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ABSTRACT

A PROGRESSIVE CITY IN THE PROGRESSIVE ERA:
CHILD WELFARE REFORM IN LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

Mary K. Marlatt

April 10, 2019

Louisville, Kentucky has a unique character, never more apparent than during the period between 1890 and 1920, as the city attempted to balance traditional southern cultural ideals with northern progress. During this period, social reformers attempted to alleviate social ills exacerbated by the industrial revolution and urban crowding by advocating for social reform. This study concentrates on specific social reforms—settlement houses and missions, free kindergartens, child labor, juvenile justice, and pure milk depots—benefitting children in Louisville, and explores how those endeavors differed from those of their counterparts in the north and south. Child welfare reformers in Louisville were mainly motivated by faith and long tradition as they negotiated the conflicting ideologies of race, religion and politics confronting them. As a southern city, Louisville surpassed its deep south cousins in Progressive Era reform, and other cities across the country benefitted from the expertise of Louisville reformers and their efforts.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This thesis examines specific social reforms benefitting children in the border city of Louisville, Kentucky, and I argue that those endeavors differed from those of their counterparts in both the north and south. Louisville activists took inspiration from the northern model of child welfare reform efforts and shaped them to fit the city’s more southern Bible-belt values. During the Progressive Era, Louisville reformers established settlement houses and missions, free kindergartens, anti-child labor movements, juvenile justice reforms, and pure milk depots based on links with their faith and the institutions, clubs, and organizations to which they belonged. I maintain that these activists were motivated by these relationships and a long Louisville tradition of aid to children, while carefully negotiating the conflicting ideologies of race, religion, and politics confronting them as border city residents. Louisvillians tried to adhere to the traditional southern culture of honor and agrarian ideals while aspiring to the pragmatism, commercialism, and industrial progress of the north. In terms of race, the Progressive Era was a period of volatility and uncertainty.¹ Racism in Louisville during this period was a paternalistic, “polite” racism, in which whites aided blacks in maintaining separate institutions such as schools, hospitals, and community centers in order to obligate the African American

community to be thankful for their help, while also barring them from separate white institutions.2

Long before the city of St. Louis claimed the title, the original gateway to the west was Louisville. George Rogers Clark established a settlement on Corn Island in 1778, near Louisville, as part of the frontier West. When Kentucky gained statehood in 1792, it reached much farther west than any other state in the Union. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark launched their Corps of Discovery expedition to the Pacific Ocean from the Falls of the Ohio in 1804.3 However, Louisville has also been called the “Gateway to the South,” reflecting the complex identity of the region.4 Prior to the Civil War, Kentucky held strong ties to the south. Originally part of Virginia, many people in Kentucky prized their Old Dominion connections, as did those with family from North Carolina and Tennessee. Kentucky’s history as a slave state created an important bond to the south, as did Kentucky’s profits from the slave trade, and some citizens resented “abolitionists who attacked slavery, slaveholders and any state that allowed slavery.”5 The Mississippi River also provided an unalterable commercial tie to the south long before statehood.6 However, Union ties could also be strong. Many Kentucky families came from Pennsylvania and other northern states, and Kentuckians had already fought for the nation in several wars. The advent of the railroad somewhat lessened the

3 “Louisville, October 15,” Kentucky Gazette, October 15, 1804.
4 First newspaper mention of Louisville as “gateway to the south,” Courier-Journal, Tuesday, April 04, 1882, 4.
6 Ibid.
importance of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers as trade routes, and strengthened ties with northern industry. Also, a percentage of Kentucky citizens did not endorse slavery and opposed secession. Kentucky’s enslaved people surpassed nineteen percent of the state’s population just before the Civil War; in Louisville slaves were slightly over seven percent of the population, so ties to slavery in Louisville would have been less binding than in more rural parts of the state. As a slave state, however, I assert that it is reasonable to consider Kentucky a southern state even before the Civil War, though many claim that Kentucky did not consider itself ‘southern’ until after Lost Cause mythology became popular near the end of the 19th century.

Considered the most socially progressive southern city, Louisville also held its own among its northern cities in the last decades of the nineteenth century and early decades of the twentieth century. Louisville has a unique character, rarely more apparent than during the time known as the Progressive Era, considered to be the years between 1890 and 1920. During this period, social reformers attempted to alleviate social ills and provide economic, political and social justice for all. In Louisville this impetus for reform manifested itself in several ways, but most notably in the field of child welfare.

Activists in the progressive movement worked to improve social and political aspects of American society, advocating for the prohibition of alcohol, women’s suffrage,

7 Ibid, 181-182.
the elimination of corruption in government, and improving public health. Sometimes religious faith motivated progressives to try to bring justice and a sense of optimism to poor and immigrant people. Almost all social reform in Louisville maintained religion at the core. A number of Louisville’s faith-driven reformers came from the Presbyterian Church and Seminary, and an equal number were members of the local Jewish community; some of those people will be introduced here.

Many Progressive Era reformers focused their efforts on the welfare of children. The growth of the urban middle class in the mid- to late-nineteenth century – the background from which most reformers emerged – led to new attitudes that emphasized the comfort, safety, and security of children. Within the newly public sphere of upper- and middle-class women, the disadvantaged children of the working poor and immigrants were a ‘natural’ focus for the ranks of women reformers. These women argued that education and recreation should be the focus of childhood, not demoralizing and exhausting labor. Their activism eventually led to state and federal laws restricting child labor, new and expanded compulsory school regulations, juvenile courts and reformatories that kept children out of adult jails, and the rise of social work as a profession, particularly for women.

Many factors impelled progressives to take up the cause of child welfare. Contemporary scientific studies regarding the physical and psychological growth and development of children, showing the toll of work, malnutrition, and illness on children affected the outlook of Progressive Era reformers.\footnote{W. H. Oates, “Child Labor and Health,” \textit{Child Labor Bulletin} 2 (May 1913): 117. (One example.)} Illiteracy and education had become
issues due to the increasing necessity for reading and writing in a rapidly developing industrial society. Concern also grew about the health and safety of children in crowded cities.\textsuperscript{12} Other issues set apart and complicated the status of children during this period: the decline of birthrates in the United States made children less expendable; the separation of place of work from place of home; a budding consumer economy versus an agrarian economy; the assimilation of middle class ideals; and widespread compulsory school attendance.\textsuperscript{13}

Many children of poverty lived in conditions inconceivable to middle-class Americans. Poor and immigrant families, crowded into slums, trying to survive, were unable to provide the ideal childhood preferred by reformers, a situation exacerbated by the changing status of children. Child welfare has long been a racialized practice, with middle-class whiteness being the ideal, and Louisville activists were no different.\textsuperscript{14} Although Progressive Era reformers generally perceived their reforms as humanitarian, a selfish fear that the middle-class social order would be weakened and chaos would erupt lay just behind many of their endeavors, especially those reforms focusing on immigrant and African American communities.

