand. Preparation for these classes appears to have been rigorous. Requiring practice outside of class time, the school's schedule set time aside in the evening for typing practice. In rare cases, young women were allowed to leave the institution for educational purposes. For example, the biennial report for 1927 shows that a young woman was allowed to attend classes at the closest black college, Lincoln University.[74]

Discipline

Tipton was established towards the end of the Progressive Era, a time when professionalism and modernism were beginning to take hold in many private children's institutions. These institutions attempted to soften their treatment of children through individualizing of treatment and a greater emphasis on child development.[75] This trend was not adopted at most publicly funded children's institutions.

---

[74] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1927-1928), 215.
[75] Cmeil, A Home of a Different Kind, 86.

Theories of child development and individualized treatment ran contrary to the basic philosophy of the state industrial school, which was founded on the belief that their purpose was to reform the bad habits of the children under their care by teaching them the value of self-discipline and hard work. To this end, the industrial school stayed true to its original goals of the first house of refuge in New York City: to teach children useful employment skills, basic education, and moral education.

Institutional use of discipline was geared towards these basic goals. The first mention of an organized system for the administering of discipline at Tipton was in the biennial report for 1922. This report describes a merit system that was tied to winning parole. A crude behavioral system of earning daily credits, it allowed each young woman three credits a day. Thirty credits were equal to one merit, and it took ninety merits to be eligible for parole. This method of discipline also involved shaming those young women who had lost credits. The girls who had misbehaved were singled out in an assembly that took place after Sunday religious services.[76]

While this system remained in effect until 1930, in 1924 the system was modified to include a form of merit system. All the young women who were admitted to Tipton were placed in grade B. The young women who earned enough merits were eventually rewarded by promotion to grade A. The young

[76] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1921-1922), 65.

women in grade A were entitled to special privileges. The young women who misbehaved were placed in grade C.[77]

There were practical reasons for using this system. By contemporary standards, Tipton was considered a large congregate institution. Throughout the 1920s, the industrial schools census ranged from 80 to 120 young women. During this time, Tipton placed a greater emphasis on compliance to a standard set of rules. The merit system used at Tipton was a remnant of the early-twentieth-century. It was similar to that used by other large congregate institutions. For instance, the Hebrew Orphanage Asylum of Cleveland, which housed 300-500 children, used that kind of system.[78]

Another remnant of the early twentieth century was Tipton's occasional use of physical punishment. Though the use of physical punishment was not an official policy of the institution, its case records show that it was used on occasion. Lilly Mathews, in a letter to the superintendent, refers to how she received a beating from the superintendent for engaging in a same-sex relationship. Lilly writes, "You have talked to me, you have beat me and you have done everything that could be done to break me of the most disgraceful habit."[79]

[77] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1925-1926), 171.
[78] Gary Polster, Inside Looking Out: The Cleveland Jewish Orphan Asylum 1868-1924 (Kent, Oh: Kent State University Press, 1990), 143.
[79] Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Case File #549, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Mo.

In another case, the discharge form of Madelyn Brown refers to striking her with wet towels as a way to subdue her when her anger became uncontrollable.[80]

The use of corporal punishment was not uncommon in children's institutions at the beginning of the twentieth century. For example, the Chicago Half Orphan's Home allowed its matron to use corporal punishment as did the Hebrew Orphan Asylum in Cleveland.[81]

Social Life

The social lives of the girls at Tipton were severely limited. Like many industrial school of the Progressive Era, Tipton saw as part of its mission the creation of a wholesome family-like environment. The school's biennial report for 1923 described this objective as follows: "The inmates find here a home in which one may express sorrows and get sympathy and love, and also a home in which one expects to be chastised if improper conduct is evident."[82] The report went on to stress that the "present management strives at all times to remove from the minds of the inmates as well as the minds of the public the penal idea of restoration…."[83] However sincere the efforts to eliminate the idea of punishment from the industrial school were, the punitive aspects of Tipton's operation overwhelmed management's ability to recreate the experience of living in a family. The need to treat the girls as though they were inmates limited their ability

[80] Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Case File #697, Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Mo.
[81] For a critique of ongoing debates over the use of corporal punishment in child-caring facilities, ,see Polster, Inside Looking Out, or Cmiel, A Home of a Different Kind.
[82] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1923-1924), 110.
[83] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1923-1924), 109.

to leave the grounds or to organize social life around group activities. The most telling indication of Tipton's operation as a correctional facility was that it did not remove bars from the windows and eliminate dungeons until 1927.[84]

Tipton's size and structure also worked against its replicating middle-class family life. Tipton was a congregate institution. In the first three decades of the twentieth century, the school's census ranged from 60-120 girls. The girls lived in four large dormitories, each supervised by a live-in matron. The girls' schedule was highly regulated. Their day began at 5:30 a.m. with a one-hour chapel service and ended with taps at 8:00 pm. Most the inmates' day was spent in school or at work. The girls spent four hours a day in school and four hours on a work detail. The school allotted two hours a day for recreation. The remainder of the time was set aside for meals.[85]

The emphasis that Tipton placed on replicating family life was the result of a complex mixture of class pretensions and an effort to teach survival strategies. The Great Migration exacerbated class conflicts within the cities that southern blacks settled. Many members of the black middle class worried about the impact of increased migration of southern blacks on their social status. Their increased anxiety led African American women reformers to consciously construct their own social identity by portraying working class and poor blacks as less respectable.[86] In order to distinguish themselves from new migrants, middle-class black women

[84] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1927-1928), 218.
[85] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo.1931-1932), 421.
[86] Victoria Wolcott, Remaking Respectability, 7.

equated the failure of black migrants to live up to middle-class standards of decorum with low moral standard.[87]

That there were important class differences regarding the meaning of respectability should not overshadow that there was also considerable agreement about the importance of respectability to African American women. Many aspects of the social uplift philosophy of respectability resonated with preexisting values in the African American community. Therefore, it is important to understand that African American women's allegiance to social respectability was more than an attempt to recreate a white bourgeois lifestyle. For most African American women, respectability was connected to a feeling of racial pride and self-definition.[88]

Black women also saw the promotion of social propriety as a method of protecting themselves against sexual harassment by white men. Thus, black women used gentility to contest the negative and pernicious sexual stereotypes held by most whites. It was conceived of as a way to safely contest white male control over their bodies. In promoting respectability, African American women were hoping to use the gendered values associated with the Victorian ideal of true womanhood to include racial empowerment.[89] In promoting a more inclusive definition of female virtue, black women intended to create the polar opposite view of black women than held by most white men. Respectability became a way in which black women confounded genetic explanations of black inferiority by

[87] Deborah White, Too Heavy a Load, 71.
[88] Wolcott, Remaking Respectability, 7.
[89] Wolcott, Remaking Respectability, 17.

insisting that they had the same character traits as white women.

At Tipton, it appears that sexual propriety was equated with being asexual. This is surprising in that most of the young women were sexually active prior to their commitment. The case records indicate that inmates' sexual experience ranged from monogamous sexual relations with boyfriends to practicing prostitution.

Lilly Davenport's history was similar to that of many of the girls who were committed to Tipton. Lilly was arrested for running away from the home of a relative to stay with her boyfriend. Less common was a story of Florence Wright, who was committed to Tipton because she relied on "gentleman friends" to help pay the bills.

The school administrators were aware of the girls' sexual history. In 1921, as part of its admissions physical, Tipton started testing the girls for venereal disease, but it was erratic in its reporting of the treatment of sexually transmitted diseases (STD). Table 6.5 details the extent of STDs among the girls admitted to Tipton.

Table 6.5 Number of Girls Committed to Tipton Diagnosed with STD[90]

Biennial Report	Number of Commitments	Number of Cases of STDs
1921	54	27
1923	87	16
1929	81	38

[90] The information for this table was taken from the Biennial reports for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls.

In a ten-year period Tipton records note the number of young women treated for STDs on only three occasions. The highest number of cases reported was in the 1929 biennial report, with thirty-eight of eighty girls receiving treatment. The lowest number was in 1923, when sixteen of eighty-seven girls were treated for an STD. Tipton, despite the significant number of cases of STDs, made no attempt to provide the girls with sex education.

The persistence of negative stereotypes about black sexuality made public discussions of sexual deportment difficult for blacks. The fear of misunderstanding often made them reluctant to discuss their views about sexuality. Whether this lack of a discussion about sex reflected the personal reticence of the African American women who managed Tipton is difficult to assess. In order to protect themselves from racial hostility, African American women developed a style of communication historian Darlene Hines-Clark has called dissemblance. Clark argues that the culture of dissemblance gives black women the appearance of being open, while remaining an enigma to whites.[91] Given this information, it seems unlikely that the African American women in charge of Tipton would reveal very much about sex education.

Works by Progressive Era African American academics and writers indicate that African American middle-class couples were part of the dramatic change in sexual mores that occurred in the early twentieth century. African Americans accepted the idea of companionate marriage as the best form of

[91] Kevin Gaines, Uplifting the Race, 6.

relationship.[92] There were differences in how blacks and whites created companionate relationships. African American couples based their interpretation of sexual comportment within marriage on longstanding African American traditions about the nature of marriage and were more likely to frame discussions about sexual intimacy within the context of black Protestant Christianity. [93]

The prevalence of negative stereotypes about African American sexuality played an important role in how African Americans expressed their ideas about sexuality. Awareness of the impact of stereotypes led most of them to develop a more moderate approach to sexual expression.[94] The conservative attitudes of the black middle class towards sexual expression are most evident in their attempts to regulate the hetero-social activities of their daughters. By the 1920s, dating had become more overtly sexual. Many young couples considered dating a process of sexual experimentation in which sexual intercourse was reserved for marriage.[95] In many middle-class African American families dating was more closely supervised by adults. These families put a high premium on maintaining a spotless reputation for their daughters.[96]

---

[92] The term "companionate marriage" refers to the belief that the basis for marriage is a deep psychological and sexual bond. This replaced the idea that marriage was based an economic considerations and the desire to procreate. Advocates of companionate marriage argued that women were equally as sexual as men and were interested in sexual relations based on mutual pleasure. For a discussion of African American attitudes towards companionate marriage, see Cynthia Simmons, "Modern Marriage for African Americans,1920-1940," Canadian Review of American Studies 30 No. 3(2000): 273-299.

[93] Christina Simmons, "'Modern Marriage' for African Americans,1920-1940," 273-299.

[94] Simmons, "'Modern Marriage' for African Americans," 273-299

[95]Paula Fass, The Beautiful and the Damned: American Youth in the 1920s (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 75.

[96] Stephanie Shaw, What a Woman Ought to Do and Be: Black Women Professional Workers in the Jim Crow Era (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 21.

The importance of a young woman's good reputation to most middle-class black families was based on both anxiety and practical considerations. Parents were worried that greater sexual freedom would lead to more opportunities for their daughters to be sexually exploited.[97] Recognizing that their daughters were sexual beings also led many black parents to institute safeguards to prevent consensual sexual experimentation[98] Middle-class African American parents were also aware that a girl with a bad reputation had limited social prospects. Black institutions supported the importance of sexual purity. A good reputation was part of the admission criteria for women at most African American colleges. Once admitted to college, these institutions closely monitored the behavior of its female students. A slight infraction of the schools rules around interaction with male students could lead to expulsion.[99]

It should be noted that modernists were themselves deeply ambivalent about female sexuality agency in adolescence. The scientific knowledge about adolescence as a psycho-social stage of development focused exclusively on white adolescent males. As a result of their ambivalences about sexual agency for women, many professionals avoided the subject. In many cases, professionals treated female social development as though young women went directly from being girls to being wives and mothers.[100]

This appears to be the case at Tipton. The management believed that keeping the girls busy was important for their moral and social development. The

[97] Shaw, What a Woman Ought to Be and Do, 27.
[98] Shaw, What a Woman Ought to Be and Do, 25.
[99] Shaw, What a Woman Ought to Be and Do, 27
[100] Lunback, Psychiatric Persuasions: Knowledge, 271.

biennial report for 1927 states, "A busy life is best for any child."[101] In the report for 1929 the home's superintendent justifies the school's busy schedule further by associating it with moral development. In this report the manager contends, "Although work is a grind if carried too far at time, a busy happy life is desirous for any child, and often saves the child's mind and body from destruction."[102]

The degree to which the environment at Tipton was kept asexual by keeping it juvenile can be seen in the types of recreational activities made available to the girls. Recreational activities were considered part of Tipton's methods of moral training. The discussion of recreation found in the biennial report for 1927 contends that keeping minds and hands occupied improved the girls' moral conduct and made the need for punishment infrequent.[103]

The types of activities available to the girls seem appropriate for younger children. Thus, the school lists among its activities use of playground equipment, jump rope, playing baseball, and going on hayrides. The installation of playground equipment was seen by the administration as part of an effort to keep the girls busy. The administrators credited the lack of discipline problems with the ability of recreation to keep the hands and minds of the girls active.[104]

Although juvenile, the types of recreation offered at Tipton was consistent with the style of amusement promoted by African American women reformers.

---

[101] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1927-1928),212.
[102] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City,Mo.1929-1930), 275.
[103] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo.1927-1928), 218.
[104] Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Dept. of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1927-1928), 212.

Many black women reformers believed that young female migrants were more vulnerable to the lure of commercial forms of amusement. A common theme among many Progressive Era reform groups was that commercial entertainment venues were a threat to the morals of America's youth. Reformers were alarmed at the lack of supervision in the strongly hetero-social environments of the dance hall, amusement park, and movie theaters. Campaigns to eliminate or regulate commercial amusement cut across racial lines.[105]

Here again racism complicates an understanding of the response of black women reformers to commercial entertainment. Lax police protection in black neighborhoods led to the creation of red-light districts in many black neighborhoods. Further, close proximity to houses of prostitution often resulted in African American women being targeted for recruitment into the sex trades. It was not uncommon for houses of prostitution to attempt to coerce young black women sent to work as domestics into working as prostitutes.[106]

For African American women, the African American prostitute became a powerful symbol of sexual exploitation and the stereotypes that arose from such exploitation.[107] It is within this context that the emphasis on protecting the virtue of African American women was framed. That is, as a way of protecting black women form sexual exploitation, black women reformers advocated close scrutiny of young black women in public places and venues that discouraged

[105] Wolcott, Remaking Respectability, 106.
[106] David Katzman, Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press,1981), 218.
[107] Wanda Hendricks, Gender, Race and Politics in the Midwest: Black Club Woman in Illinois (Bloomington, Ind: Indianan University Press, 1998), 52.

hetero-sociability.[108] It is in this connection to wholesomeness and decreased hetero-sociability that the recreation at Tipton would appear logical and appropriate to the managers of the school.