Scholarship has yet to robustly engage Louisville’s place as the most socially progressive southern city during the Progressive Era. In this thesis I argue that Louisville tried to balance traditional southern culture with northern progress in their vision for reform. To illustrate this complex blend, I focus on specific child welfare reform efforts

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, 6.
in Louisville benefiting low-income and immigrant children of the city, including the elimination or reduction of child labor, compulsory education laws, pure milk programs, kindergartens, playgrounds, and juvenile courts. In these case studies, I mainly focus on the role of women reformers who approached social issues differently than men. Directing their efforts to issue connected to the well-being of women, children, the home, and the community, women created a significant public role for themselves, leading to appointments to committees and task forces, and eventually, government office. Many scholars rightfully interpret the efforts of women activists as maternalistic, and women have been long been seen as “mothers or potential mothers.” For many, however, “feminism, socialism and social justice” shaped that maternalism into something more. Women were more directly contesting the power of patriarchy than ever before, and beginning to become agents of change in their own right – by 1910, more than three-fifths of settlement house workers were women, and between 1890 and 1920, the “numbers of professional women increased 226 percent.”

As in other movements across the country, Louisville’s foray into progressive reform did not suddenly appear overnight. Supporters of child welfare launched, failed,

---


16 Elisabeth Israels Perry, “Men are from the Gilded Age, Women are from the Progressive Era,” Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era 1, no. 1 (January 2002): 34.

17 Ibid.

and succeeded with many different initiatives well before and after the Progressive Era. The House of Refuge for juveniles, one of the earliest reforms proposed in Louisville, took eighteen years to become a reality. Another early reform endeavor emerged in 1881 when Louisville adopted a version of a New York humanitarian effort begun in the 1870s, introducing fresh-air excursions specifically to benefit the sick and poor.

Middle-class Louisvillians expressed concerns for the plight of the impoverished, delinquent, and vagrant children of their city long before the turn of the twentieth century, as did reform-minded individuals in other cities. New York, Boston, and Philadelphia had juvenile houses of refuge before 1830. In November, 1847, a notice appeared from the committee appointed to care for the poor of Louisville. After several meetings, the sixteen committee members produced their report, “which after examining the causes and character of pauperism,” concluded that the city needed an “an alms-house and a house of refuge for exposed children.” Regrettably, this Board felt no expediency to build a such a house of refuge, even though over twenty-five such institutions existed in the United States by 1847.

In January, 1856 the Board of Alderman reported:

The necessity of Houses of Refuge in all large cities, and the beneficial effects resulting from them, can no longer be mooted… Wherever they have been established, their influences for good have been the most gratifying and cheering… Public attention has been directed to this subject and much has already been done, but not enough to afford that full and complete remedy which we all so much desire… At the last session of the Legislature of Kentucky an act was passed authorizing the establishment of a House of Refuge.

20 “To The Citizens of Louisville,” Louisville Daily Courier, November 1, 1847, 2.
21 Ibid.
22 Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, “Juvenile Justice History.”
The Board recommended that a tract of land outside the city be purchased to accommodate the existing alms house and the forthcoming House of Refuge.\(^\text{24}\) Nine years had passed since the citizens were urged to build a house of refuge, yet nothing had been done. It would be three more years before the House of Refuge Board of Managers would meet for the first time.\(^\text{25}\) The Board requested donations from citizens to fund the House of Refuge, and advertisements ran for many weeks asking to buy property.\(^\text{26}\) In March, 1860 the City Council passed an ordinance to donate the sixty-seven-acre Oakland Cemetery property to the House of Refuge.\(^\text{27}\) All through 1860 and 1861, proposals for bids ran in the local press for brick makers, tinners, masons, and all manner of construction tradesmen to erect the House of Refuge. Upon completion, however, the federal government took possession of the building to use as a hospital during the Civil War. The House of Refuge admitted the first juveniles in August 1865, after the cessation of the war.\(^\text{28}\) It had taken the citizens of Louisville eighteen years to fulfill the need for the house of refuge identified in 1847. Still, no other southern city had such an institution in 1865.\(^\text{29}\)

Although the House of Refuge had successfully opened, the city could not accommodate female juveniles needing care. The first annual report for the House of

\(^{24}\) Ibid.
\(^{27}\) “City Council,” *Louisville Daily Courier*, March 17, 1860, 1.
Refuge, published in 1867, lamented that only boys were admitted and, “arrangements have not yet been perfected” to admit girls. The Board of Directors also stated their belief that it had not been intended as a workhouse or a penal institution, but as a refuge in the strictest sense of the word. However, this approach did not last, for within a few years it had become a de-facto juvenile detention center. In 1873, the House of Refuge opened accommodations for delinquent and neglected girls.

After opening, the House of Refuge endured throughout the twentieth century in Louisville. It remained in operation until 1912, when it moved and became the Parental Home and School. In 1919 the Parental Home and School merged with the Industrial School of Reform, becoming the Jefferson County Children’s Home. The Children’s Home merged with other juvenile welfare services in 1967. This merger became known as Metropolitan Social Services Department, an umbrella organization covering all manner of neglected, dependent, and delinquent children. The Metropolitan Social Services Department disbanded in the 1990s. Thus, the story of social services for children in Louisville began, remarkably before the Civil War, with the House of Refuge.

---

30 House of Refuge, First Annual Report of the Board of Directors to the General Assembly of the State of Kentucky and the General Council of the City of Louisville for the year ending Dec. 31, 1866, (Louisville: Courier Steam Book and Job Printing Establishment, 1867), 7.
31 Ibid.
33 “No Place Selected for Parental Home and School,” Courier-Journal, August 28, 1912, 8.
34 “New Site for Louisville U to be Considered,” Courier-Journal, July 12, 1919, 5.
36 Ibid.
37 Newspaper searches show the department active in 1996, but in 2003 referred to as the old MSSD.
Almost ten years before the publication of Jacob Riis’ groundbreaking *How the Other Half Lives*, Louisville citizens knew that tenement living did not promote good health, particularly during the hot and humid summer months, stirring concerns about their less-fortunate neighbors. Tenements were overcrowded and some occupants lived in rooms with no windows or other ventilation.38 The first Fresh Air Excursions for poor and sickly children of Louisville took place in the summer of 1881. According to the *Courier-Journal* report of one of the first trips, there were “900 persons aboard, about 600 of whom were small children. Of the children at least 200 were babes in arms, and several of them were extremely ill.” The children’s excursions on the steamboat Eckert lasted three-and-a-half hours, going upriver eighteen miles.39 These afternoon boat rides gave participants a breath of fresh air not available in the tenements, and physicians distributed tickets to their most needy patients.40 The children enjoyed donated snacks and ice water, and doctors on board examined sick children.41 The Flower Mission and the YMCA provided chaperones and assistants.42 In 1900 reformers expanded this project into the Fresh Air Home, available to tenement mothers and their children for a week in the country, free of charge, with healthy food, fresh milk, and plenty of sunshine and opportunities for exercise.43 Frances Ingram, Head Resident of Neighborhood House,

39 There were also excursions for the elderly.
41 Ibid.
42 “Young Folk and Old Folk,” *Courier-Journal*, July 21, 1881, 5.
43 “Want to Increase Usefulness of the Fresh Air Home,” *Courier-Journal*, February 23, 1901, 7.
supervised the Fresh Air Home.\textsuperscript{44} It remained in operation until the early 1960s, when suburban sprawl led to a decreasing inner-city population.

The strong influence of southern hospitality and Yankee industriousness made, and continues to make, Kentucky a complex place. Progressive Era child welfare activists found themselves balancing this blend of values in their work. In this thesis, I argue that Louisville’s child welfare reform efforts from 1890 to 1920 had both southern and northern qualities. Louisville activists were inspired by several of the child welfare reform efforts in northern cities, but unlike many of those cities, Louisvillians did not attempt to reshape city government in order to achieve their goals.\textsuperscript{45} Like their northern counterparts, Louisville reformers believed that conditions should be improved for African American children. But, as in the south, they contended that segregation maintained peace between the races.\textsuperscript{46}

I highlight those at the forefront of child welfare reform efforts and try to determine what motivated their efforts. Race in a border city complicated matters for Progressive Era reformers who were ostensibly benevolent yet still, possibly unintentionally, supporting white supremacy. Those at the forefront of child welfare reforms in Louisville were motivated by the common threads of faith and Louisville’s long tradition of helping others in need, particularly children. Louisville reformers’ affiliations with clubs, religious organizations, and charitable interests provided an informal network of support, strengthening each of their endeavors by association. I also

\textsuperscript{44} Frances Ingram Papers, Filson Historical Society, Louisville, KY.
\textsuperscript{46} Wright, 268.
trace the influence of Louisville’s social reform efforts on other cities, arguing that local reformers impacted national reform professions. Many Louisville reformers served on influential national child welfare committees and task forces, while others left Louisville to initiate or facilitate efforts in other parts of the United States.
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Louisville’s unique status as a border city between north and south leaves it a difficult place to analyze, particularly with regard to political or social movements. Perhaps this explains why accounts of Louisville’s reform networks during the Progressive Era are few and far between. Some scholarly works have focused on this period of Kentucky’s history – many are biographical, while others focus on politics or race relations – and although useful to my efforts, they do not cover child welfare reform other than peripherally. I emphasize the people behind the reform efforts, their motivations, the charities they supported – while connecting them to the Progressive Era history of Louisville.

There are some scholarly works concentrating on the Progressive Era in the south, but fewer on Kentucky specifically. James Klotter’s *Kentucky: Portrait in Paradox, 1900-1950* is a broad overview of the first half of the twentieth century in Kentucky and is one of the few Kentucky histories embracing the Progressive Era that debates the question of Louisville’s northern or southern ideology. Klotter discusses the southern ideals and northern commercial interests that met in Louisville to create the unusual north/south blend of ideas and attitudes. He contests the notion of Kentucky as always behind the rest of the country, noting that when compared only to the south, Kentucky rose to the top during the early twentieth century.47 William Link’s *The Paradox of Southern Progressivism, 1880-1930* argues “southern progressivism should be

---

understood as a clash between radically divergent views of the social contract." His view is that “southern traditionalists … understood ‘community’ in local terms,” and that this view caused southerners to “view social problems passively and often indifferently.” In contrast, I argue that what he sees as indifference is in fact the staunch individualism of the southern rural poor, with relief offered on a short term, one-to-one basis, rather than by broad-based civic reform. Link notes that northern reformers viewed ‘community’ unlike southerners, because they came from a white, urban, middle-class environment. These northern reformers saw the “familiar social conditions” taken for granted by traditional southerners as “appalling.” With this view, he completely ignores that white, urban, middle-class people lived in the south, and it is those people I examine.

James Marten’s *Childhood and Child Welfare in the Progressive Era* separates northern and southern progressives, but neither of his definitions quite aligns with Louisville’s reformers. He unequivocally states, “Northern political reformers aimed to ‘clean up’ politics by eliminating city bosses, southern Progressives sought to ‘clean up’ the violence and corruption in their states by disfranchising the African Americans against whom most of that violence and corruption was directed.” Louisville’s child welfare activists focused less on individual politicians than their counterparts in the north, and some Louisville reformers actually worked against the disenfranchisement of African Americans, particularly African American women.

---

49 Ibid.
50 Ibid, xii.
51 Ibid, xi-xii.
52 Marten, 3.
53 Most notably, Eleanor Tarrant Little and Patty Blackburn Semple.
Middle-class white women led the child welfare reform movement, whether in the north or south, and the existing scholarship downplays this. In his first chapter, Klotter compares the poor and elite in Louisville and across the state, but gives no mention to the middle-class citizens who comprised most of the social welfare reformers of early twentieth-century Louisville. His portrayal of the ‘elite’ of Louisville is one of people who smoked, drank, and gambled while living in lavish mansions on St. James Court and Fourth Street.\(^{54}\) He notes that, “a shadow world of saloons, prostitutes, and tenement houses… existed outside the realm of polite society’s conversations.”\(^{55}\) Louisville women born and raised in the highest echelons of Louisville society, and those of the urban middle-class, became deeply interested and involved in efforts on behalf of those living in Klotter’s ‘shadow world’ of tenement houses. No mention is made by Klotter of the wealthy individuals who did not fit into his narrow view of the St. James elite, and he ignores the middle-class. Link puts women in a box labeled ‘morality’ and underplays their importance in reform work. In *The Paradox of Southern Progressivism, 1880-1930*, other than women’s suffrage, women are mentioned mainly in the context of temperance and sexual moral reform, with a few references to their work in rural missions, maternal health, and some areas of school reform. Understanding the overlooked efforts of these women, and others like them, contributes significantly to our understanding of early twentieth-century reform efforts in Louisville and the United States.

The ideologies of child welfare reform can be interpreted as political, but not tied to politics and politicians, even though reform efforts by those working in the field often


\(^{55}\) Ibid, 8.
led to legislation. Like Klotter, Link emphasizes the politics – and male politicians – of the period. Link briefly mentions case studies of progressive reform from Southern states, but, like Klotter, little mention is made of the grassroots efforts, philanthropic organizations, or individuals who fought for reform issues. I maintain that grassroots efforts are the reason many goals were achieved. If left to male politicians of the early twentieth century, we might still have eight-year olds working in factories, no compulsory school, and few public health laws. Link only mentions children as a side note to reform efforts such as prohibition, suffrage, and school reform. Even when discussing school reform, the students and the difficulties they faced are not emphasized, instead the politicians who held school board and superintendent positions are highlighted.