Religious Training

Religious training was also an important element in the treatment approach at Tipton. The school's superintendent described the influence of religion on the treatment at Tipton when she wrote, "We try to study the girl to see what the creator intends her to do … ."[109] Given this approach, it is not surprising that in 1925 the industrial school's biennial report would make the following observation, "We believe that the teaching of Christianity is the first step that is to be taken to enlighten our misunderstood girls, unhealthy girls, and neglected girls."[110]

The following table details the religious affiliation of the girls committed to Tipton. The vast majority of the girls who were committed to Tipton listed their religious affiliation as Baptist. Specifically, a review of the biennial reports from 1921-1930 indicates that out of 405 girls admitted to Tipton, 203 listed their religious preference as Baptist. To put this number in context, it is helpful to compare it to the religious preferences of the other girls admitted to Tipton. The

[108] Wolcott, Remaking Respectability, 24.
[109] Biennial Report of the State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Department of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1927-1928), 212.
[110] Biennial Report of the State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Department of Penal Institutions (Jefferson City, Mo. 1925-1926), 171.

biennial reports indicate that in the ten years for which records are available Tipton committed seventy-nine Methodist girls and fifty-two Catholic girls.[111]

Table 6.6 Religious Affiliation of the Girls Committed to Tipton[112]

Year	Baptist	Catholic	Methodist	Other	None
1921	8	10	4	2	0
1922	11	5	4	6	0
1923	18	4	5	11	4
1924	20	1	7	12	1
1925	19	8	6	6	5
1926	25	2	9	1	4
1927	30	5	12	2	6
1928	33	8	15	1	3
1929	34	7	15	1	3

What is remarkable about Tipton's use of religion in its attempts at reformation is the timing. By the 1920s, secular scientific thought had replaced religious explanations of human behavior. For most Progressive reformers scientific method was a critical part of their efforts for social reform.[113] Their reliance on moral reasoning illustrates the importance of the black church in African American social reform.

The church experience of African American women was important in another way to the women who managed Tipton. Evelyn Brooks-Higgenbotham

---

[112] This data was obtained from the Biennial Reports of the State Industrial School for Negro Girls 1921-1929.
[113] See O'Connor, Poverty Knowledge and Ehrenreich, The Altruistic Imagination for an analysis of the relationship between Progressive social reform and scientific methods.

notes that in the early twentieth century that the Baptist Women's Conventions became a safe place for African American women. She observed that within the confines of the conferences black church women were asserting a form of agency over how black women were represented. [114] To a great degree the same observation can be made about the industrial school at Tipton. The women who ran Tipton articulated many of the same beliefs about the importance of respectability and its relationship to racial progress. Within the restrictions placed on it by the Department of Corrections attempted to replicate the efforts of black churchwomen.

Conclusion

The beliefs and values of the women who managed Tipton were consistent with the aims of Progressive Era reform. African American women used a similar path to achieve their status as social reformers. Similar to their white counterparts, they leveraged their participation in social and church groups to enter the public sphere of social reform, and they relied on their status as mothers to claim an expertise in child welfare.

This is not to say that black and white maternalism was identical. Black women, within the framework of American child welfare reform, created a distinctly African American version of maternalism. Drawing on African American culture, they created their own view of the politics of maternalism. African American reform agendas were inseparable from their agendas from racial equality. African American child welfare reforms, and by extension African

[114] Higgenbotham, Righteous Discontent, 186.

American maternalism, were not exceptions to this process. An important feature of African American maternalism was that it was explicitly connected to the goal of improving the status of African Americans as a whole. Thus, black women believed that in improving the status of African American women, they were uplifting the entire race.

Teaching respectability was not simply a means to improve the lives of African American women; it was also conceived of as a means to advance racial equality. The women who ran Tipton believed that it was their mission to produce a cadre of young African American women who were equal to white women. In doing this, they believed that they were advancing the cause of racial equality.

That Tipton was a segregated institution allowed it to operate as a relatively autonomous site for African American child welfare reform. There is little evidence of direct interference by the state into the operation of the industrial school. However, the fact that Tipton operated as a correctional facility prevented the black women from fully implanting their version of child welfare reform. The conflict between the maternalist values of the African American women who ran Tipton and the requirements of a correctional institution was evident throughout the early history of the State Industrial School for Negro Girls. For example, the fact that there were bars on the windows and cells for solitary confinement conflicted with the idea of creating a family like environment.

One of the primary differences in their approach to social reform was that black women did not always maintain emotional distance in their relationships to the poor. The correspondence between the industrial school's superintendent

and the girls demonstrates the importance both the superintendent and the girls placed on a close personal bond. The letters of the girls still in the institution indicate how important the superintendent's approval was to them. In these letters the girls often state that they have deviated from the values of the institution and promise to do better.

The letters from the girls who had been paroled from Tipton also reflect the girls interest in pleasing the superintendent. They discuss in detail how they were living respectable lives. The most frequent comment seen in these letters is that they have married and settled into domesticity.

Tipton's reliance on the Victorian construction of womanhood was problematic for the institution. The institution's emphasis on sexual purism led it to promote activities that encouraged the girls to repress any sexual interest. There is little in the school's literature that suggests that the staff at Tipton was concerned about the girls expressing healthy attitudes towards sexuality. Such a lack of concern is even more surprising given the large number of girls who were sexually active prior to their commitment to Tipton. The most frequent reference to sexuality involved the girls engaging in same-sex liaisons as a "sex problem."

The importance placed on domesticity can also be seen in the way Tipton organized its vocational training. For example, the strong emphasis on learning to be a seamstress reflected the school's desire to give the girls skills that they could use for a home based industry. Dress making allowed the girls the opportunity to have a family and contribute to the family economy. To its credit, the industrial school tried to offer more skilled training for girls who were ready.

For example, Tipton provided secretarial and nursing training for girls who had completed high school. A small number of girls even attended the state's African American college, Lincoln University.

Finally, one feature that distinguished African American materialism was the emphasis on religion. Like so many aspects of African American life, the women who became Progressive reformers came from church institutions. Church life was inseparable from their conception of a respectable life. The idea of a upright and virtuous life was grounded in their experience a church women. Therefore, it is not surprising that religious training through daily prayer, church sermons, and religious clubs were a regular part of life at Tipton.

It is difficult to underestimate the importance of the black church to African American social life. In many African American communities, it remained one of the few sources of stability. In the early twentieth century, secular black scholars often argued that one of the most negative effects of urbanization on African Americans was the demise of the authority of the black church. Tipton's emphasis on religious education was its attempt to restore the connection between respectability and church authority.

Chapter 7

Race Ideology at Work:

The St. Louis Juvenile Court and the Naturalization of Racial Ideology in Child Welfare Practice

The operation of the St. Louis Juvenile Court reflects the complex relationship between racial practice and public policy. In one respect, the inclusion of African American children in the juvenile justice system represented racial progress. In many cases, St. Louis child savers simply chose to ignore the needs of black children. The creation of a segregated juvenile justice system at least acknowledged the needs of black children and a commitment to try to address them. At the same time what happened to black children once they entered the juvenile justice system reflects how racial attitudes influenced decisions which on the surface appear race neutral. This chapter examines the relative ease with which racial ideology was incorporated into the work of the juvenile justice system. Whiteness theory argues that white privilege is so pervasive that it often goes unnoticed. In other words, it seems like a natural part of everyday life. This chapter looks at two key players in the juvenile justice system: the police and the juvenile court. It will look at the way that these organizations factored race into their decision-making. It will examine the degree to which racial assumptions were naturalized into their everyday operations.

Establishment of the juvenile court represents the Progressive Era child saving movement at its most aggressive and influential. The rapidity with which states incorporated juvenile courts into their court systems is a tribute to the

ability of Progressive Era reformers to create public support for their reform efforts.[1] As is often the case with reform movements, the push for juvenile courts contained contradictory and conflicting goals. While advocating against institutionalization of children in correctional facilities, juvenile courts were not shy about placing children in institutions. In fact, corresponding to the rise of the juvenile courts in the United States was an increase in the number of institutions for delinquent and dependent children.

Progressive child savers envisioned the juvenile court as accomplishing three goals: (1) the introduction of diagnostic and preventive methods into juvenile court proceedings, (2) the introduction of probation officers to determine whether court intervention was necessary, and (3) the creation of separate correctional facilities for juveniles suspected of delinquency, dependency, or neglect.[2] Since most juvenile courts adapted themselves to local political conditions, it is helpful to think of them as being more diverse in their practices.[3] Though juvenile courts were very responsive to local political realities, the elements listed above could be found as part of the structure of juvenile courts across the country.

It is important to keep in mind that the efforts to establish juvenile courts were part of a broader social movement to accommodate urban institutions to an

[1] David Rothman, Conscience and Convenience, 205.
[2] Steven Schlossman, Love and the American Delinquent (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 59.
[3] Jennifer Trost, Gateway to Justice: The Juvenile Court and Progressive Child Welfare (Athens, Ga: University of Georgia Press, 2005), 2.

increasingly industrial and immigrant population.[4] In their efforts to adapt the legal system to a modern industrial society, Progressive Era child savers included within the functioning of the court important elements of Progressive Era social theory. In particular, the court movement included new ideas about criminality and the nature of childhood.

Sociological jurisprudence was a central feature of the juvenile courts' approach to crime and criminality. Sociological legal reasoning tried to address legal problems by taking into account the social factors that were seen as the root causes of criminality.[5] Social reformers tended to define delinquency as complex behaviors resulting from the impact of a degrading urban environment and troublesome family life.[6] Based on this understanding of the relationship between law and social forces, juvenile court advocates created a system that stressed rehabilitation over discipline. Thus, the goal of the court was to reform the child by ameliorating the worst conditions in society. The emphasis on rehabilitation was a reflection of the influence of popular psychological theories of child development. The new discipline of child psychology presented the public with a developmental paradigm of child maturation. The idea that childhood included separate and distinct stages of development helped the public

[4] Schlossman, Love and the American Delinquent, 57.
[5] Michael Willrich, City of Courts: Socializing Justice in Progressive Era Chicago (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 99.
[6] David Wolcott, Cops and Kids: Policing Juvenile Justice,1890-1940 (Columbus, Oh.: Ohio State University Press, 2005), 10.

appreciate that the minds and behaviors of children were different from those of adults.[7]

The political consensus around the creation of the juvenile court was achieved by blending liberal interest in using government to aid the less fortunate with the conservative interest in social control. Thus, the juvenile court adopted methods of informality and flexibility, while at the same time expanding the role of the state in the lives of the poor and working class families.[8] The remarks of Memphis juvenile court judge Camille Kelley demonstrate the degree to which the juvenile court saw itself as an institution for social control. In an interview in the Memphis Chamber of Commerce Journal, judge Kelley states, "My concept of the juvenile court is a strong arm used to supplement home care and training, or supply it where it does not exist …"[9] Kelley's remarks underscore an important feature of the approach of Progressive Era reformers in dealing with delinquency: They were cognizant of the role of environment, but their primary emphasis was on ensuring that juveniles conformed to existing social norms.

St. Louis Juvenile Court

Missouri's first steps into creating a juvenile court system were quite tenuous and shaped by local political concerns. The impetus for the St. Louis juvenile court came from local women's clubs. For example, the jail committee of the Humanity Club was formed in 1899 to investigate the conditions for boys in

[7] Barry Feld, Bad Kids: Race and the Transformation of the Juvenile Court (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 30.
[8] David Tanenhaus, Juvenile Justice in the Making (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004),22.
[9] Trost, Gateway to Justice, 55.

St. Louis jails.[10] The committee discovered that there were approximately forty boys under the age of 16 incarcerated in St. Louis jails, most of them awaiting trial in adult courts. The committee also discovered that three different courts had jurisdiction over the cases of juvenile offenders – violations of city ordinances were heard in police court, cases involving misdemeanors were tried in the Court of Criminal Correction, and felonies were tried in the state circuit court.[11]

The Court of Criminal Correction was unique to St. Louis and was the city's most conservative court. Since it dealt with misdemeanors, it heard a large number of juvenile cases. According to St. Louis's chief probation officer in 1902, this court heard 47% of all juvenile cases. The jail committee was very critical of the Court of Criminal Corrections' practices. In particular, the women were upset with the way the court treated juveniles on their court date. The Court of Criminal Correction mixed juveniles and adults in a large iron cage just outside the court room.[12]

In an attempt to improve treatment for juvenile offenders in the city's courts, the Humanity Club hired an investigator to collect information about the boys and make suggestions about disposition. The courts viewed the effort of the Humanity Club as an attempt to intrude into the operation of the court. Frustrated with the resistance by St. Louis's court system, juvenile court advocates attempted to force the courts to accept the use of probation officers in juvenile cases. Thus, the 1901 Missouri General Assembly passed legislation requiring

[10] Benjamin Clay Weakley, "The St. Louis Juvenile Court" (Master's Thesis, Washington University, 1913), 10.
[11] Weakley "The St. Louis Juvenile Court," 11.
[12] Weakley, "The St. Louis Juvenile Court," 11.

the presence of probation officers for juveniles tried in St. Louis adult courts. The St. Louis Court of Criminal Corrections resisted implementation of this law by refusing to place children on probation. In 1902, the Court of Criminal Corrections placed five children on probation.[13]

In 1903, the Missouri General Assembly passed legislation allowing the establishment of juvenile courts in Missouri cities with populations greater than 100,000.[14] For all practical purposes, this law allowed the state's two largest cities, St. Louis and Kansas City, to create juvenile courts. The state legislature revised the law in 1909 to include cities with populations greater than 50,000. In 1911, it further expanded the authority of the juvenile courts by increasing the age of children under juvenile court jurisdiction from 16 to 17.[15] In1911, the General Assembly resolved any remaining political problems by making the state circuit court the court of original jurisdiction for all juvenile cases. The law also required all other courts to transfer juvenile cases to the juvenile courts.[16]

In most key aspects, the Missouri juvenile court law was modeled after the 1899 legislation passed in Illinois.[17] However, in one important aspect the St. Louis Juvenile Court (SLJC) differed from other urban juvenile courts. The SLJC did not have a permanent presiding judge. The circuit court established a pattern of assigning three circuit court judges to a committee that supervised the operation of the court. Each judge served an eighteen-month term during which

[13] Weakley, "The St. Louis Juvenile Court," 12.
[14] Weakley, "The St. Louis Juvenile Court," 12.
[15] Weakley, "The St. Louis Juvenile Court," 13.
[16] Weakley, "The St. Louis Juvenile Court," 13.
[17] Weakley, "The St. Louis Juvenile Court," 12.

he would serve as juvenile court judge for six months. This panel of three judges set policy and oversaw the management of the juvenile court. Management of the court included the court itself, the probation department, and the House of Detention.[18]

Juvenile court advocates were frequently worried about political interference in the operation of the court. Part of this fear rested on their awareness of how appointments to the St. Louis Police Board were considered patronage jobs.[19] The makeup of the police board of supervisors depended on which political party held the governor's office. Political parties promised interest groups within the city positions on the police force in exchange for political support in the elections. Reformers attempted to protect the court from political patronage by insulating it from public pressure. St. Louis's child savers went as far as removing juvenile court employees from the city's civil service system. The court administered its own competitive exam for the superintendent of the Detention Home and probation officers.

Some aspects of the SLJC were segregated. The St. Louis Juvenile Detention Home maintained a segregated unit for black children. In order to keep the detention home segregated, black children awaiting trial were placed in the city's industrial school rather than in the detention home. In the probation department, black girls and younger black children were placed with one probation officer, and black boys were placed with another. By the late 1920s,

[18] Weakley, "The St. Louis Juvenile Court," 18.
[19] During the Civil War control of the St. Louis police department was given to the state. Union officials were concerned that the police were sympathetic to the Confederate cause and therefore not reliable in enforcing martial law.

the probation office had hired two black probation officers, one man and one woman, to serve as probation officers for all black children.

Discretion in Arresting St. Louis Juveniles

Throughout the early twentieth century, the racial atmosphere in Missouri was extremely hostile towards African Americans. Frequently this hostility was transformed into violence. The pervasiveness of racial violence in Missouri is best seen in the widespread acceptance of lynching within the state. Lynchings were reported in Missouri as late as 1927.[20]

During the period under study, lynching occurred in small towns like Louisiana and Liberty, and in larger cities like Springfield. Support for lynching crossed economic and educational lines. The Crisis reported that in 1921 a lynching took place took place on the campus of University of Missouri.[21]

Racial violence was also a common feature in the African American community in St. Louis. The worst police brutality occurred across the Mississippi River in East St. Louis. During the 1917 riots, that city's police either joined the rioters or allowed them to murder African Americans.[22] However, prior to the East St. Louis riot, there were skirmishes between the St. Louis police and St. Louis's African Americans. In one instance in 1894, a shootout occurred in the court house when the police tried to re-arrest a black man after he had just been

[20] This observation is made after completing a survey of articles in The New York Times on race relations in Missouri. The latest article referring to a lynching was published on May 24, 1927. The New York Times "Negro Lynched in Missouri," 24 May, 1927, 27.
[21] The Crisis, "Race Relations in Missouri," June 1923, 55.
[22] For a detailed discussion of the East St. Louis Riot see Elliot Rudwick, Race Riot in East St. Louis (Carbindale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1964).

acquitted of another crime.[23] In another incident in 1904, a shootout developed between blacks and the police on Election Day when African Americans thought someone was trying to steal a ballot box.[24]

Not all conflicts between the St. Louis police and African Americans led to gunfire, however. After Jack Johnson became heavyweight champion, the police riot squad had to be called to subdue black crowds in the city.[25] African Americans resented the lack of black representation in the SLPD. By 1920, less than 1% of the SLPD was African American whereas the national average for large cities in the same period was 1.2%. African Americans appointed to the police department were not accorded the rank of police officer. They were given a special status – Negro specials. Negro specials could only patrol in black neighborhoods and were not allowed to arrest whites.[26]

The St. Louis Police Department was organized differently from that of most other metropolitan areas in that the police board was appointed by the governor. This method of appointing police commissioners made the police department less responsive to local pressure. The inability of blacks to consistently influence state politics undermined their ability to pressure the city into hiring black police officers. Even when blacks were able to win concessions on a state level, they were thwarted by local resistance. In 1912 the republican governor, in return for black political support in St. Louis, promised to get the

[23] The New York Times, "Race Riot in St. Louis Court Room," 12 December, 1894, 1.
[24] The New York Times, "Election Riot in St. Louis," 12 February, 1901, 1.
[25] The New York Times, "Police Club Rioting Negroes," 5 July, 1910, 4.
[26] Eugene Watts, "Black and Blue: Afro-American Police Officers in Twentieth Century St. Louis," Journal of Urban History 7 no. 2 (1981): 148.

board of police commissioners to appoint two black police officers. The board rejected the governor's request, claiming there were no black applicants who had passed the literacy test.[27]

The ongoing animosity between the SLPD and St. Louis's blacks helps explain the overrepresentation of African American children in juvenile arrest statistics. The following table provides a breakdown of juvenile arrests over a forty-year period.[28]

Table 7.1. Juvenile Arrests in St. Louis by Race and Gender 1891-1930[29]

Year	White Boys	Black Boys	White Girls	Black Girls
1891	2460	834	856	464
1892	2874	992	710	527
1893	3238	1210	777	738
1894	3399	1213	867	774
1895	3094	1289	906	1030
1896	3141	1050	970	895
1897	1269	415	953	813
1898	1917	703	876	760
1899	3006	1030	728	642
1901	1853	429	350	339
1902	1702	499	424	384
1903	2149	565	459	421

[27] Eugene Watts, "Black and Blue: Afro-American Police Officers in Twentieth Century St. Louis,"137.
[28] These data were compiled from the Annual Reports of the St. Louis Police Department. These documents are located in the St. Louis Police Archive.
[29] The data used in this table was obtained from the Annual Reports of the St. Louis Police Department.

1904	2308	589	411	355
1905	2744	589	567	394
1906	2744	596	567	394
1907	3021	769	303	265
1908	3528	861	330	368
1909	3322	780	378	359
1911	3668	801	342	357
1913	1508	359	154	86
1914	2365	516	385	285
1915	1754	364	135	72
1916	2375	537	262	405
1917	1807	303	157	48

What is so striking about this chart is the consistency over time in the number of black children arrested. When examined by decade, the data shows little variation in the number of black children arrested. In the 1890s, the percentages hovered around the low 30s. There is a gradual decrease in the 1900s to the mid 20s, while in the 1910s and 1920s the percentages cluster around the low to mid 20s. Further, there is an increase in the late 1920s to the upper 20s, which may in part be a response to worsening economic conditions.

In one sense, these figures defy common sense in that one would expect a significant increase in the arrest rates of African Americans as the black population increased. In the forty years represented, the African American population doubled from approximately 4% of the St. Louis population to 8%. The largest increase in the black population occurred after 1917, but the arrest rates for this period remained relatively stable.

The police operated with tremendous autonomy, using their discretion to determine when to intervene, detain children, or refer children to the juvenile court.[30] The overrepresentation of black children in the arrest data suggests that racial attitudes of the police affected how they interpreted laws pertaining to juvenile delinquency. The general feeling of animosity that existed between the police and the black community, as well as the inability of African Americans to influence the police, appears to have affected the way the police treated black youth.

The data presented in Table 7.2 examines the offenses for which black and white boys were arrested and charged by the SLPD. The information is restricted to boys because information on girls is affected not only by racial attitudes but also attitudes by sexuality and gender.

Table 7.2. Charges by Race Brought Against Boys by the SLPD[31]

Year and Race of Child	Burglary	Larceny	Runaway	Incorrigibility	Disturbing the Peace
1912					
White Boys	80	217	82	103	33
Black Boys	32	94	5	21	17
1922					
White Boys	119	349	21	78	108
Black Boys	28	118	8	18	47
1923					
White Boys	94	348	26	70	125
Black Boys	52	114	14	24	23
1924					

[30] Wolcot, Cops and Kids, 7.
[31] Data compiled from the annual reports of the St. Louis Police Department.

White Boys	134	447	13	77	161
Black Boys	69	209	6	21	39
1926					
White Boys	74	179	0	91	12
Black Boys	68	65	3	32	4

The data demonstrate that most African American boys were arrested for crimes against property. The largest group of black arrests came under the charge of larceny. Larceny covered most forms of petty theft. The types of crimes included under the charge of larceny could vary significantly. Two young black men charged with larceny in 1922 provide an example of the types of behavior considered to be larcenous; Mike Smith, age 15, was charged with larceny after being accused of stealing a bike, while George Thomas, also age 15, was arrested for larceny after stealing from a store. The wide variety of criminal activity included in the charge of larceny is itself an indication of the discretion of the police in dealing with juvenile delinquents.

The high rate of arrests of black youth for crimes against property demonstrates that the SLPD took a more legalistic approach to delinquency with African American males. With the exception of 1922, the data for the five years represented in this chart indicate that the number of black boys arrested for larceny and burglary exceeded 50% of the total number of black boys arrested by the SLPD.

A different picture emerges when examining the arrests of white boys in these years. In three of the five years represented, the number of white boys

arrested for larceny and burglary was less than 50%. A similar picture can be seen when looking at offenses that represent a violation of social norms rather than of property rights. Three offenses were chosen to illustrate this point. Disturbing the peace was selected because it represented a significant number of the boys charged. The other offenses, running away and incorrigibility, were chosen because they represented status offenses, charges that apply only to youthful offenders.

Status offenses merged as part of the juvenile justice system in order to provide judges and social welfare agencies a method for enforcing what they considered a normative conception of childhood.[32] Reformers' enactment and enforcement of status offenses was an extension of child saving. The goal of the juvenile justice system in these cases was the reestablishment of a bond between child and society.[33] In this light, status offenses were the epitome of Progressive Era child saving attempts at reformation rather than punishment of children.

St. Louis Juvenile Court at Work

Created in 1904, the St. Louis Juvenile Court was one of the first juvenile courts in the nation. It most respects, its methods approximated those found in other large American cities. Most contemporary critiques of the juvenile court movement have stressed its role as an institution of social control. There is no question that social control was an important feature of the juvenile court

[32] Feld, Bad Kids, 13.
[33] Schneider, In the Web of Class, 151.

movement. Middle-class reformers gave the juvenile court broad powers in order to exercise control over the poor and new immigrants.[34] While social control critiques have some merit, they do not adequately explain the influence of race on the operation of American juvenile courts. The social control argument largely reduces the motives of juvenile court reformers to an explanation of class differences. In tends to make the juvenile court movement monolithic, and blurs serious disagreements within the child saving movement about the propriety of state intervention within the lives of poor and immigrant families.[35]

In the case of race, social control theories tend to ignore the influence of other forms of ideology. In privileging class as a primary motivation of Progressive Era child savers, social control critics have ignored the role of institutions in perpetuating other forms of social structure. A more helpful way to understand the role of the juvenile court in perpetuating the color line is to look at how racial ideology intersected with the court's role as an institution of social control. A predominant feature of the racial ideology of the early twentieth century was the assumption that African Americans were by nature prone to be criminals. George Frederickson in his work on the black image in the white imagination points out that criminal acts by African Americans were used to illustrate the idea that African Americans were more bestial than whites and lacked impulse control.[36] Conservative racial ideology used these images to justify white control over African Americans.

---

[34] David Rothman, Conscience and Convenience, 252.
[35] Ashby, Saving the Waifs: 14.
[36] George Frederickson, The Black Image in the White Mind, 274.

The influence of social control also worked its way into the debate over the nature of childhood. The social discourse on the nature of children had two distinct strands. On the one hand, children were viewed as innocents who needed protection from society. While on the other hand, children were portrayed as wild and unsocialized beings that society needed to be protected from.[37] Both these views of children found their way into Progressive ideas about delinquency. Court advocates tended to classify children into two broad categories, predelinquent and delinquent. Predelinquents were assumed to be innocent and helpless, while delinquents were seen as hardened and tough.[38]African American children, in particular African American males, were classified as delinquent. Historically the actions of African Americans children have been interpreted as more adult-like and menacing. There has been a tendency to interpret their actions as intentional or conscious acts. Consequently there was emphasis on seeing African American children as criminal.

Black Children and Dependence and Neglect

The influence of racial ideology on the administration of juvenile justice becomes clearer when methods of classification are examined. Children entered the juvenile court system through two primary pathways: They were classified as dependent and neglected or as delinquent. The line distinguishing dependence from delinquency has never been clear-cut. In fact, there is considerable overlap between in how Progressive Era child savers defined these terms.

---

[37] Feld, Bad Kids, 4.
[38] Trost, Gateway to Justice, 36.

It was generally assumed that delinquent children were neglected and that neglected children exhibited some type of delinquency.[39] The difficulty that court officials had in defining dependence and delinquency allowed them to use their own discretion in how children were adjudicated by the court.

Though a great deal of vagueness was associated with the legal definition of dependence and delinquency, there was one-clear distinction: delinquency involved a violation of local or state law. The adjudication of delinquency, therefore, assumed a level of culpability on the part of youth. Dependence, on the other hand, carried no assumptions about the culpability of the child.

In terms of the general discourse on children, dependent children were children in need of protection, and delinquents were more likely to be considered a threat to society. There were also real consequences attached to these labels. Delinquent children ran a greater risk of losing their freedom through placement in an industrial school. Statistical data on the nation's juvenile courts show that there was a national pattern of African American children being underrepresented in the cases of dependence and neglect, while being overrepresented in the number of children classified as delinquent. A 1932 report on the working of ninety-two juvenile courts noted that African Americans constituted only 15% of the cases of neglect. [40]

The following table compares the number of dependence cases for seven major American cities. It was created to accomplish two goals: (1) to document

[39] Ashby, Saving the Waifs, xii.
[40] Juvenile Court Statistics 1930: Based on Information Supplied by 92 Courts, United States Department of Labor, Children's Bureau. Publication No. 212 (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1932), 23.

the disparity between white and black children classified as dependent, and (2) to compare the actions of the SLJC with other metropolitan juvenile courts.[41] The data refer to those cases adjudicated at the end of the 1920s when most of the first migrations of African Americans to large northern urban areas had peaked.

Table 7.3. Classification of African American Children as Dependent by City

City/State	White Boys	White Girls	Black Boys	Black Girls
Washington, DC	69	57	94	95
Fulton Co., Ga.	197	198	22	23
Baltimore, Md	174	161	62	69
New York, NY	1760	1666	266	198
Wayne Co., Mich.	404	378	78	67
Milwaukee, Wisc.	646	591	40	27
St. Louis, Mo.	252	297	16	17

The data in Table 7.3 clearly demonstrate the disparity between how black and white children were treated by the juvenile courts. The relatively small number of black children classified as dependent was consistent across geographic regions. Only in Baltimore and Washington, D.C., did the number of African American children classified as dependent exceed the national average.

[41] The data for this table were compiled from two sources, Juvenile Court Statistics 1930 and the Juvenile Court of St. Louis.

These statistics also suggest that there was no evidence of gender bias in the treatment of African American children. In three of the juvenile courts sampled, the number of African American boys and girls is almost identical. With the exception of New York City and Milwaukee, the gap between African American boys and girls is very small. The gender pattern for African American and white children also looks very similar.

The St. Louis Juvenile Court had the lowest number of dependent African American children. The low number of dependent black children is a feature that it shares with other southern cities. Table 7.4 compares the operation of the SLJC with that of three other southern cities.[42]

Table 7.4. Classification of African American Children as Dependent in Southern Cities

City	White Dependent Children	Black Dependent Children
St. Louis, Mo.	549	33
Fulton Co., Ga	395	46
Greenville, S.C.	65	9
Norfolk, Va.	110	36

The low number of black dependent children is a consistent feature among all these juvenile courts. In the area of classification of children, St. Louis appears to reflect its southern origins, which is surprising given that the other

[42] The information for this table was compiled from Juvenile Court Statistics 1930 and the Juvenile Court of St. Louis.

border cities in the survey had the highest number of dependent African American children. Baltimore and Washington, D.C., had larger percentages of dependent black children. In the case of Washington, D.C., the number of black children considered dependent exceeded the number of white children.

What is also remarkable about the number of dependent black children in the SLJC system is how consistent they were. Table 7.5 compares the number of African American children classified as dependent to the number of children classified as delinquent. The table also gives a ratio of delinquency to dependence.[43]

Table 7.5. Rates of Dependence by Race in the SLJC

Year	Number of Delinquents	Number of Dependent	Ratio of Delinquency to Dependence
1910	309	151	2:1
1913	448	25	14:1
1921	402	21	19:1
1922	401	92	4:1
1923	538	47	11:1
1924	474	36	13:1
1927	265	33	8:1

After 1910 the number of black children classified as dependent and delinquent remains fairly constant. In four of the seven years surveyed, the ratio

[43] The data for this table was collected from the following sources Chief Probation Officers Annual Report, St. Louis Juvenile Court found in the Missouri Department of Corrections and Charities Biennial Report for 1909-1910, Benjamin Clay Weakley, "The St. Louis Juvenile Court" (Master's Thesis, Washington University, 1913), Milerna Schlutius, "Juvenile Delinquency" (Master's Thesis, Washington University, 1925), and The Nature of the Delinquency Problem in St. Louis, A report published by the Child Welfare League of America 1928.

of African American delinquents to African American dependent children was greater than 10:1. The greatest difference occurred in 1921 and the smallest in 1923. Excluding these two variations, the number of black delinquents to black dependent children remained relatively constant for an eleven-year period.