Settlements and missions played an integral part in Progressive Era reform. They provided a tangible place for reform efforts to coalesce and spread throughout the community. Settlement workers served on committees, task forces, and other groups providing vital insight into the communities they served. The only Kentucky settlement either Klotter or Link mentions is Hindman Settlement in Knott County. The exclusion of Louisville’s settlements and missions reinforces Klotter’s view of upper and middle-class Louisvillians’ lack of awareness to the plight of the urban poor and immigrants. Link does not discuss urban settlements or missions in the south, even though Louisville, New Orleans, and Baltimore could boast of successful, well-established settlements before 1900. He touches on a few rural settlements, most notably Hindman, but never mentions the Calhoun Colored School and Settlement in Calhoun, Alabama, the Elizabeth Russell Settlement in Tuskegee, Alabama, or the Log Cabin Settlement near Asheville, North
Carolina, all of which pre-dated Hindman by several years.\footnote{Ralph E. Luker, \textit{The Social Gospel in Black and White: American Racial Reform, 1885-1912}, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 166; Arlette Ingram Willis, “Literacy at Calhoun Colored School,” \textit{Reading Research Quarterly} 37, no. 1 (Jan.-Feb.-Mar., 2002): 8; Frances Ingram, “The Settlement Movement in the South,” \textit{World Outlook} 27, no. 5 (May, 1937): 13-14.} This focus only perpetuates the stereotype of the illiterate, backwoods Southern hillbilly, and not only ignores city life in the south, but ignores reform efforts benefitting African Americans and immigrants – many of which could be compared to those in northern cities.

The one book that focuses directly on Louisville and its reform efforts does not concern the Progressive Era, but the Civil Rights Era. However, it does give insight into the unique middle ground of the border city. \textit{Civil Rights in the Gateway to the South: Louisville, Kentucky, 1945-1980} by Tracy E. K'Meyer explores the “mixed economy, population, and regional identity” of Louisville from a civil rights and race relations perspective.\footnote{Tracy E. K'Meyer, \textit{Civil Rights in the Gateway to the South: Louisville, Kentucky, 1945-1980}, (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2010), 3.} This book informs my approach, as it offers a new way to consider the north/south dichotomy that has existed in Louisville since before the Civil War and persists today.

The characteristics of child welfare reform differed across the United States. As a broad overview, James Marten’s \textit{Childhood and Child Welfare in the Progressive Era} is helpful in defining the many child welfare efforts initiated across the country. By focusing on Louisville, I expand on many of the points he covers, where I give name and substance to his sometimes vague portrait of the generic ‘progressive.’ He claims that, “many acted out of compassion for the less fortunate, while others feared that without a coherent approach to poverty, crime, political corruption and urban hygiene, society was
in danger of falling apart,” but makes no space for those who were both compassionate and conscious of social order. Reformers in the midst of their work did not stop to analyze motives and rationales for their actions. In hindsight can we try to ascribe motivation based on what we know, but without diaries, letters, or other personal documents that explicitly explain, we can only speculate.

Many of the women presented here, like Frances Ingram, remained unmarried and childless, choosing instead to use their talents to uplift the lives of those less fortunate. Others, like Eleanor Tarrant Little, married and had children, but continued to work alongside their like-minded husbands. Others became involved in paid or charity work after the death of a husband, or after their children were grown. It is difficult to ascribe twenty-first century ulterior motives to women who spent years of their lives, and sometimes large amounts of money, deeply involved in causes that took them to the poorest and dirtiest parts of town to work with illiterate, unwashed, and unchurched people. These women were products of their time, maternalistic and at times condescendingly racist in many of their views. However, their work expanded opportunities for middle-class Louisville women outside the home, and created a foundation for further child welfare reform in the twentieth century. To view these women reformer’s work only in terms of class or race further overlooks the extent to which many women rejected the male idea of urban politics. “Middle class women were reaching beyond the betterment of own class to shape a new social compact for the society as a whole.”

58 Marten, 3.
59 Flanagan, 118.
60 Ibid.
There are obvious gaps in the scholarship of Progressive Era Louisville. Melanie Goan points out in her 2015 article, “The End of Kentucky’s Winning Season?” that there are some “important questions … and lines of inquiry… as scholars seek to better understand the twentieth century development of Kentucky.”\textsuperscript{61} She notes “reform efforts in Louisville … have received little attention. Frances Ingram’s work at Louisville’s nationally known Neighborhood House … remains unstudied,” as does the work of “nationally known kindergarten reformer, Patty Smith Hill.”\textsuperscript{62} Both women, and other reformers in Louisville, contributed significantly to the history of Louisville as a border city during the Progressive Era. Rebecca Baer Krupp’s 1939 master’s thesis, “Neighborhood House: A Settlement’s Part in Social Planning,” comes closest to discussing the work I have presented here, but she narrowed her focus to Neighborhood House and Frances Ingram, at that time recently-retired and available for interview. Krupp’s interests lay in the advances in and efficacy of social planning, instead of social reform.\textsuperscript{63}

Louisville’s place in Progressive Era reform, particularly focusing on child welfare, has not been appropriately demonstrated in the existing scholarship. Klotter and others point to Kentucky’s lack of funding for education, the reliance on agriculture and the slow growth of industry, which doomed Kentucky to fall far behind its neighbors as the twentieth century progressed. Social reform, particularly in Louisville, is overlooked


\textsuperscript{62} Ibid, 206.

as a force that pushed the city, and state, to some prominence during the Progressive Era. Here, I will attempt to remediate this deficiency, tracing Louisville’s activists and their child welfare reform efforts through the various endeavors they initiated and the motivations behind them.
CHAPTER 2
LOUISVILLE REFORMERS: WHO AND WHY?

Progressive Era efforts in Louisville encompassed a wide array of efforts and approaches, many of them involving child welfare and education. Central to these were the rise of settlement houses and missions and some of the movements that grew out of these efforts, specifically: kindergartens, playgrounds, the Babies Milk Fund, child labor laws, and the juvenile courts. What tied these endeavors together were the people involved, namely the philanthropists, volunteers, social workers, and club women. These activists participated in a wide variety of causes and philanthropic endeavors. As individuals interested in their fellow humans and the uplift of the community, most volunteered, donated to and/or served on multiple boards and committees, ranging from the Louisville Orchestra to the Equal Rights Association to the Recreation League. Additionally, the networks cultivated by these individuals informed the shape of this movement in Louisville.

In the mid-nineteenth century, white middle-class women in Kentucky, like their contemporaries across the United States, enthusiastically established clubs in their cities and towns. Many such women used their experience in church organizations to provide them with the leadership and administrative skills they used in their clubs.64 Higher education had become more accessible to women, and fostered a thirst for continuing...

educational pursuits and another, stealthier, result of education – personal freedom.

Industrialization, and its consequences on the American home – smaller families, better health, and ready-made clothing – reduced the burden of household tasks on women, particularly middle-class urban women, contributing to their newfound quest for freedom from the home.⁶⁵ Literary clubs, card clubs, and cultural enrichment clubs flourished in Louisville, providing a respectable excuse for women to leave their homes and socialize with other like-minded women.

Clubs other than the strictly social existed as well. The Girls High School Alumnae Club, open to all graduates of the Louisville Girl’s High School, met regularly.⁶⁶ Many of the women active in the reform movement had graduated from the Girls High School – some had become teachers or social workers, and others volunteered. The College Club, open to women college graduates or attendees, formed at Neighborhood House to “promote interest in higher education among women in Louisville.”⁶⁷ In 1899, the College Club membership included thirty-nine graduates from schools such as Vassar, Wellesley, Bryn Mawr, the University of Michigan, Cornell, and the University of Pennsylvania – an accomplished group.⁶⁸ Patty Blackburn Semple founded the local Vassar Club for Vassar graduates. This group promoted the college and proctored its entrance exams in Louisville every year.⁶⁹ These clubs were indicative of a

⁶⁸ Ibid.
⁶⁹ Goan, “Patty Blackburn Semple.”
national trend. Fewer than twenty-five percent of college graduates were women in 1890; just ten years later, women accounted for forty percent of graduates.70

Eventually, the club women of Louisville, and Kentucky, would come under the aegis of the National Federation of Women’s Clubs. The Kentucky Federation of Women’s Clubs, founded in 1894, included all variations of clubs across the state, and the sixteen original clubs of the Kentucky Federation grew to thirty-three by 1898.71 In the latter part of the century, the women’s clubs of Kentucky dedicated much of their time and energy to social reform in their communities, and club women played a part in virtually every child welfare reform effort in Louisville.72 The Alumnae Club committees put forth several initiatives benefitting children and participated in other efforts. Every organization mentioned in this thesis relied upon clubwomen’s involvement – many times a women’s club planted the original seed for an institution or charity. The objectives of most women’s organizations remained primarily humanitarian – to serve the needy, weak, and defenseless – rather than to acquire wealth and power for themselves or women in general.73

Every Louisville reform effort had faith at its core, whether secular or church-affiliated, and this quality informed civic life in the city as well. The Social Gospel movement persuaded progressive-minded religious people “to the mission of social uplift” due to “the urban-centered problems of slums, crime, political corruption and

70 Ryan, 201.
72 Ibid.
73 Ryan, 205.
People of “intelligence and property” were challenged to accept their duty as the natural leaders in elevating the disenfranchised masses. This movement had a profound influence on child welfare reformers in Louisville. Although child welfare reformers belonged to a broad spectrum of faiths, in Louisville two faiths and their institutions stand out as leaders in reform efforts. The Presbyterian congregations and the Jewish community of Louisville both contributed significantly to the welfare of children in Louisville throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The Presbyterian Church split during the Civil War, as did the nation, over the issue of slavery. The old-school Calvinist-leaning denomination that would become known as northern Presbyterians had established the Danville Seminary in 1853. The Presbyterian Seminary in Louisville, operated by the southern Presbyterians, opened in 1893 during the midpoint of the Social Gospel movement, which had begun around 1870. Followers of Social Gospel tended to be middle-class people who combined a call for social action with an emphasis on the importance of the rights and responsibilities of the individual. “The whole movement had something of a utopian cast,” and tended to believe wholeheartedly in forward progress. Social Gospelers’ beliefs were not in
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“automatic or inevitable progress,” but progress conditional upon man's response to the
guidance of God, and regarded selfishness as a sin. Their confidence in innate human
goodness extended to the belief that people could be educated to choose good. Many
Louisville Presbyterians embodied the spirit of the Social Gospel prior to World War I.

Much as Louisville is a border city, the Presbyterian Seminary became the border
between north and south for Presbyterians. During 1901, the Danville Seminary and the
Louisville Seminary merged, “creating the only Presbyterian seminary jointly sponsored
by both churches. It thus became a bridge between North and South.” The Seminary
held no allegiance to north or south, much like Louisville as a city:

people would note that the Seminary’s location was such that it was
nobody’s place. Of the people who attended, those from the East were
coming West; those from the West, going East; those from the North,
going South; and those from the South, going North. (Some people)
thought that was a helpful pedagogical tool, for it meant students had a
kind of openness to new things by their very choice of the Seminary.

The Presbyterian Seminary had a considerable influence on the city. It welcomed all
comers from both sides of the Presbyterian split. Seminary graduates John Little of
Alabama and Louisville native Archie Hill were instrumental in starting two of the most
prominent settlement houses, and every seminary student interned at a local congregation
to gain practical pastoral experience. The congregants of the numerous Presbyterian
churches in Louisville – twenty-three in 1900 – were notable among the child welfare
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reformers. The Presbyterian Church has deep roots in Louisville, so it should not be surprising that the Presbyterian Church USA moved its headquarters to the city in 1988.\(^86\)

The Jewish community of Louisville also contributed greatly to Neighborhood House and other child welfare reform efforts across the city. Although some anti-Semitism existed in Louisville, by the turn of the century it had lessened. Discriminatory practices in Louisville institutions tended to be less overt in than their northern counterparts. Jews in the south have always been a small minority, and southerners have historically respected them as “people of the Bible.”\(^87\) The southern prejudice against African Americans contributed to a more tolerant atmosphere for the small numbers of Jews compared to the north.\(^88\) The most notable examples of discrimination of Jews in Louisville at the turn of the century were the country clubs and hospitals. Jewish Hospital opened in 1905 “to meet the need of Jewish patients… and to provide a place for Jewish doctors to practice.”\(^89\) Even though Jewish students were admitted to the medical schools in Louisville, Jewish physicians had long been denied staff privileges at most of the local hospitals.\(^90\) While Jewish patients could be admitted to some hospitals, kosher meals were not available, particularly troubling to newer, mostly Orthodox immigrants.\(^91\) “The hospital was launched by men who … hoped and planned for a hospital where indigent


\(^{88}\) Ibid.

\(^{89}\) Herman Landau, \textit{Adath Louisville, the Story of a Jewish Community} (Louisville: Grieb Printing Company, 1981), 113. (fn: “The fact that discrimination existed on hospital staffs naturally lacks documentation.”).
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\(^{91}\) Ibid, 113.
Jews would receive medical care in an environment where there would be a sympathetic understanding of the patient, his habits and customs.”

92 Notably, Jewish Hospital opened their doors to all – “persons of any creed … as free or pay patients.”

Who were Louisville’s Progressive Era social reformers? Mostly educated, merchant-class citizens. Some, such as Lucy Belknap, Zara DuPont, and Louise Speed came from wealthy families who had made their fortunes in previous generations. However, those such as Frances Ingram, Rebecca Judah, Archie Hill, John Little, and Eleanor Tarrant Little were of well-educated but middle-class backgrounds, their fathers earning a living as merchants, educators, and clergymen.