These data point to one other interesting fact. The constancy of the numbers suggests that the rapid increase in the African American population did not significantly affect the relative number of African American children appearing before the SLJC. From 1920 -1930, the African American population of St. Louis doubled from 4 to 8%. In this same period of time, the number of children appearing before the juvenile court remained between 450 and 500. Though it is difficult to draw any conclusions from this small amount of data, it does suggest the possibility that African American families remained functional through their transition to urban life.

Delinquency and African American Children

While the relative number of black children adjudicated for delinquency remained within a narrow range, in the 1920s it increased as a percentage of children adjudicated for delinquency. Table 7.6 illustrates this steady rise in the percentage of African American children adjudicated for delinquency.[44]

Table 7.6. Rates of Delinquency by Race for the SLJC

Year	Number of Children	Number of Black	Blacks as % of

[44] The data were taken from Schultius, "Juvenile Delinquency." (Master's Thesis Washington university, 1925)

	Adjudicated	Delinquents	Cases
1921	1689	402	23%
1922	1566	402	25%
1923	1994	583	26%
1924	1674	474	28%
1927	881	265	30%

The number of children, with the exception of 1927 and 1923, shows only minor fluctuations. The increases in the number of black children arrested in 1923 may be attributed to a concerted effort by the police to crack down on crime. In the early 1920s, St. Louis experienced a dramatic increase in crime, and in response to public pressure, the police increased arrests for small offenses. Part of this police campaign focused on ridding the city of vice.[45] Since most red-light districts were in African American neighborhoods, the number of blacks arrested increased. This increase in the percentage of African American delinquents illustrates how black children were vulnerable to police and juvenile court discretion. Most arrests of black delinquents occurred between the ages of 13 and 17. Psychologists have suggested that black children use adolescence as a period where they emphasize the importance of their African heritage.[46] It is in adolescence that racial identity and racial assignment are most in conflict. This conflict between self-perception and societal attribution helps explain how the

[45] Eugene Watts, "Police Response to Crime and Disorder in Twentieth Century St. Louis," Journal of American History 70 no. 2 (Sept. 1983), 348.
[46] Margaret Spencer and Carol Markstrom-Adams, "Identity Process among Racial and Ethnic Minority Children in America," Child Development 61 no. 2 (April 1990), 290-293.

percentage of African American delinquents could increase relative to total number youth adjudicated for delinquency in the SLJC.

Matthew Fry Jacobson, in his work on whiteness, stresses the importance of perception to the construction of racial beliefs. Specifically, he stresses that racial beliefs are acted on through a process of perception that is conditioned by the traditions in which a person is reared.[47] In other words, since the dominant view of the culture in the early twentieth century was that African Americans were criminal by nature, it is not surprising that the police and the courts would see African American youth as criminal. African American vulnerability results when African American youth as part of their own psychological development stress the importance of African American culture and traditions in a society that is conditioned to be hostile towards them.

Jacobson's work is also helpful in explaining the way in which racial belief influences state action. At first glance, the data on delinquency appear to suggest that racial ideology had little to do with how cases were decided by the SLJC. After all, the number of white children adjudicated by the court was far greater than the number of African American children. Consequently, the percentage of white children within any category of disposition would be greater. However, upon closer examination, there are some facts that without considering racial beliefs are more difficult to explain. For instance, why were black children

[47] Jacobson, Whiteness of a Different Color, 10.

overrepresented within the SLJC system and why were so few African American children considered to be neglected?[48]

An even more troubling question is why administrators and supporters of the SLJC were not concerned with these facts? Understanding racial ideology as a conditioned mode of perception helps provide a way of explaining how racial ideology becomes naturalized part of the landscape.[49] In other words, racial difference becomes the foreground for making decisions about character and intent. A similar decision made repeatedly over time becomes the basis for policy.

Race and Institutional Commitments

One area where racial beliefs affected the operation of the SLJC was in its policies towards commitment to institutions. The SLJC used only publicly managed industrial schools for juvenile delinquents. The juvenile court placed most children at its own facilities for delinquent youth, and in a smaller number of cases used the state industrial school system. Despite their stated goal of rehabilitation, for all practical purposes these industrial schools were correctional facilities.

The SLJC was more conservative that other large-city juvenile courts, in that it was more prone to place children in juvenile facilities. In 1920, it placed

[48] The over-representation of African American children can be seen by looking at the aggregate data presented in Table 7.7. Using this data we can extrapolate that African American children averaged around one third of the total number of children adjudicated by the court. In the eight years presented in the table the average of black children coming before the court remains close to one third the total number of children adjudicated.
[49] Jacobson, Whiteness of a Different Color, 10.

444 children in institutions. By comparison, Denver and Washington, D.C., only placed 128. At the other end of the continuum was the juvenile court in Boston, which placed only forty-nine children. In the early 1920s, approximately 28% of the children who appeared in the SLJC were placed in institutions.[50] In 1926, the percentage of institutional commitments grew to 36%.[51]

In terms of aggregate numbers, significantly more white children than African American children were placed in juvenile facilities. Therefore, looking at relative percentages would provide much information on how African American children were treated by the SLJC. Table 7.7 compares the number of children committed based on ratios of the number of children committed from each racial group and the total number of children from each racial group adjudicated by the court. The use of ratio provides information of the frequency or rate with which children from each racial group were committed.[52]

Table 7.7. Rates of Commitments to Industrial Schools by Race for the SLJC

Year	Number White Children Adjudicated	Number White Children Committed	Ratio	Number Black Children Adjudicated	Number Blacks Committed	Ratio

[50] Larenroot and Lundberg, Juvenile Courts at Work, 153.
[51] Report on the Nature of Delinquency Problem in St. Louis, Child Welfare League of America, 1927, 5.
[52] The data for this table were collected from the following sources, Chief Probation Officers Annual Report, St. Louis Juvenile Court found in the Missouri Department of Corrections, and Charities Biennial Report for 1909-1910, Benjamin Clay Weakley, "The St. Louis Juvenile Court" (Master's Thesis, Washington University, 1913), Milerna Schlutius, "Juvenile Delinquency." (Master's Thesis, Washington University, 1925), and The Nature of the Delinquency Problem in St. Louis, Child Welfare League of America.

1910	1025	299	3:1	251	65	3:1
1912	925	151	6:1	211	44	5:1
1921	1287	283	5:1	402	88	3:1
1922	1165	159	7:1	402	88	4:1
1923	1456	196	7:1	538	97	5:1
1924	1200	349	3:1	468	65	4:1
1926	526	179	3:1	271	118	2:1

As illustrated, the largest differences between rates of commitment occurred in the early 1920s. The difference in rates of commitment for white and black children can in part be attributed to the increase in white racial hostility that emerged as a result of mass wartime migration of African Americans. White St. Louisans reacted to the growth in the city's African American population by increasing their efforts to enforce racial segregation. Thus, St. Louis was one of two cities in 1916 to pass a referendum making it illegal to sell homes in white neighborhoods to African Americans. One year later, some of the worst race rioting of the era took place in East St. Louis.

In discussing the St. Louis juvenile court's commitment of African American children, it is important to recognize that the attitude of black parents towards institutional commitment was influenced by gender. The parents of African American boys almost never sought the help of the SLJC. Most of the African American boys were referred to the SLJC by the police. However, African American parents used the SLJC to help control their daughters. The use of the SLJC by black parents was remarkable, since the outcome in almost every case

was court-ordered commitment to Tipton. A review of cases of African American girls committed to the State Industrial School for Negro Girls between 1926-1928 shows that of the eighteen girls committed, African American parents were witnesses in eleven cases.[53]

In every case where African American parents sought help from the SLJC, the charge was immorality or incorrigibility. In these cases, the girls were adjudicated for staying out late and associating with immoral persons. Mary Wilson was typical of the type of case where African American parents sought the help of the SLJC. Mary was a 14-year-old girl who was staying out all night. Unable to get Mary to comply with his wishes, Mary's father requested help from the SLJC. The court sided with Mr. Wilson, and Mary was sentenced to Tipton for three years.[54]

The generational conflict over sexual propriety is clearer in cases involving association with immoral persons. In many cases, black parents sought the help of the SLJC when they disapproved of their daughter's boyfriend. Court documents in these cases often list the name of the boyfriend. Betty Watts's case was similar to many of the cases of association with immoral persons. Betty was a 16-year-old girl who was dating George Edwards. Her father asked for the court's help after objecting to this relationship. The court agreed with Mr. Watts and sentenced Betty to two years at Tipton.[55] African American parents' use of the juvenile court to reinforce their authority over their daughters was mirrored by

[53] As part of my research, I was given access to the records of the St. Louis juvenile court. The data cited come from my review of the records.
[54] St. Louis Juvenile Court Case, St. Louis Juvenile Court Files for 1927 #36160.
[55] St. Louis Juvenile Court Case, St. Louis Juvenile Court Files for 1928 #37075.

other ethnic groups in the early twentieth century. Immigrant parents looked to the juvenile court to strengthen their authority over their daughters when their behavior conflicted with family expectations and needs.[56] The fact that African American parents only involved the court in cases where sexual behavior was at issue indicates that they were equally concerned about their daughter's sexuality.

In comparing the behavior of African American parents with that of other ethnic groups, it is important to remember that African American families had to contend with well-entrenched stereotypes about African American sexuality. American society has combined its biases against poor women with its antipathy for African Americans to create powerful images of African American women as sexually promiscuous.[57] This fact makes the African American parents' decision to take risk involving a white-run institution, like the SLJC, all the more amazing.

African American Children and Probation

The introduction of probation into the juvenile justice system was one of the hallmark achievements of the juvenile court movement of the early twentieth century. Progressive child savers saw juvenile court probation as achieving two important goals: (1) to make the administration of juvenile justice less costly and (2) to allow the juvenile court to operate like a social service agency.[58] The role of the probation officer was to help families live up to their responsibility of properly

[56] Mary Odem, Delinquent Daughters, 159.
[57] Nell Irvin-Painter, "Hill, Thomas and the Use of Racial Stereotype," in Race-ing Justice, En-gendering Power: Essays on Anita Hill, Clarence Thomas, and the Construction of Social Reality, ed. Toni Morrison (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992), 211.
[58] Michael Willrich, City of Courts, 89.

bringing up of their children.[59] To facilitate the work of the court, probation officers were given wide latitude in deciding which cases to bring to the attention of the court. Probation officers used social casework methods to investigate families and to determine proper disposition of a case.

The power of probation officers to determine which cases would come to court could place them in conflict with the poor and immigrant families they were investigating. The leeway provided by juvenile judges to probation officers stemmed from the willingness of probation officers to use middle-class family norms in assessing and intervening with families. At times poor families interpreted the actions of their children not as delinquency but as contributions to the family economy.[60] This was especially the case where foraging in rail yards for coal or finding materials that could be sold to scrap dealers was involved.

The SLJC's probation office developed along functional lines. Two probation officers were assigned to complete investigations, and fourteen officers were responsible for the supervising children placed on probation.[61] The work of the probation office was further divided along gender lines. The number of probation officers supervising probation cases was evenly divided between men and women. Neglect cases and girls on probation were supervised by women officers, while the boys were supervised by male probation officers.[62] This division of labor led to an uneven distribution of the workload. Table 7.8

---

[59] Clapp, Mothers to Us All, 68.
[60] Schnieder, In the Web of Class, 164.
[61] Emma Lundberg andKatherine Lenroot, Juvenile Courts at Work: A Study of the Organization and Methods of Ten Courts Washington D.C.: U.S. Dept of Labor Children's Bureau,1925,165.
[62] Lundberg and Lenroot, The Juvenile Court at Work, 165.

compares the caseloads of the fourteen probation officers involved in supervision.[63] The number of cases supervised by women probation officers was the most uneven, ranging from 56 cases carried by Calhoun to 151 cases carried by Whitman. The cases for male probation officers were more evenly distributed. Here the difference is 95 cases carried by DeGrant and 155 by Higgins.

Table 7.8. Probation Caseloads in the SLJC by Gender and Race

Probation Officer's Name	Gender	Neglect Cases	Delinquency Cases	Total
Anderson	Female	18	65	83
Calhoun	Female	10	48	58
Conrad	Female	13	53	56
Elgas	Female	32	112	146
Mincke	Female	41	42	83
Runge	Female	18	76	94
Whitman	Female	52	99	151
Young*	Female	26	93	119
DeGrant	Male	4	91	95
Gavin	Male	13	123	136
Higgins*	Male	7	148	155
Jaeger	Male	12	108	120
McClain	Male	19	93	112
Roessel	Male	6	118	124

*African American Probation Officers

[63] The data for this table were part of a CWLA report "The Juvenile Court of St. Louis" published in 1927. The starred names are the SLJC's two African American probation officers. A probable explanation for male officers supervising neglect cases is that probation officers were the most frequent referrals to the SLJC for neglect cases.

High caseloads were a consistent feature of the probation office of the SLJC. The average case load in 1919 was 156.[64] The national standard was 75 cases.[65] Eight years later in 1927, the average case load had dropped to 109. Even this smaller number was considered to be an impediment to effective casework. In its report, the Child Welfare League of America criticized the court for its high caseloads.[66]

The work of the probation office was further divided along racial lines. Early in its history, the SLJC recognized the need to hire an African American probation officer. Sarah Young was hired by the court in 1908. The court hired its second African American probation officer, William Higgins, in 1918. All African American children were assigned to these two officers. Segregation of cases within the probation office led to the African American officers carrying a disproportionate number of cases. Table 7.8 showed that the two African American officers had caseloads above the office average of 109. Higgins caseload of 151 was much higher than the office average, while Young's caseload of 119 was closer to the office average.

While race appears to have been a significant factor in other aspects of the SLJC operation, it does not seem to have been a factor in decisions about probation. This is somewhat surprising given the SLJC's willingness to commit African American children to industrial schools. Data on the SLJC use of

---

[64] Larenroot and Lundberg, The Juvenile Courts at Work, 171.
[65] Larenroot and Lundberg, The Juvenile Courts at Work, 171.
[66] The average of 109 was calculated from the total case load number presented in the table on SLJC probation case loads. The criticism of high case loads may be found in "Juvenile Court of St. Louis," a made on the St. Louis Juvenile Court by the CWLA in 1927,16.

probation demonstrates that most African American children were placed on probation when it was their first time before the court and the case involved a minor offense. For example, George Smith, age 12, was placed on probation after breaking into a store and stealing $1.00.[67] Similarly Robert Hayes, age 15, was placed on probation after stealing a watch.[68]

Table 7.9 compares the rates of probation for African American and white boys. As illustrated, there was very little difference in the rates of probation for African American and white boys. In 1923 and 1924, when there was a difference in the rates of probation, African American children appear to have a slightly better chance of being placed on probation than their white counterparts.