Neighborhood House volunteers and residents became involved in many of the child welfare efforts in Louisville, contributing to the network of reformers. Kindergartens, playgrounds, the Babies Milk Fund, and child labor reform were all connected to Neighborhood House. Eleanor Tarrant held office in the Louisville Consumer’s League and the Louisville Woman’s Club while at Neighborhood House, and served as Ward Chairman in 1912, fighting for women’s right to vote in school board elections.94 After her marriage to John Little, she focused her efforts on the uplift of the African American community, but continued to emphasize the welfare of children. After Frances Ingram moved to Neighborhood House in 1905, she became involved in the child labor movement, juvenile court, and the reform school. Patty Blackburn Semple served on the board of Neighborhood House for many years, and consistently supported its
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work. She facilitated the establishment of the Louisville Drama League, Girl Scouts, Legal Aid Society, and juvenile court. Semple and Eleanor Tarrant Little fought for women to have the right to vote in school elections. Upon gaining that right, they encouraged black women to register and vote by speaking at African American churches, libraries, and the Colored Branch of the YWCA. These examples only demonstrate a small portion of the influence Neighborhood House volunteers and employees had on Louisville reform activities, while the Jewish and Presbyterian communities of Louisville profoundly affected the settlement house.

One of the most well-known and wealthiest of Louisville families in the nineteenth century, the Belknaps were among those whose contributions to social reform efforts have been largely overlooked. The patriarch of the prominent Presbyterian family, Massachusetts native William B. Belknap, came to Louisville in 1840, married the daughter of a local banker, Mary Richardson, and established several businesses, Belknap Hardware the most recognizable. “Caring nothing for public honors, he was earnestly devoted to the welfare” of the city of Louisville. “His charities were constant, but quiet always and avoiding publicity.” He and his daughter Lucy were among those who first volunteered and contributed to the Presbyterian Colored Mission at the turn of the century. Mrs. Belknap, a long-time Woman’s Club member and charter member of the Warren Memorial Presbyterian Church, would upon her death be described as “one of the
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city’s most noted philanthropists.”99 She donated funds for several buildings to house charities in the city, the most noteworthy being Neighborhood House, the Associated Charities building, and the Presbyterian Seminary.100 The Belknaps were generous to African American charitable and educational efforts in addition to the Presbyterian Mission, particularly the Lincoln Institute, an all-black boarding high school in Shelby County founded by the trustees of Berea College after the Day Law passed the Kentucky Legislature in 1904.101 Lucy Belknap bequeathed $10,000 to be spent in the city of Louisville for “the education of Negro girls,” and funds to support the Red Cross Hospital for African Americans.102 Lucy and her mother were both Woman’s Club members of long-standing. The Belknap family contributions to local charity efforts extended into the next generation, with grandsons Walter Belknap and Lafon Allen supporting many of the same charities as their Aunt Lucy, including Allen’s long-time affiliation with the Recreation League. This branch of the Belknap family were quiet but persistent supporters of child welfare efforts in Louisville.

Another prominent Presbyterian social work family in Louisville were the Hills. The father, William W. Hill, a Presbyterian minister and educator, edited the 

*Presbyterian Herald* for over twenty years. Four of his six children shaped child welfare efforts locally and nationally. Archibald A. Hill graduated from the Central University of Kentucky and the Presbyterian Seminary in Louisville.103 After founding Neighborhood

---
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House, he moved to New York City as the first head resident of the West Side Neighborhood House. A charter member of the Playground Association of America, he was active in numerous social work and child-welfare organizations. Patty Smith Hill rose to prominence as a national leader in the kindergarten movement and was an early member of the International Kindergarten Union. Mildred Hill, an accomplished musician and published composer, taught kindergarten and volunteered as a music teacher at Neighborhood House until her death. Mildred gave private piano lessons in Louisville for many years, in addition to her activities with the Woman’s Club and the Humane Society. Mary Hill, a kindergarten teacher, served as principal at the Stuart Robinson Kindergarten, the Tobacco Exchange and later at the Temple Kindergarten, run by a progressive Jewish group. She lived at Neighborhood House for several years, and founded the City Federation of Mothers Clubs, an early version of the Parent Teacher Association (PTA) of Louisville.

John Little of the Presbyterian Mission, and his wife, Eleanor Tarrant Little, were life-long crusaders for social welfare, participating in both settlement work and other reforms, especially those regarding the African American community. Mrs. Little worked enthusiastically for the establishment of the juvenile court, and was instrumental in founding Louisville’s playground movement. After her early sudden death in 1917, friends established the Eleanor Tarrant Little Memorial Foundation to ”provide food for
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underfed, indigent children” in public schools and to educate mothers about nutrition.\textsuperscript{109} In 1921 a children’s ward opened at the Red Cross Hospital named in memory of Mrs. Little.\textsuperscript{110}

Another staunch Presbyterian and a Radcliffe graduate, Louisa J. Speed volunteered during the first summer the Presbyterian Mission opened and continued as John Little’s aide for many years.\textsuperscript{111} Later, she served as secretary for Associated Charities.\textsuperscript{112} Speed helped to establish the African American Red Cross Hospital, and participated in several other efforts to uplift the black community of Louisville.\textsuperscript{113} She also wrote columns for local newspapers and published two books, possibly influencing her readers to assist the causes she supported.\textsuperscript{114}

Louise Marshall, founder and long-time volunteer administrator of the Cabbage Patch Settlement, belonged to the Presbyterian Church, and other members of the church assisted Marshall at the settlement. Corrine Sadd, also a Presbyterian, ran the SADD Mission after the death of her minister husband in 1872. She operated an industrial school, teaching the Bible along with domestic work, and provided food and clothing to the poor.\textsuperscript{115} In 1884 Louisville citizens held a joint benefit concert to raise money for the SADD Mission and the Hebrew Relief Fund, a tacit recognition of the acceptance of the Jewish community in Louisville.\textsuperscript{116}
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Charles Goldsmith, a prominent dry good wholesaler, volunteered with several charities in Louisville. A Trustee on the Board of Neighborhood House for several years, he recommended Frances Ingram for Head Resident in 1905.\(^{117}\) He served on the Board of the Anti-Tuberculosis Society, and was named President of the Jewish Hospital Board of Trustees in 1908.\(^{118}\) Attorney Lewis N. Dembitz, a Polish immigrant and the uncle of Supreme Court Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis, wrote the first history of Jews in Louisville.\(^{119}\) His volunteer work assisting Jewish refugees from Russia may have led to his position on the Board of Neighborhood House, since many of the refugees settled in the area surrounding Neighborhood House.\(^{120}\)

Rebecca Rosenthal Judah, a long-time supporter of Neighborhood House, volunteered her time, served on the Board of Advisors, and later became involved in the School for Citizenship.\(^{121}\) Active in the Consumers League of Kentucky and the Highland Civic Club, she notably led a 1911 fight over the freshness of eggs sold in Kentucky.\(^{122}\) She advocated for tougher child labor laws, and served as treasurer of the Kentucky Equal Rights Association, championing for women’s suffrage and rights.\(^{123}\) For most of her life, Judah was a member, and occasional officer, of the National Council of Jewish Women, both locally and nationally.\(^{124}\)

\(^{117}\) Frances Ingram Papers, Filson Historical Society.
\(^{121}\) Ingram papers.
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Jean Starr Redelsheimer served as principal of the Asda Israel Free Kindergarten at Sixth and Broadway, and led the Women’s Club at Neighborhood House. She left Louisville in 1902 to continue settlement work in New York, where she later served as Head of Women’s Work at the New York Educational Alliance.