Table 7.9. Rates of Probation in the SLJC for Boys[69]

Year	Total No. of White Boys	White Boys on Probation	Ratio	Total No. of Black Boys	Black Boys on Probation	Ratio
1910	843	135	3.5:1	172	72	3.3:1
1921	1127	352	3:1	327	165	2:1
1922	990	357	2.7:1	327	120	2.7:1
1923	1151	381	3:1	443	156	2.8:1
1924	1023	266	3.8:1	404	166	2.5:1

[67] SLJC St. Louis Juvenile Court Files for Case # 36191.
[68] SLJC St. Louis Juvenile Court Files for Case # 37046.
[69] The data for this table were taken from two mater's thesis Benjamin Weakley, The St Louis Juvenile Court, (Master's Thesis Washington University,1913) and Milerna Schlutius "Juvenile Delinquency" (Master's Thesis Washington University,1925)

The data contained in Table 7.10 that the court had a similar even-handed approach to African American girls. This data should be read with a degree of caution. Decisions about probation were made within the context of a segregated legal and social welfare system. The SLJC was as committed to maintaining racial segregation as other major institutions in St. Louis. Decisions on disposition were shaped by the need to maintain racial segregation. This was certainly the case in the court's treatment of African American girls. That is, the number of African American girls placed on probation was affected by the lack of institutions for African American girls.

Table 7.10. Rates of Probation in the SLJC for Girls[70]

Year	Total No. of White Girls	White Girls on Probation	Ratio	Total No. of Black Girls	Black Girls on Probation	Ratio
1910	91	27	3.3:1	21	6	3.5:1
1921	160	65	2:2	75	48	1.5:1
1922	175	82	2.1:1	74	36	2:1
1923	205	109	1.8:1	95	50	1:1.9
1924	177	82	2.1:1	70	35	2:1

Prior to the opening of Tipton in 1916, the St. Louis Industrial School was the only industrial school in Missouri to accept African American girls. In order to

[70] The data for this table were taken from two master's thesis Benjamin Weakley, "The St Louis Juvenile Court", (Master's Thesis Washington University,1913) and Milerna Schlutius "Juvenile Delinquency" (Master's Thesis Washington University,1925)

accommodate African American girls from outside the St. Louis area, the industrial school accepted older girls from other communities in Missouri. Due to the large number of older African American girls at the St. Louis Industrial School, court officials did not think it proper to commit younger African American girls to this facility. [71]

Even after Tipton opened, the placement of African American girls remained problematic. This is in large part due to SLJC's decision to segregate its reform school for girls. The Child Welfare League of America report on the St. Louis court noted the small provision made for the industrial training of African American girls.[72] It seems likely that if the court had the opportunity, it would have committed more African American girls to institutions. From the beginning fewer girls were adjudicated by the SLJC. By extension, this meant that fewer girls were placed on probation. The court's Victorian attitudes towards women further complicated the use of probation for girls. That is, the court believed that it was not proper for girls to come to the court building to report to their probation office. Instead probation officers were required to visit girls in their homes.[73] The amount of time devoted to travel by probation officers made home visits a far less efficient means of supervision than office visits. Placing girls on probation proved to be an added burden to an already overworked department.

The data on probation for girls closely resemble those on boys placed on probation. The rates for African American and white girls were very close. In the

[71] Weakley, "St. Louis Juvenile Court," 54.
[72] "The Juvenile Court of St. Louis," 5.
[73] Lundberg and Lenroot, Juvenile Court at Work, 172.

few cases where there was a difference, African American girls fared better than white girls.

Conclusion

There has been a tendency among scholars to treat the juvenile courts as though they were monolithic institutions. Unfortunately, this tendency to see all juvenile courts as very similar blurs the recognition of the influence of local factors in the operation of juvenile courts. When compared with other large urban juvenile courts, the SLJC appears to have adopted a more conservative approach to dealing with delinquency. Its greater use of institutional commitments and its less frequent use of probation are examples of the SLJC conservative character.

The operation of the SLJC was also influenced by the racial customs of the city. As a border city, St. Louis had an uneven approach to racial segregation. The SLJC reflected this mixed attitude. The segregated system developed by the SLJC reflected racial progress over the general neglect shown black children.. The practices of the SLJC provide an example of how institutions can naturalize racial differences. The juvenile court did not make any overt references to race in its decision-making. It used the same language and court process for African American children as it did for white children. At the same time as the court appeared neutral in its decision-making, it allowed race to be a significant aspect of most areas of court operation. The influence of race was most evident in its classification of most African American children as delinquent and its record of incarcerating a larger percentage of African American children.

The operation of the SLJC shows how informal procedures of the police and the probation department contributed to the naturalization of racial differences. Police discretion in terms of whom to arrest and the probation officers' ability to resolve some cases informally clearly contributed to the overrepresentation of African American children in the SLJC. Indeed, overrepresentation of African American children in the SLJC was a feature of the juvenile court from its very beginning. In this regard St. Louis's experience was similar to that of other big cities. The disproportionate number of black children was also noted in the juvenile courts in New York, Chicago, and Detroit. This fact strongly suggests that the problem of overrepresentation of African American within the juvenile justice system has its origins in the early history of the court.

The pattern of court commitments to juvenile facilities further supports the contention that racial ideology was a factor in the operation of the SLJC. The number of African American children committed to juvenile facilities was disproportionate to the African American children processed by the court. In particular, the statistical data demonstrates that African American boys had the greatest chance of being committed to a correctional institution. Decisions about probation are an anomaly in that they are different from most other parts of the SLJC operation. The slightly higher number of African American children placed on probation may be explained by their overrepresentation in the SLJC. Since probation was the most common form of disposition, it seems logical to assume that most African American children would end up on probation. Given the fact that approximately 28% of the children coming before the court were African

Americans, it is surprising that the difference in rates of probation between white and black children was not greater. The minimal differences in rates of probation underscore how racial beliefs played in the operation of the court.

Epilogue

At the end of nineteenth century, St. Louis was part of the national movement to reform and modernize child welfare services. Thus, one finds in the actions of St. Louis's child welfare reformers the same emphasis on centralizing child welfare philanthropy, improving efficiency through increased coordination between public and private agencies, and reduction of sectarian tension that existed in other major American cities at the time. In adopting these themes of reform, St. Louis became part of the national narrative about the importance of children and childhood to the future of the nation. Child saving combined the reformers' concern for the welfare of children with their belief in the use of direct governmental action to achieve their goals.

In pursuing these reforms, St. Louis reformers were also participating in a national narrative about race. The historian Robert Weibe observed that Progressive Era reformers helped maintain social continuity by drawing a circle around the groups they perceived to be worthy of help while excluding everyone else. No group of people was more excluded than African Americans. Since a motivating factor for Progressive Era child welfare reform was preparing immigrant children for citizenship, the marginalization of African Americans had to be reconciled with principles of democracy. To accomplish this end, reformers relied on the scholarship of American social science, some of which reinvented and modernized the white stereotypes about black inadequacy.

Through scientific racism, American social scientists helped create a rationale for racial segregation. Specifically, it inculcated into its research results

the conclusions of a conservative racial ideology that posited that the only place for African Americans was on the very bottom of American society. The predominant scientific narrative at the start of the twentieth century asserted that African Americans were intellectually and emotionally incapable of participation in society. . Based on this narrative, Progressive reformers assumed that blacks would need remediation before they could benefit from social welfare reform.

In this time period, both Black and white scholars produced research that contradicted the conclusions of scientific racism. This research was largely ignored by public policy markers. It was not until after 1930 that the research of racial liberals replaced scientific racism. For most of the first thirty years of the twentieth century scientific racism remained a major part of the official story of race in America. This narrative about black character was an essential part of St. Louis's Progressive Era child welfare reform. Using subtle and sophisticated means, reformers clung to the idea that blacks were morally and intellectually inferior to exclude them from most reform initiatives. For instance, in the city-administered mothers' pension program only two African American women received pensions. Similarly, the city's Board of Children's Guardians, which placed children in foster care, only accepted a small number of black children.

While the official narrative of African American inadequacy dominated most public policy decisions, white St. Louisans were not able to recreate the patterns of total segregation that existed in the South. Most areas of St. Louis public life were strictly segregated. There were, however, areas where integration prevailed and other areas that remained contested. Public transportation and

housing were arguably the most important areas of St. Louis's public life that remained contested.

The ability of St. Louis's African American politicians to avoid the complete segregation found in the Deep South reflects both their relative political strength and their weakness. They proved to be very adept at using the competitive nature of Missouri politics to block segregation legislation from being passed in the state legislature. Thus, St. Louis's African American political leaders often moved their electoral support between the two major parties to prevent specific forms of segregation from becoming law. They also used the promise of support for local funding initiatives to prevent the imposition of segregation.

Despite the success of black politicians, their political power in St. Louis remained fairly limited. Nowhere is the limitation more clear than in the failure of African Americans to block the 1917 referendum on neighborhood segregation. The fact that the ordinance passed with such a large majority of white votes demonstrates the limited nature of political alliances for African Americans. Housing was one of the most contested areas for working-class blacks and whites. In the early twentieth century, the shortage of adequate housing coupled with the increased migration of blacks to St. Louis served to increase racial tensions in the city. The segregated housing referendum was the result of longstanding conflicts over where blacks had a right to live.

The fight over housing hid other areas of racial tension. For example, it covered up not only white anxiety about having to compete with African Americans for basic resources, it also hid white anxiety about African American

assertiveness. African Americans' demand for housing reflected a disruption in the city's racial order. Their actions were in direct conflict with the city's conservative racial ideology. The widespread reaction to black competition for housing is evidence of how most whites saw this competition as a challenge to white privilege. Criticism came from a number of sectors of St. Louis society, including religious, political, and business leaders.

The trajectory of St. Louis's African American children's institutions further demonstrates the limits of African American political alliances. Their lack of influence allowed St. Louis philanthropic institutions to marginalize these institutions. This study demonstrates how the structure of St. Louis's philanthropy reinforced segregation. In subtle but highly effective ways, St. Louis's philanthropic community ensured that these institutions would remain poorly funded.

While appearing to be race neutral, St. Louis's philanthropic policies in fact actively promoted racial discrimination. Their tacit support of segregation created a double bind for black institutions. It isolated them from important sources of financial support, while at the same time blaming African Americas for poor management. The latter assertion, which helped legitimize and naturalize racial segregation, was only credible because it fit with the dominant narrative of African American inadequacy.

It is important to note that each of the institutions in this study experienced segregation differently. The results of this study suggest that an institution's white social capital, the support from socially and politically important white institutions,

affected how it experienced racial segregation. The experience of the Colored Orphans Home most clearly demonstrates the effect that racial ideology can have on social reform. Of all the institutions studied, the COH most clearly articulated the goals of Progressive Era child welfare reform, embracing the ideas of modern child welfare. Thus, it actively attempted to keep the families of the children it admitted involved in their care and was most open to allowing the children to be involved with outside groups. Their children attended public school and participated in outside social groups.

Ironically, the COH had the least amount of white social capital. Given their embrace of modern child welfare practices it seems natural to assume that the city's child savers would enthusiastically support the COH. However, the COH was the children's institution mostly closely identified with St. Louis's African American community. Consequently, its existence for most of the early twentieth century remained precarious. It was not until after African American migration to St. Louis made the African American community more of a player in city politics that the COH's existence was secure. After closing in 1919, the COH reopened in 1924 as a more viable institution, thanks largely to a broader base of support among the city's African Americans and the generosity of Annie Malone.

Saint Francis Home (SFH), the other institution in this study, was sheltered from many Progressive Era child welfare reforms. Like many of the Catholic institutions in the early twentieth century, SFH resisted modernization. For most of the first thirty years of the twentieth century, SFH remained a nineteenth-century institution. The least modern of all St. Louis's Catholic

children's institutions, SFH made little effort to keep the children in contact with their families; it kept children for long periods of time, and made minimal use of foster care for younger children.

What is remarkable about SFH is how its operation evoked so little concern from St. Louis's child welfare reformers.[1] Saint Francis Home was an anathema to goals of child welfare modernization, and yet the city's reformers showed little interest in reforming it. This paradox is difficult to explain, unless the influence of race on welfare reform is considered. That is, the indifference of reformers to SFH lends credence to the assertion that child welfare reform was intended for white children. Since child welfare reform was for white children, it did not matter what type of institution was available to African American children.

From this perspective, St. Louis's child savers were indifferent to SFH because it operated within existing racial norms. The conservative racial ideology that dominated the first decades of the twentieth century was most concerned with keeping blacks in their place. The nuns who operated SFH did little to disrupt these norms. A major part of the mission of SFH was to train its girls to be domestics. There is little evidence to suggest the Oblates ever encouraged the girls to think beyond these limited horizons. In fact, in the early decades of the

[1] As a Catholic institution, St. Francis Home was to a degree insulated from Progressive pressures to modernize. Part of the late-nineteenth-century détente between Protestant and Catholic groups was th. understanding that government organizations would not needlessly interfere with the operation of Catholic institutions. This is not to suggest that Catholic institutions were immune from pressures to modernize. Throughout the twentieth century, Catholic institutions were increasingly subject to regulation by state and local agencies. Catholic institutions were also responsive to the growing influence of community chests on local philanthropy. A good explanation of the pressure on Catholic institutions to modernize may be found in Brown and Mc Keown, The Poor Belong to Us. An analysis of the détente reached between Protestants and Catholics may be found in Peter Halloran, Wayward Children and Eric Schneider, Web of Class.

twentieth century, the home used images of the girls being trained for domestic service in their fundraising efforts.

To be fair, there is no direct evidence that the Oblates explicitly agreed with segregation. The experience of the nuns who ran SFH indicates that social capital is in part contingent on racial hegemony. The Oblates had to operate within a rather narrow set of racial parameters. The racial policies of the St. Louis Archdiocese closely mirrored those of the society at large. St. Louis's parishes and schools were segregated, and the church did little to challenge the immorality of racial segregation. Had the Oblate sisters aggressively challenged racial segregation within the church or society, the bishop would likely have asked them to leave the diocese.

However, despite the limitations of social capital, SFH benefited from its association with the Catholic Church. As a Catholic institution, it had regular access to institutional sources of social and financial support. The home received institutional support from the church's Indian and Colored Mission fund. In addition to the institutional support from national church organizations, SFH benefited from the generosity of local parishes and other religious orders. The home's records show that it routinely received contributions from St. Vincent de Paul Societies and from the members of other religious orders. This continued support from Catholic organizations provided SFH with a stability that eluded the C OH.

The Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls provides an example of African American creativity in the face of extreme racial hostility. African

American maternalism was a strategic response to the social and political realities of the Progressive Era. By grounding traditional concerns for marriage and family into a strategy for racial advancement, African American women were able to blend different narratives about the nature of womanhood and reform into a single narrative. . Their persistent demands for respectability were calculated to challenge many early-twentieth-century racial stereotypes. The demand for the same level of respect accorded to white women was a sophisticated means of subverting the social construction of women to assert that black women were equal in status to white women. African American women conflated improving the lives of black women with uplifting the entire race. For African American women, the goal of equality with white women was inseparable from racial equality and protecting black women from sexual exploitation.

The strong emphasis on respectability was not the only distinguishing feature of African American maternalism. African American women also incorporated important aspects of African American culture into their reform paradigms. The women who managed Tipton emphasized religious training and education as a means of social uplift. The black church was the cornerstone of African American social and cultural life. The women who managed Tipton took their experience as church women and used it to make Tipton a safe place for black women to express their own views about gender and race.

Like most African American social welfare reform, child welfare reforms had its origins in the black church. Historically, the black church has provided welfare services to its members. Moreover, for many of the African American

women involved in social reform, the church was the center of their social as well as spiritual life. Therefore, it would have been very difficult for these women to separate their reform activities from their religious faith.

Given this fact, it is not surprising that religious instruction was an important part of the program at Tipton. In African American maternalism, religion was intertwined with the idea of respectability. Thus, association with church was seen as a way of avoiding the temptations associated with commercial entertainment and affiliation with church groups was viewed by most African Americans as providing the restraint necessary for social uplift.

The emphasis on education was also a part of the idea of social uplift. African American women who managed Tipton knew that the girls in their charge would most likely continue to work after marriage. Therefore, the industrial school did its best to provide them as many educational opportunities as possible, including training in secretarial work, nursing, and cosmetology. However, even with this recognition of the need for black women to continue to work after marriage, the African American women who managed Tipton remained committed to preparing young women for the traditional roles given to women. For example, their emphasis on dress making was an attempt to provide the young women under their care with a skill that could accommodate the demands of working while raising a family.

There was also a democratic component to African American maternalism. African American reformers wanted the women under their care to emulate their success. Education was viewed as a primary way of achieving

success. The encouragement to succeed educationally was primarily a way in which black women reformers attempted to reduce the emotional distance between themselves and the girls.

But the emphasis on respectability had its limits. The life at Tipton was in many respects sterile. The prevalence of same-sex relationships in the school reflected the school's lack of interest in addressing the girls' sexuality. Respectability as developed at Tipton required the suppression of sexuality. The routine at Tipton provided activities that did not address their becoming young adults. Much of the physical abuse that occurred at Tipton can be attributed to a lack of understanding of the conflicts inherent in a strict code of respectability. The two activities most related to physical punishment were engaging in same-sex liaisons and overt expressions of defiance.

If Tipton provided a safe place for African Americans, then the St. Louis juvenile court was a less sympathetic venue. It is important to note that black parents did not see the court as completely hostile to their interests, often petitioning the court for help when their children were beyond their control. However, the court's treatment of African Americans was in most cases harsher than it was for white children.

The juvenile court system was the pinnacle of Progressive Era child welfare reform. It included the hallmarks of Progressive reform. Like most areas of American social welfare reform, child welfare reform lacked a central bureaucratic authority to institute a national plan. Implementation relied on interested local parties replicating what had been tried in other cities. Such

reliance on local venues to advance reform made child welfare reform sensitive to local racial practices. The approach to race taken by the SLJC reflects the complex and intricate ways that racial attitudes can affect the trajectory of child welfare reform. The inclusion of black children in the juvenile justice system represented racial progress for St. Louis. At the same time how black children were treated by the court demonstrates the way that racial attitudes affect decision-making in child welfare institutions,.

There is no evidence of outright racial hostility by either the St. Louis police or the juvenile court. Their approach to race relations was similar to that of most institutions in St. Louis at the time, in that they accepted segregation as a routine part of civic life. In this respect, the child savers in St. Louis were similar to most Progressive Era reformers. Many Progressives were opposed to segregation but were unwilling to risk their reform goals in order to confront its practice.

The operation of the St. Louis justice system gives a clear picture of how reform agendas can naturalize racial ideology. St. Louis's child welfare reformers' uncritical response to segregation allowed the juvenile justice system to legitimize racial stereotypes. More importantly, it allowed these stereotypes to become part of its decision-making process.

The result of this process of naturalization was far from benign. Both in its use of its discretionary power and in its official operations, the police and juvenile court treated white and black children differently. Thus, African American children were overrepresented in both the juvenile arrest statistics and in the statistics of

children adjudicated by the juvenile court.

A closer examination of the difference in treatment shows that many of the actions of the police and juvenile court were consistent with the racial stereotypes found in the conservative racial ideology that dominated in Progressive Era. The police and juvenile court accepted the idea of black criminality. The overrepresentation of blacks in the number of juvenile arrests demonstrates how the police saw African American children as a more of a threat to society. This was especially true of their attitude towards black males, among whom the difference in arrest rates was most dramatic. The arrest of black males was significantly greater than the black population as a whole.

The juvenile court was also influenced by narratives about black criminality. Black children were significantly overrepresented among the children adjudicated by the court. In the first decade of the twentieth century, African Americans made up approximately 6%- 8% of the city's population, but African American children consistently constituted 30% of the cases adjudicated. The experience of the St. Louis juvenile court suggests that the ongoing problem of overrepresentation of minority children may have had its origins in the very beginning of the court's operation.

Even more revealing is extremely small number of African American children classified as neglected. The definitions of neglect and delinquency remain quite fluid. The lack of precision has allowed the court a great deal of discretion in classifying children. Unless racial bias in considered, it is difficult to explain the juvenile court's high rate of classifying black children as criminal

rather than neglected. The same can be said of the court's overuse of reform school for black males. The court appears to have developed a harsher standard for black males than for white males. Black males were seen as in more need of incarceration than white males.

The St. Louis juvenile court was pragmatic in its allegiance to racial ideologies. Cost seems to have played a significant role in how it treated black girls. The large number of African American girls on probation stemmed in part from the lack of a local institution for African American girls. The city bore the cost of placing girls at Tipton. The court resolved this problem by placing most African American girls who came before the court on probation.

The link between child welfare reform and whiteness can also be seen in who had influence in creating the new welfare system. Historians of social welfare have pointed out that most successful reform movements have been fostered by coalitions that crossed class lines. In the case of child welfare reform, the coalition in St. Louis was created along racial as well as across class lines. African Americans were left on the margins of child welfare reforms. Their needs were only considered within the context of maintaining racial segregation. Consequently, the majority of the resources went to help the children of European immigrant groups.

This study provides further support for George Lipsitz's assertion that social welfare programs can serve as a means of positive investment in whiteness. Lipsitz's work uses the implementation of postwar social welfare programs to make his point. The findings of the present study suggest that the

process of eliding racial preferences with welfare benefits began much earlier. Its conclusions indicate that racial bias may have been embedded in the very beginning of the modern American child welfare system.

The course of child welfare reform in St. Louis points to the need for more research on the hegemonic role that racial ideology plays in the development and implementation of child welfare programs. Several single-city studies have included the effect of race on the administration of the juvenile court system of early twentieth century. Their findings are similar to those of the present investigation. Few studies have looked at the relationship between racial ideology and multiple child welfare programs in the same city. Given the prevalence of racial bias in St. Louis's child welfare programs, a larger study comparing the implementation of child welfare programs seems a reasonable next step.

A study of border cities would offer fertile ground for future research. Border cities are places where cultures collide.[2] An examination of border cities highlights how social relationships in a modern society are complex phenomena in which multiple claims of citizenship are articulated and contested. John Hatigan has suggested that scholars need to pay closer attention to the role that local settings play in the creation of whiteness.[3] An emphasis on local practices permits scholars to move from theoretical abstractions about whiteness to

[2] Jose David Saldivar provides a good explanation of how border areas are places where cultures collide and conflict. See Jose David Saldivar, Border Matters: Remapping American Cultural Studies (Berkley: University of California Press, 1997).
[3] John Hartigan, Racial Situations: Class Predicaments of Whiteness in Detroit (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 4.

understanding its application in real-life settings.

The history of St. Louis's race relations demonstrates that far from being a white-black binary, competing groups of whites used race relations as part of their efforts to extend their control over the city. African Americans often attempted to use this conflict to advance the needs of their community. Ironically, the use of race by whites to advance their own political agenda made the color line less stabile. Child welfare reform became part of the means by which social elites modernized and stabilized St. Louis's system of racial segregation. A comparison of North-South border cities can help elaborate the role that local politics played in implementation of racial ideology that is embedded in national policy initiatives.

My hope in examining how racial ideology was part of child welfare reform in St. Louis is that this study represents a small step in filling the gap between broad narrative and local practice. In highlighting how child welfare reform was itself a complex phenomenon that can serve more than one purpose, the study was able to document how St. Louis's child welfare reform became a means of modernizing a conservative racial ideology. Results of the study show that not only did St. Louis's child welfare reformers not question the racial assumptions of the dominant racial ideology, they accepted them as facts. In doing so, they helped transform nineteenth-century racial attitudes into a modern scientifically based system of racial privilege.

Bibliography

Periodicals

A ME Church Review, July 1902, February 1905, July 1906, October 1907, October 1911.

The Annals of American Academy of Social Sciences, CXL, 1928, 287-293.

The Crisis, November 1914,November 1920, February 1921, December 1921, June 1923.

The Family, May 1921 and January 1923.

Journal of Applied Psychology,7(1923).

Mangold, George. "Children's Institutions in St. Louis," Bulletin of the Council of Social Agencies, 1 March, 1919.

Southern Workman, April 1908, 138-139.

Our Colored Missions, 12 December, 1921.

Newspapers

Chicago Defender, 13 October, 1917 and 17 August,1917 .

Cleveland Advocate, 25 April,1903, 14 April, 1906, 19 November, 1913, 24 June, 1916, 10 October,1916, 19 November, 1916,4 December, 1920.

Cleveland Journal, 25 April, 1903, 14 April, 1906.

Kansas City Call, 11 November, 1925, 5.

New York Age, 12 December, 1894, 12 February, 1901, 5 July, 1910, 14 December, 1916, 24 May, 1927.

Ohio Monitor, 12 December, 1919.

St. Louis Argus, 1 June 1915, 21 January, 1916, 9 June, 1916, 16 September, 1916, 24 May, 1918.

St. Louis Palladium, 8 April, 1903.

Government Documents

Edward Clopper. "Child Welfare in Tennessee: An Inquiry by the National Child Labor Committee for the Tennessee Child Welfare Commission," Tennessee Child Welfare Commission, 1920.

Hall, Charles E. Negroes in the United States 1920-1932. U.S Census Bureau (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1935).

Juvenile Court Statistics for 1930. U.S. Department of Labor Children's Bureau (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1932.)

Leete, Mary Mather. The Children's Bureau of Cleveland, U.S. Dept. of Labor. Children's Bureau (Washington, D.C.: GPO).

Lunberg, Emma and Katherine, Lenroot. "Juvenile Courts at Work: A Study of the Organization and Methods of ten Courts." U.S Dept of Labor Children's Bureau, 1925.

Missouri Dept. of Corrections. Biennial Report for the Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Jefferson City, Mo, 1921-1930.

Missouri Board of Charities and Corrections. Biannual Report 1901-1903, 1905-1906,1909-1910,1911-1912,, Jefferson City, Mo.

Nesbit, Florence. "Standards of Public Aid to Children in Their Own Homes." U.S dept. of Labor Children's Bureau, 1923.

St. Louis Police Dept. Annual Reports 1891-1930. St. Louis, Mo., St Louis Police Dept. Archives.

U.S. Census Bureau, Negro Population of the United States 1790-1915. U.S. Census Bureau (Washington, D.C. GPO, 1917).

U.S. Census Bureau, Prisoners and Juvenile Delinquents in Institutions 1904. The Bureau of the Census (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1907).

Conference Proceedings

George Haynes. "Cooperation with Colleges in Securing and Training Negro Social Workers for Urban Center." The National Conference of Corrections and Charities, Boston, Ma., 1911.

Mrs Frank Pitts. “St. Louis Colored Orphan Home.” In Proceedings of the National Convention of the National Association of Colored Women, Richmond, Va., 1896, Kansas City, Mo.: University of Missouri at Kansas City, microfilm.

Mrs. F. Pitts. “St. Louis Colored Orphans Home.” The National Association of Colored Women, Boston, Ma., July 29-31, 1896, Kansas City ,Mo.: University of Missouri at Kansas City, microfilm.

Mrs. F. Pitts. “The Colored Orphan Home.” Presentation at the National Association of Colored Women Conference, Boston, Ma., July29-31, 1896, Kansas City, Mo.: University of Missouri at Kansas City, microfilm.

Unpublished Documents

Brown family Application to St Francis Home. Correspondence File, Oblate Sisters of Providence Archive Baltimore, Md.

Child Welfare League of America, Report on the Child Welfare Work of St. Louis, Missouri and Recommendations Leading to the Development of a Community Plan in Children’s Work, Report, 1928. Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri at St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.

Committee for Social Service Among Colored People. Report on the Colored Orphans Home, March 1914. Special Collections, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

CSSACP Minutes, April 1913, January 1914, February 1910, January 1912, March 1914. Special Collections, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

CSSACP. “Plans for 1911-1912.” Special Collections, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

McLean, Francis. Survey of Charities of St. Louis: A Summary of Important Findings and Recommendations, August 31, 1916. Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri at St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.

Child Welfare League of America, The Nature of the Delinquency Problem in St. Louis. , 1927. Western Historical Manuscript Archives, University of Missouri at St Louis, St. Louis, Mo.

Child Welfare league of America, Report on Child Welfare Work of St. Louis Missouri and Recommendations Leading to the Development of a Community Plan in Children’s Work,1928 Western Historical Manuscript Archive, University of Missouri at St. Louis.

St. Francis Home Annual Review. Annual Review for 1905, 1908, 1912, 1920, Twentieth Anniversary Review, Oblate Sisters of Providence Archives, Baltimore, Maryland.

St. Francis Home Income Statement for December 1899, February1904, June 1904, June 1906, December 1906, February 1907, November 1908, December 1921, January 1922, March 1922. Oblate Sisters of Providence Archives, Baltimore, Maryland.

St. Francis Home Vital Statistics Log 1918-1926. Oblate Sisters of Providence Archives, Baltimore, Maryland.

The Mission in St. Louis . Oblate Sisters of Providence Archive, Baltimore Md.

Paddgett, Alice. The Catholic Program in St. Louis for the Care of Dependent, and Delinquent Children, 1934. Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri at St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.

Case Histories

Missouri Dept. of Corrections. Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Case Files 718 ,Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Mo.

Missouri Dept. of Corrections. Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Case File 549, 647 and 722. Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Mo.

St. Louis Juvenile Court. Cases, 36160, 36191, 37046, 37075, St. Louis City Juvenile Court Files, St Louis City Juvenile Court.

Oral Histories

Catherine Hagen Oral History. St. Louis Missouri, Completed by Mary Seematter, March 21,1999.

Unpublished Master's Theses and Dissertations

Chavis, Ruth. "Poverty and Relief Among Negroes of St. Louis" (Master's Thesis, University of Missouri, 1919). Columbia, Mo. Ellis Library University of Missouri.

Christensen, Lawrence. “Black St. Louis: A Study in Race relations 1865-1916.” PhD Dissertation University of Missouri, 1972. Watson Library, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Ks. Microfilm.

Lemond, Dorothy.” History of St. Louis Provident Association” (Master’s Thesis, Washington University, 1933). St. Louis, Western Historical Manuscript Archives University of Missouri at St. Louis.

McGinnes, Henry. “A History of St. Francis Home” (Master’s Thesis, St. Louis University, 1951). Oblate Sisters of Providence Archive, Baltimore, Md.

Pollock, Ivan. “The Parental and Home Conditions of One Thousand Neglected Children” (Master’s Thesis, Washington University, 1911). St. Louis, Special Collections, Washington University

Schlutius, Milerna. “Juvenile Delinquency” (Master’s Thesis, Washington University, 1925). St. Louis, Special Collections, Washington University

Weakley, Benjamin Clay. “The St Louis Juvenile Court” (Master’s Thesis, Washington University, 1913).