A resident at Neighborhood House for several years, Minnie Baldauf left Louisville in 1904 to work in other settlement houses and as a probation officer in Cleveland before returning to Louisville around 1921. She served on several Jewish women’s charitable groups, including the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, often in a leadership role. Her obituary noted that music had been a priority in her life and that “quietly for many years Miss Baldauf supported all musical endeavor in the city.”

These are only a few of the notable child welfare reformers in Louisville from the late nineteenth century through the first decades of the twentieth – and in some cases, these activists continued their work well into mid-century. I have illustrated the diversity of charitable interests embraced by each, and argue that this intersection of interests contributed to the atmosphere of cooperation within the charitable organizations and organizers in Louisville. Each of them used their talents and connections to further the cause of child welfare reform in Louisville. However, white activists in Louisville were similar to their counterparts in northern cities – they supported black institutions partly out of true compassion for others, yet were paternalistic towards blacks and desired racially segregated institutions such as hospitals, playgrounds, and YMCAs to ensure that

---
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the African American community would not insist on access to their own (white) institutions.\textsuperscript{129}

\textsuperscript{129} Wright, 155.
CHAPTER 3
LOUISVILLE’S MISSIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

Child welfare campaigns during the latter decades of the nineteenth century and first part of the twentieth century emerged as a variety of broad-based and specific measures, including legislative action, urban sanitary campaigns, educational programs, kindergartens, and playgrounds – amid countless others. The establishment of neighborhood community centers that functioned as missions or settlement houses, originated in cities across the nation. Both provided services and aid to low-income and immigrant populations, and much of their work focused on efforts to serve and educate children. Nationwide, settlement houses were secular projects, run by middle class progressives. Hull House in Chicago, established in 1889, is unmistakably the most well-known settlement house in the United States, although founded three years after the Neighborhood Guild Settlement in New York City, established in 1886. By 1891, there were six non-religious settlement houses in America. Faith based missions, although much like settlement houses, were most often Protestant and operated by clergy and affiliated with, and funded by, a particular church or denomination.

influenced community and social life in Louisville so deeply that it would be difficult to disentangle its effect from the motivations of reformers. All of the settlement houses and missions relied on religious communities for guidance and support, particularly in their beginnings. I maintain that Louisville’s ‘missions’ and ‘settlement houses’ during this period are virtually indistinguishable, since all were steeped in religion-based morality and taught Bible study and other religious subjects.

The founders of the Holcombe Union Gospel Mission had their roots in true missionary work, as they focused on saving the downtrodden. Steve P. Holcombe, a reformed alcoholic and gambler, founded the non-denominational Holcombe Mission around 1881.133 The Mission’s first Constitution, written in 1886, stated the “object shall be to do general Gospel City Mission work to reach the masses, and to provide for the wants of those who need Christian encouragement and instruction… The management and teaching shall be strictly evangelical and absolutely undenominational.”134 The Constitution authorized a Board of Managers with twenty members to be chosen from different denominations – no more than five from any one church.135 After a few years, this mission, originally intended to preach the gospel to drunkards, gamblers and other dissolute men who populated the waterfront and slums of Louisville, expanded its outreach to poor, urban children.

133 “A Pleasant Surprise,” Courier-Journal, April 25, 1884, 8.
135 Ibid.
The reason why those operating the Holcombe Mission decided to expand its purpose to include children remains unclear. The first activity for children organized by the Mission combined food and fresh air at an 1884 picnic for 200 children at Short-line Park near LaGrange, Kentucky.\(^\text{136}\) The child-centered activities of the Mission rapidly expanded. By 1885 they established a sewing school for girls and a weekly Mother’s Meeting.\(^\text{137}\) In 1887, the first free kindergarten in Louisville opened at the Mission, which quickly led to the establishment of the Louisville Kindergarten Training School.\(^\text{138}\) In 1906 the Mission started a Day Nursery for child care to benefit working mothers, and the next year organized a Mother’s Club where women were taught to sew, to buy economically, serve a well-balanced meal, and render first aid to the injured.\(^\text{139}\) The Mission also operated a free health clinic for children. In 1917 they established a Boarding Home for young girls who were dismissed from orphanages or sent by Juvenile Court.\(^\text{140}\) They arranged jobs for the girls, who then paid a percentage of their wage for board.\(^\text{141}\) This small, non-denominational mission led the way for other settlement houses and missions in Louisville, long before the groundswell of child welfare reform that followed. Had Steve Holcombe called his institution a ‘settlement house’ rather than a mission, it would rival New York’s Neighborhood Guild Settlement as the oldest in the United States.
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A decade after Union Gospel established their mission, social work, settlements, and missions became a popular issue discussed among Louisvillians. In 1895 and 1896, several lectures on settlement work were presented to various groups, and citizens held meetings to debate settlement house options. Over the next decade this led to the founding of several other charitable missions and settlement houses in Louisville. Some are still in existence, most notably Neighborhood House, founded in 1896, Wesley House, founded in 1903, Cabbage Patch Settlement House, founded in 1910, and what is now the Plymouth Community Renewal Center, founded in 1917. Other missions and settlements have come and gone in the community – all determined to enrich the lives of the poor and the newly-arrived immigrant.

In 1896, aspiring social worker Archibald A. “Archie” Hill organized the settlement that eventually became Neighborhood House. Hill became interested in settlement work through volunteering at the YMCA and his studies at the Presbyterian Seminary. Earlier that year, Chicago Commons Settlement House founder Reverend Graham Taylor came to Louisville to speak on settlement houses and social work at the Union Gospel Mission. While in Louisville, he stayed with Archie Hill. This connection is believed to have inspired Hill to found Neighborhood House, with the

---
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financial backing of local philanthropist Lucy Belknap. In October 1896, Neighborhood House clubs and classes began in a vacant saloon building. They first held a story club for small children, and attendance wildly surpassed expectations. By September 1897, Neighborhood House leased a ten-room house at 324 East Jefferson Street and the real work began. One of the first classes, “emergency and bedside nursing” for adults began in late fall 1897, with a small fee charged to enable Neighborhood House to hire a live-in district nurse. For the poor and immigrant families who resided in the community, it would have been prudent to have a nurse on staff. Many of the residents would not have been financially able, or willing, to see a doctor. Many new immigrants found the American healthcare system impersonal and frightening, and visits to the doctor were often seen as a last resort.