Letters

Chairman CSSACP to Wm. T. Cross Secretary State Board of Charities and Corrections. December 29,1910. Special Collections, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Ann Brown to Superintendent Bowles, 30 August 1936. Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Case File 718. Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Mo.

Susan Billings to Superintendent Bowles, n.d. Missouri State Industrial School for Negro Girls, Case File 59. Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Mo.

Mrs. Ann Clark to Mother Mary Elizabeth, 13 November, 1927. Oblate Sisters Archive, Baltimore, Md.

Jane Cummings to Mother Superior of SFH, June 29, 1929. Oblate Sisters Archive, Baltimore, Maryland.

Letter from Camille Dawes to Superintendent Bowles Missouri Industrial School for Negro Girls, Case File 722. Missouri State Archives, Jefferson City, Mo.

Frank Tegethoff to Oblate Sisters 10 Sept.,1920. Oblate Sisters of Providence Archive, Baltimore, Md.

Secondary Sources

Abramovitz, Mimi. Regulating the Lives of Women: Social Welfare Policy from Colonial Times to the Present. Boston: South End Press, 1992.

"Additional Letters of Negro Migrants,1916-1918." Compiled by Emmet J. Scott, Journal of Negro History 4no.4(Oct. 1919) 412-465.

Alba, Richard. "Assimilation's Quiet Tide." In Majority and Minority: The Dynamics of Race and Ethnicity on American Life, 6th ed., ed. Norman Yetman Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1999.

Anderson-Esping, Gosta. "The Three Political Economies of the Welfare State." In Power Resource Theory and the Welfare State: A Critical Approach, ed. Julia O'Connor and Gregg Olson Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Anderson, Kristen. "German-Americans, African Americans and the Republican Party in St. Louis,1865-1872." Journal of American Ethnic History 28 no.1 (Fall 2008):34-51

Ashby, Leroy. Endangered Children: Dependency, Neglect and Abuse in American History. New York: Twayne Press, 1997.

_____. Saving the Waifs: Reformers and Dependent Children,1890-1917. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984.

Baldwin, James. " On Being White and Other Lies." In Black on White: Black Writes on What It Means to Be White, ed. David Roediger New York: Schocken Press, 1998.

----------. "White Mans Guilt." In Black on White: Black Writers on What It Means to Be White, ed. David Roediger New York: Schocken Press, 1998.

Barber, Bernard. "Absolutization of the Market: How We Got From There to Here." In Markets and Morals, ed. Dworkin et al. New York: Hemisphere Publishing, 1977.

Bell, Derrick. "White Superiority in America Its Legal and Economic Costs." In Black on White: Black Writers on What It Means to Be White, ed. David Roediger New York: Schocken Press, 1999.

Billingsley, Andrew. Black Families in White America. Englewoods Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Publishing, 1968.

----------. Climbing Jacob's Ladder: The Enduring Legacy of African American Families. New York: Touchstone,1992.

Boger,Gretchen. "The Meaning of Neighborhood in the Modern City: Baltimore's Residential Segregation Ordinance." Journal of Urban History 35 no.2 (Jan.2009):234-

Borchert, James. Alley Life in Washington D.C.: Family, Community, Religion and Folklife,1850-1970. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1980.

Bremmer, Robert. From the Depths: The Discovery of Poverty in the United States. New York: New York University Press, 1972.

Brint, Steven. In an Age of Experts: The Changing Role of Professionals in Politics and Public Life. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Brodkin, Karen. How Jews Became White Folks: What That Says About Race in America New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1998.
Brown, Dorothy and Elizabeth McKeon. The Poor Belong to Us: Catholic Charities and American Welfare. Cambridge.: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Butler, Judith. The Psychic Life of Power. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1999.

Calloway, Licia Morrow. Black Family (Dys)Function in the Novels of Jessie Fauset, Nella Larsen and Fanny Hurst. New York: Peter lang, 2003.

Carlton-LaNey, Iris and Vanessa Hodges. "African American Reformers Mission: Caring for Our Girls." Affilia 19 (Fall 2004): 257-272.

Cash-Bennett, Floris. African American Women and Social Action: Volunteerism from Jim Crow to the New Deal. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 2001.

Chambers, Clarke. "Women in the Creation of the Profession of Social Work." Social Service Review 60 no. 1 (March 1986): 1-33.

Christensen, Lawrence. "Race Relations in St. Louis,1865-1916." Missouri Historical Review 78 no.2 (1983): 123-136.

Chodorow, Nancy. The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press, 1978.

---------- . Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1989.

Clapp, Elizabeth. “Welfare Reform and the Role of Women.” Journal of American Studies 28 no. 3 (1994): 359-383.

----------. Mothers of All Children: Women Reformers and the Rise of the Juvenile Courts in Progressive Era America. University Park, Pa: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998.

Cmiel, Kenneth. A Home of a Different Kind: One Chicago Orphanage and the Tangle of Child Welfare. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Corbett, Katherine and Mary Seematter. “’No Crystal Stair’: Black St. Louis, 1920-1940.” Gateway Heritage 8 no.2(Fall 1995):82-88.

Collins-Hill, Patricia. Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciences, and the Politics of Empowerment, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Craven, Hamilton. Before Head Start: The Iowa Research Station. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

----------. “Child Saving in the Age of Professionalism,1915-1930.” In American Childhood: A Handbook and Research Guide, ed. N. Ray Hiner and Joseph Hawes Westport, Con.: Greenwood Press, 1985.

_____. “American Social Science and the Invention of Affirmative Action, 1920s-1970s.” in The Social Sciences Go to Washington: The Politics of Knowledge in the Post Modern Age. New Brunswick, N.J. Rutgers university Press,2004.

Crenson, Matthew. Building the Invisible Orphanage: A Prehistory of the American Welfare System. Cambridge:Harvard University Press, 1998.

Crocker, Ruth H. Social Work and Social Control: The Settlement Movement in Two Industrial Cities 1889-1930 .Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1991.

Crummell, Alexander. “The Attitude of the American Mind Toward Nero Intellect” in BlaCK Scholars in the Line: Race, Social Science and American Thought in the Twentieth Century, ed. Jonothan Scott Holloway and Ben Kepple, (South Bend,Ind: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 45-51.

Dewey, John. “Liberalism and Social Action.” In John Dewey: The Later Works 1925-1953 Vol 11:1935-1937, ed. Jo Ann Boydston Carbondale, Ill: University of Southern Illinois Press,1981.

----------. “Creative Democracy: The Task Before Us.” In John Dewey and the Promise of America (Columbus, Oh.: American Education Press, 1939).

Diner, Stephen. “Chicago Social Workers and Blacks in the Progressive Era.” Social Service Review 44 (Dec 1970): 393-410.

_____. A Very Different Age: Americans of the Progressive Era. New York: Hill and Wang,1998.

DuBois, W.E.B. “Our Spiritual Strivings.” In The Souls of Black Folks New York: Penguin Press, 1989.

----------. “The Souls of White Folks.” In Black on White: Black Writers on What It Means to Be White, ed. David Roediger New York: Schocken Books, 1998.

----------.. The Black North 1901: A Series of Articles Originally Published in Nov-Dec 1901 New York: Arno Press, 1969.

_____ .. “The Size, Age and Sex of the Negro Population “, in Black Scholars on the Line: Race, Social Science and American Thought in the Twentieth Century, ed Jonothan Scott Holloway and Ben Kepple (Soth Bend, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 131-149.

Dukes, Richard and Ruben Martinez. “The Effects of Ethnic Identity, Ethnicity, and Gender on Adolescent Well-Being.” Journal of Youth and Adolescence 26 (Oct. 1997): 503-517.

Early, Gerald ed. Ain’t But a Place: An Anthology of African American Writings about S. Louis. St. Louis: St. Louis Historical Society Press,1996.

Eherenriech, John. The Altruistic Imagination: The History of Social Work and Social Policy in the United States. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Erikson, Erik. Identity, Youth and Crisis. New York: W.W. Norton and Sons, 1962.

Ethington, Philip. “The Metropolis and Multicultural Ethics: Direct Democracy versus Deliberative Democracy in the Progressive Era.” In Progressivism and the New Democracy, ed. Sidney Millkis and Jerome Mileur (Amherst, Ma: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999).

Fanon, Frantz. Black Skins, White Masks, 9th ed. New York: Grove Press, 1967.

Fass, Paula. The Beautiful and the Damned: American Youth in the 1920s. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Feld, Barry. Bad Kids: Race and the Transformation of the Juvenile Court. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Feldstein, Ruth. Motherhood in Black and White: Race and Sex in American Liberalism, 1930-1965. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Flax, Jane. Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press, 1990.

Foner, Eric. " Rsponse to Eric Arsen" Internstional Labor and Working Class History 60 (Fall 2000), 57-60.

----------. Disputed Subjects: Essays on Psychoanalysis, Politics and Philosophy. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Foucault, Michel. Punishment and Discipline: The Birth of the Prison, trans. Allen Sherman. New York: Vintage Books, 1972.

_____. The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences. New York Vintage Books,1970.

Franklin, Donna. Insuring Inequality: The Structural Transformation of the African American Family. New York: Oxford Press, 1997.

Fredrickson, George. The Comparative Imagination: On the History of Racism, Nationalism, and Social Movements. Berkeley, Ca: University of California Press,1997.

----------. The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny,1817-1914. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Friedman, Rena. These Are Our Children: Jewish Orphanages in the United States, 1880-1925. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998.

Gaines, Kevin. Uplifting the Race: Black Leadership, Politics and Culture in the Twentieth Century. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Gersman, Elinor Mondale. "The Development of Public Education for Blacks in Nineteenth Century St. Louis, Missouri." Journal of Negro Education 41 (Winter 1972),35-47.

Geertz,Cliford. The Interpretations of Culture: Selected Essays of Clifford Geertz New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Giddings, Paula. When and Where I Enter: Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America. New York: Bantam Books, 1985.

----------. "The Last Taboo." In Race-ing Justice, En-Gendering Power: Essays on Anita Hill, Clarence Thomas and the Construction of Social Reality, ed. Toni Morrison. New York: Pantheon Books, 1992.

Gillard, John SJ. The Catholic Church and the American Negro. Baltimore: St. Joseph Press, 1929.

Gittens, Joan. Poor Relations: The Children of the State in Illinois,1818-1990. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1994.

Gordon, Linda. "Black and White Visions of Welfare: Women's Activism 1890-1945." Journal of American History (Sept. 1991): 559-598.

---------- . Pitied But Not Entitled: Single Mothers and the History of Welfare. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

---------- . "Single Mothers and Child Neglect,1880-1920." American Quarterly 37 (Summer 1985):173-192.

----------. Heroes in Their Own Life: The Politics and History of Family Violence Boston, 1880-1960. New York: Penquin Books, 1989.

Gottlieb, Peter. Making Their Own Way: Southern Black Migration to Pittsburgh, 1916-1930. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1987.

Greene, Lorenzo and Gary, Kreamer. Missouri's Black Heritage. Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Press, 1993.

Greenstone, J. David. "Dorthea Dix and Jane Adams: From Transcendentalism to Pragmatism in American Social Reform." Social Service Review 53 no. 4 (December 1979): 527-559.

Greven, Phillip. Spare the Child: The Religious Roots of Punishment and the Psychological Impact of Physical Abuse (New York: Knopf, 1991).

Grossman, James. Land of Hope: Black Southerners and the Great Migration (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

----------. “The White Man’s Union: Resonance of Race and Class, 1916-1922.” In The Great Migration in Historical Perspective: New Dimensions in Race, Class and Gender, ed. Joe William Trotter. Bloomington, Ind: University of Indiana Press, 1991).

Gutman, Herbert. The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom,1750-1925. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.

Hacsi, Timothy. Second Home: Orphan Asylums and the Poor Families in America. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Hale, Grace Elizabeth. Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890-1940. New York: Vintage Books, 1999.

Hall, Stuart. “Signification, Representation, Ideology: Althussier and the Post Structuralist Debates.” Critical Studies in Mass Communication 2 no. 2 (June 1985): 91-114.

Halloran, Peter. Boston’s Wayward Children: Social Services for the Homeless Child, 1830-1930. Rutherford, N.J.: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 1989.

Haney Lopez, Ian. “Social Construction of Race.” In Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge, ed. Richard Delgado. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995.

----------. “White by Law: Then What Is White?” In Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge, ed. Richard Delgado (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995).

----------. White By Law. New York: New York University Press, 1996.

Hart, Hasting H. Child Welfare in the District of Columbia : A Study of Agencies, Institutions for the Care of Dependent and Delinquent Children New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1924.

Hawes, Joseph. The Children’s Rights Movement: A History of Advocacy and Protection. Boston: Twayne Press, 1991.

----------. Children in an Urban Society: Juvenile Delinquency in the Nineteenth Century. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991.

Heathcott, Joseph. “Black Archipelago: Politics and Civic Life in the Jim Crow City.” Journal of Social History 38 no.3 (Spring 2005): 705-736.

Held, David. Models of Democracy, 2nd ed. Stanford, Ca: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Hendricks, Wanda. Gender, Race and Politics in the Midwest: Black Club Women in Illinois. Bloomington, Ind: University of Indiana Press, 1998.

Herni, Florette. Black Migration: Movement North New York: Anchor Press, 1975.

Higgenbotham, Evelyn Brooks. Righteous Discontent: The Women's Movement in the Black Baptist Church 1880-1920. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

_____. "Nannie Buroughs, 1879-1961." in Black Women in America. ed. Darlene Hine, Elsa Brown and Rosalyn Turborg-Penn Bloomington, Ind. University of Indiana Press, 1993, 201-205.

Himmelfarb, Gertrude. Poverty and Compassion: The Moral Imagination of the Late Victorians. New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1991.

Hine-Clark Darlene. "We Specialize in the Wholly Possible": The Philanthropic Work of Black Women." In Lady Bountiful Revisited: Women, Philanthropy, and Power, ed. Kathleen McCarthy. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

Hofstadter, Richard. The Age of Reform: From Bryant to FDR. New York: Vintage Books,1955.

Hollinger, David. "How Wide a Circle of "We"? American Intellectuals and the Problem of the Ethnos Since World War II." American Historical Review 98 (April 1993): 317-337.

----------. "Postethnic America." In Majority and Minority: The Dynamics of Race and Ethnicity in American Life, ed. Norman Yetman (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1999).

Hooks, Bell. "White Representations in the Black Imagination." in Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism, ed. Ruth Frakenberg Durham. N.C.: Duke University Press, 1997.

---------- . Bone Black: Memories of Girlhood. New York: An Owl Book – Henry Holt and Company, 1984.

Holt, Thomas. "Marking of Race: Race Making and the Writing of History." American Historical Review (February 1995): 1-20.

Ignatiev, Noel. How the Irish Became White. New York: Routledge, 1995.

In Her Place: A Guide to St. Louis Woman's History. ed. Katherine Corbett. St. Louis, Mo.: Missouri State historical Society Press,1999.

Irons, Peter. Jim Crow's Children: The Broken Promises of the Brown Decision. New York: Penguin Books, 2002.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Jackson, Phillip. "Black Charity in the Progressive Era." Social Service Review 52 no. 3 (1978): 400-417.

Jones, Jacqueline. Labor of Love, Labor of Sorrow: Black Women, Work and Family from Slavery to the Present. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

Jordan, Winthrop. White Over Black: Attitudes Towards the Negro,1550-1812. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1969.

Katz, Michael. The Price of Citizenship : Redefining the American Welfare State. New York: Henry Holt Co., 2001.

----------. The Undeserving Poor: From the War on Poverty to the War on Welfare. New York: Pantheon Books, 1989.

_____. In the Shadow of the Poor House: A Social History of Welfare in America. New York: Basic Books,1986.

Katzman, David. Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1981.

----------. Before the Ghetto: Black Detroit in the Nineteenth Century Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press,1973.

Kelley, Robin. "An Archaeology of Resistance." American Quarterly 44 no. 2 (June 1992): 292-298.

Kelleher,D. "St. Louis 1916 residential Segregation Ordinance." Missouri Historical Society Bulletin 27 (1970)

Kellner, Douglas. Media Culture: Cultural Studies, Identity and Politics Between the Modern and Postmodern. New York: Routlege,1995.

Kolchin, Peter “Whiteness Studies: The New History of Race in America” Journal of American History 89 (June 2002) 54-74.

Koven, Seth and Sonya Michel, eds. Mothers of a New World: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of the Welfare State. New York: Routledge Press, 1993.

Kunzel, Regina. Fallen Women, Problem Girls: Unmarried Mothers and the Professionalization of Social Work. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Kusmer, Kenneth. A Ghetto Takes Shape: Black Cleveland, 1870-1930. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1978.

Lears T. J. Jackson. No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

---------- . “The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities.” American History Review 90 (1985): 567-593.

Lebove, Roy. Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career 1890-1930. New York: Anthenum, 1980.

Levine, Lawrence. Black Culture and Black Consciousness: Afro-American Folk Thought From Slavery to Freedom. New York: Oxford University Paperback, 1978.

Lewis, Earl. “Expectations, Economic Opportunities, and Life in the Industrial Age: Black Migration to Norfolk, Virginia, 1910-1945.” In The Great Migration in Historical Perspective: New Dimensions of Race, Class and Gender, ed. Joe William Trotter. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1991.

---------- .In Their Own Interests: Race, Class and Power in the Twentieth Century Norfolk, Virginia. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press, 1991.

Lieberman, Robert. “Race and the Limits if Solidarity: American Welfare State Development in Comparative Perspective.” In Race and the Politics of Welfare Reform, ed. Sanford Schram, Joe Soss, and Richard Fording. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001.

Lindenmeyer, Kristie. A Right to Childhood: The U.S. Children’s Bureau and Child Welfare, 1912-46. Urbana, Ill: University of Illinois Press, 1997.

Lipsitz, George. The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997.

_____. Sidewalks of St. Louis: Places, People, and Politics in an American City. Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Press, 1991.

Litwack, Leon. Trouble in Mind: Black Southerners in the Age of Jim Crow. New York: Vintage Books, 1998.

Lunback, Elizabeth. Psychiatric Persuasions: Knowledge, Gender, and Power in Modern America. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Macleod, David. The Age of the Child: Children in America, 1890-1920. New York: Twayne Press, 1998.

----------. Building the Character of the American Boy: The Boy Scouts and the YMCA and Their Forerunners. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983.

McGerr, Michael. A Fierce Discontent: The Rise and Fall of the Progressive Movement in America. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003

McGreevy, John. Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the twentieth Century Urban North. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Massey, Douglas and Nancy Denton. American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Meier, August. Negro Thought in America, 1880-1915: Racial Ideologies in the Age of Booker T. Washington (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1969).

Meyers, Tamara and Joan Sangster. "Retorts, Runaways, and Riots: Patterns of Resistance in Canadian Reform Schools for Girls, 1930-1960." Journal of Social History 34 no. 3 (2001),669-697.

Miller, Andrew. "Social Science, Social Policy and the Heritage of African-American Families." In The Underclass Debate: Views From History, ed. Michael Katz. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Miller, David. "Racial Socialization and Racial Identity: Can They Promote Resiliency for African American Adolescents." Adolescence 34 (Fall 1999): 493-500.

Miller Kelly. Race Adjustments: Essays on the North American Negro. New York: Neale Publishing Co., 1908.

Mintz, Steven. Huck's Raft: A History of American Childhood. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Morrison, Toni. Playing in the Dark: Whiteness in the Literary Imagination. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.

Morton, Marion. "Institutionalizing Inequalities: Black Children and Child Welfare in Cleveland 1859-1998." Journal of Social History 34 no. 1 (2000), 141-162.

Muncy, Robyn. A Dominion of Their Own: Women and Reform Politics from 1890-1930. New York: Basic Books, 1984.

Nagel, Joan. "Constructing Cultural Identity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture." In Majority and Minority: The Dynamics of Race and Ethnicity in American life, 6th ed. ed. Norman Yetman. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1999.

Nasaw, David. Children of the City: At Work and at Play. Garden City, N.J.: Anchor Press,1985.

Neckerman, Kathryn. "The Emergence of 'Underclass' Family Patterns 1900-1940." In The 'Underclass' Debate: Views From History, ed. Michael Katz Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Nightengale, Carl. On the Edge: A History of Poor Black Children and Their Dreams. New York: Basic Books, 1993.

_____. "The Transnational Contexts of Early Twentieth Century American Urban Segregation." Journal of Social History 39 no 3 (Spring 2006)

Noble, Charles. Welfare as We Knew It: A Political History of the American Welfare State. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Nolen, Rose. Hoecakes, Hambone, and All That Jazz: African American Traditions in Missouri. Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Press, 2003.

O'Connor, Alice. Poverty Knowledge: Social Science,Social Policy, and the Poor in the Twentieth Century U.S. History. Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press,2001.

Odem, Mary. Delinquent Daughters: Policing and Protecting Female Sexuality. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.

O"Donnell, Sandra. "Care of Dependent African American Children in Chicago: The Struggle Between Black Self Help and Professionalism." Journal of Social History (Summer 1994):763-776.

Orloff, Ann. "Political Origins of America's Belated Welfare System." In The Politics of Social Policy in the United States, ed. Margaret Weir et al. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 1988.

Osofsky, Gilbert. Harlem: The Making of a Ghetto Negro New York, 1890- 1930, 2nd ed. New York: Harper Tourchbooks, 1971.

Painter-Irvin, Nell. "Hill, Thomas and the Use of Racial Stereotypes." In Rac-ing Justice, En-Gendering Power: Essays on Anita Hill, Clarence Thomas and the Construction of Social Reality, ed. Toni Morrison New York: Pantheon Books, 1992.

_____. Standing at Armageddon: A Grassroots History of the Progressive Era. New York: W.W Norton and Co.,1987.

Parsons, Stowe. Ethnic Studies at Chicago 1905-1945. Chicago: University of Chicago Press,1987.

Pascoe, Pegy. "Law, Court Cases and Ideologies of 'Race' in Twentieth Century America", Journal of American History 83 no.1 (June 1996), 44-69.

Platt, Anthony. The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

_____. E. Franklin Frazier Reconsidered. New Brunswick, N.J. Rutgers University Press, 1991.

Pleck, Elizabeth. "Black Migration to Boston in the Late-Nineteenth Century" (PhD Dissertation, Brandeis University; Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilm 1973).

Polster, Gary. Inside Looking Out: The Cleveland Jewish Orphanage Asylum, 1868-1924. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1990.

Putnam, Robert. Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000.

Quadagno, Jill. The Color of Welfare: How Racism Undermined the War on Poverty. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Reeves, Margaret. Training Schools for Delinquent Girls. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1929.

Roediger, David. Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class. New York: Verso, 1991.

---------- . "In between People: Race, Nationality and the New Immigrant Working Class."Journal of Ethnic American History 16 no. 3 (1997): 3-44.

Rothman, David. Discovering the Asylum: Social Disorder in the New Republic. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1971.

----------. Conscience or Convenience: The Asylum and Its Alternatives in Progressive America (Boston: Little Brown and Co.,1980).

Rothstein, Bo. "Understanding the Universal Welfare State: An Institutional Approach." In Democratic Equality: What Went Wrong, ed. Edward Broadbent. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich. "Welfare States and Democratic Citizenship." In Democratic Equality: What Went Wrong. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Ryan, Allen. "Two Concepts of Political and Democracy: James and John Stuart Mill." In Machiavelli and the Nature of Political Thought, ed. Martin Fliesher. New York: Atheneum Books, 1972.

Schlossman, Steven. Love and the American Delinquent. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Schneider, Eric. In the Web of Class Reformers and Delinquents in Boston 1803s-1930s. New York: New York University Press, 1999.

Schoenberg, Sandra and Charles Bailey. "The Symbolic Meaning of an Elite Black Community: The 'Ville' in St. Louis." Missouri Historical Society Bulletin 33(1976): 94-102.

Schram, Sanford. "Looking Back Toward the Future"--Praxis for the Poor: Piven and Cloward and the Future of Social Science in Social Welfare. New York: New York University Press, 2002.

----------. Words of Welfare: The Poverty of Social Science and Social Science Research. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press,1995.

----------. “Putting a Black Face on Welfare.” In Race and the Politics of Welfare Reform, ed. Sanford Schram, Joe Soss, and Richard Fording. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 2001.

Schweninger,Loren. “Within the Lowest Caste: The Financial Activities of James P. Thomas in the Nineteenth Century South.” Journal of Negro History 63 no.4 (Oct.1978): 353-364.

Scott, Daryl M. Contempt and Pity: Social Policy and the Image of the Damaged Black Psyche 1880-1996. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Sengupta, Gunja. “Elites, Subalterns, and American identities: A case Study of African American Benevolence.” American Historical Review, 104 no. 4 (2002): 1104-1139.

Simmons, Cynthia. “Modern Marriage for African Americans, 1920-1940.” Canadian Review of American Studies 30 no. 3 (2000) 273-299.

Shaw, Stephanie. What a Woman Ought to Do and Be: Black Professional Workers in the Jim Crow Era. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Skocpol, Theda. Missing Middle: Working families and the Future of Social Policy. New York: W.W. Norton, 2000.

Slessarev, Helene. “Racial Tension and Institutional Support: Social Programs During a Period of Retrenchment.” In The Politics of Social Policy in the United States, ed. Margaret Weir et al. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 1988.

Smedley, Audrey. Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a World View, 2nd ed. Boulder, Co.: Westview Press, 1999.

Smith, Barbara. “Introduction.” In Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology ed. Barbara Smith. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2000.

Spear, Allan. Black Chicago: The Making of a Negro Ghetto. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Spencer, Margaret and Carol Markstrom-Adams. “Identity Process Among Racial and Ethnic Minority Children.” Child Development 61: (April 1990) 290-310.

Stack, Carol. All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1974.

Stehno, Sandra. “Public Responsibility for Dependent Black Children: The Advocacy of Edith Abbott and Sophonisha Breckenridge.” Social Service Review 62 (September 1988): 485-503.

Sullivan, William M. Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America. New York: Harper Business, 1995.

Sutton, John R. Stubborn Children: Controlling Delinquency in the United States, 1640-1981 (Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press, 1988).

Tanenhaus, David “Growing Up Dependent :Family Preservation in the Early Twentieth Century Chicago.” Law and History Review 19 no.3 (Fall 2001), 547-582.

_____. Juvenile Justice in the Making. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Tatum, Beverly. Why Are All the Blacks Sitting Together in the Cafeteria and Other Conversations About Race. New York: Basic Books, 1997.

Tice, Karen. “Mending Rosa’s Working Ways: A Case Study of an African American Mother and Breadwinner.” In Bad Mothers: The Politics of Blame in Twentieth Century America, ed. Molly Ladd Taylor and Lauri Urmanski. New York: New York University Press, 1995.

Tiffen, Susan. In Whose Best Interest: Child Welfare Reform in the Progressive Era. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1984.

Walter Trattner. From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America, 6th ed. New York: Free Press, 1994.

Trost, Jennifer. Gateway to Justice: The Juvenile Court and Progressive Child Welfare. Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia press, 2005.

Trotter, Joe William. “Race, Class and Industrial Change: Black Migration to Southern West Virginia.” In The Great Migration in Historical Perspective: New Dimensions of Race, Class and Gender, ed. Joe William Trotter. Bloomington, Ind.: University of Indiana Press, 1991.

----------. “Blacks in the Urban North: The Underclass Question in Historical Perspective.” In The Underclass Debate: Views from History, ed. Michael Katz. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Tuttle, William. Race Riot: Chicago in the Red Summer in 1919. New York: Antheneum, 1970.

Tyack, David and Elizabeth Hansot. Managers of Virtue:Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1890 New York: Basic Books,1982.

Wald, Priscilla. Constituting Americans: Cultural Anxiety and the Narrative Form. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1995.

Walkowitz, Daniel. "The Making of a Feminine Professional Identity: Social Workers in the 1920s." American Historical Review 95 no. 4 (October 1990): 1051-1078.

Walsh, Joel. "Shining Stars: Negro Leagues in St. Louis." Gateway 3 (Winter 2004-2005): 10-21.

Watts, Eugene. "Black and Blue: Afro-American Police Officers in Twentieth Century St. Louis." Journal of Urban History 7 no.2 (1981) 131-168.
_____. "Police response to Crime and Disorder in twentieth Century St. Louis." Journal of American History 70 no.2 (Sept 1983), 340-358.

Welek, Mary. "Jordan Chambers: Black Politician and Boss." Journal of Negro History 57 no.4 (Oct.1972):352-369.

Wellman, David. Portraits of White Racism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Weibe, Robert. The Search for Order 1877-1920. New York: Hill and Wang,1967.

_____. Self Rule: A Cultural History of American Democracy. New York: Hill and Wang,1995.

White, Deborah Gray. Too Heavy a Load: Black Women in Defense of Themselves, 1890-1994. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1999.

Wilkins-Peebles, Wilma. "Janie Porter Barrett and the Virginia Industrial School for Colored Girls: Community Response to the Needs of African American Children." Child Welfare 74 (Jan./Feb, 1995): 143-161.

Williamson, Joel. The Crucible of Race: Black/White Relations in the American South Since Emancipation. New York: Oxford Press, 1984.

Wilrich, Michael City of Courts: Socializing Justice in Progressive Era Chicago. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Wilson, William Julius. The Declining Significance of Race: Blackness and the Changing of American Institutions (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).

----------. The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Wolf, Eric. "Perilous Ideas: Race, Class and People - The Sidney Mintz Lecture for 1992." Current Anthropology 35 (February,1994): 1-12.

Wolcott, Davis. Cops and Kids: Policing Juvenile Justice 1890-1940. Columbus, Oh.: Ohio State University Press, 2005.

Wolcott, Victoria. Remaking Respectability: African American Women in Interwar Detroit. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

----------. "Bible, Bath and Broom. Nattie Burroughs: National Training School and African American Uplift." Journal of Women's History 9 no. 1 (1997), 88-110.

Yetman, Norman. "Definitions and Perspectives." In Majority and Minority: The Dynamics of Race and Ethnicity in American Life, 6th ed., ed, Norman Yetman. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1999.

Zelizer, Viviana. Pricing the Priceless Child:The Changing Social Value of Children. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Zmora, Nurith. Orphanages Reconsidered: Child Care Institutions in Progressive Era Baltimore. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994.