In addition to a nurse, social workers also lived at the settlement. Neighborhood House’s first full-time residents were Archibald Hill, his sister Mary Hill, Mary D. Anderson, and Nurse Rose Tweed. Archie Hill did not remain at Neighborhood House for long. In 1899 a wealthy church congregation recruited him to lead the West Side Social Settlement in New York City, and “not enough funds could be secured (in Louisville) to justify him refusing it.”
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Resident, but followed Hill to New York after their marriage in 1901. The Neighborhood House Advisory Board hired Charlotte Kimball, a nurse from Philadelphia to take her place.\textsuperscript{153} By 1902 Neighborhood House had grown exponentially – more classes, more programs, and more people. They needed to expand, and Mary Richardson Belknap, Lucy Belknap’s mother, offered to fund a new location, and in a few weeks she purchased a thirty-room house at 530 South First Street for $6500.\textsuperscript{154} According to the \textit{Courier-Journal}, “the big yard will be used by the gardening classes… tennis courts for the girls and play grounds for the boys. The second floor will have eight large rooms for the use of the various clubs,” with thirteen sleeping rooms on the third floor.\textsuperscript{155} They also offered a laundry room for the women of the neighborhood to do their washing.\textsuperscript{156} The same year, Neighborhood House officially incorporated, with a Board of Managers: Lucy Belknap, Zara DuPont, Patty Blackburn Semple, Rebecca R. Judah, Charles Goldsmith, Lewis W. Dembitz, Henry Klauber, Lafon Allen (nephew of Lucy Belknap), and Percy W. Booth.\textsuperscript{157} Many on this Board remained affiliated with Neighborhood House the rest of their lives. Several of the men practiced law or owned businesses, providing valuable community contacts for the settlement. All of the women on the Board supported charity and reform efforts throughout the city, particularly Patty Blackburn Semple, who became the first woman trustee of the Louisville Free Public Library and an active member of the Free Kindergarten Association.\textsuperscript{158} These connections benefitted Neighborhood House,
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and connections to the settlement benefitted other efforts in the city. By combining their
talents and energies, those who worked or volunteered at Neighborhood House “made
possible the exercise of greater and more effective political power by its members.”

Those employed at Neighborhood House did not confine their work to the
settlement house, instead extending their assistance to other reform efforts, most notably
by serving on local, state, and national social work committees. In 1902, the Board
named Eleanor Tarrant as Head Resident. Before coming to Neighborhood House,
Tarrant, a schoolteacher, held office in the Louisville Consumer’s League, which used
the power of consumers, mainly women, to improve pay and working conditions for
women and to restrict child labor. She continued her work with the Consumers League,
the Louisville Woman’s Club, and other charitable organizations while at Neighborhood
House. These relationships with other reform organizations, and those involved in
them, strengthened her work at the settlement and provided opportunities to expand its
outreach.

In the first nine years there were four Head Residents, but in 1905 Neighborhood
House gained the most influential and long-serving resident in its history. That fall,
Eleanor Tarrant married John Little, director of the Presbyterian Colored Mission, and
left Neighborhood House. Upon her departure, Frances Ingram, a graduate of
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Louisville Girls’ High School, Louisville Normal School, and the University of Louisville, arrived, and would serve as Head Resident until her retirement in 1939.\footnote{163} Additionally, Ingram sat on the boards of the Louisville-Jefferson County Children’s Home and the Louisville Industrial School of Reform. She held charter membership in the American Association of Social Workers, and belonged to numerous other national, state, and local social welfare organizations.\footnote{164} Ingram’s influence on Neighborhood House would be immeasurable.

A deep-seated social reform effort of the Progressive Era became known as the Americanization movement, which propagated culturally biased standards of child raising.\footnote{165} Neighborhood House, like most settlements and missions, encouraged Americanization within their immigrant communities. Pogroms in Russia during the early twentieth century led to mass immigration of Jews to the United States, including Louisville. Those served by Neighborhood House consisted mostly of Russian, Syrian, and Italian immigrants, and Ingram worked to help them to acclimate. After World War I, the push for Americanization became stronger and many felt that it should be required of immigrants to become ‘Americans.’\footnote{166} Beginning in 1921, Neighborhood House began formal citizenship classes to prepare immigrants to become American citizens.\footnote{167} By 1938 Neighborhood House operated the only naturalization school in Kentucky, the discontinuation of other schools most likely due to the severe 1924 restrictions on
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immigration enacted by the federal government, and the resulting decrease in immigrants.\textsuperscript{168}

All the work of Neighborhood House addressed timely and urgent needs, although child welfare became Ingram’s primary concern. She served as a maternalistic figure in her quest for child welfare reform. Maternalists held the view that all women should look after all children, since women were supposed to have an innate expertise when it came to children and a responsibility to apply their domestic and familial values to society at large.\textsuperscript{169} Settlement houses also provided an emotional and economic substitute for traditional family life, linking the female social worker with other talented women of her own educational and political background, increasing her political and social power.\textsuperscript{170}

Public anxiety about the morality of children and young women greatly intensified and spread during this period of rapid urban and industrial growth.\textsuperscript{171} Ingram witnessed some of the worst living, working and recreational environments that Louisville had to offer, and endeavored to protect children and young women from dance halls, pool rooms and other ‘low’ forms of entertainment offered in the city. In order to have some control over certain situations, she served as Chair of the Welfare Committee of the War Recreation Board during World War I. This committee met with dance hall proprietors, presenting them with regulations to “protect the girls of Louisville (and
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provide) enjoyment for the soldiers at Camp Zachary Taylor by operating proper dance halls.”

They suggested several regulations, which included each hall having a chaperone, allowing no girls under sixteen to enter, and not admitting unescorted girls after nine p.m. As a respectable alternative to dance halls, the War Recreation Board held their own chaperoned dances for soldiers at the Hawaiian Gardens at Fourth and Broadway. Common across the United States during World War I, oversight such as this ensured the “physical and moral purity” of a newly drafted military, which became an “object of concern” for the government, together with the sexual propriety of young women in a rapidly changing, and permissive, society. This type of regulation reflected Americans’ increasing concerns about the potential for sex outside of marriage – which “threatened middle-class Victorian ideals of sexual restraint.” Many of Ingram’s public lectures focused on protecting the morality of children.

Ingram also fought against child labor in Kentucky and nationally. She served on the Child Labor Committee of the Louisville Consumer’s League beginning in 1907, the Kentucky Child Labor Association before 1909, and spoke tirelessly on the subject at meetings, conferences, and conventions. Child labor laws linked to compulsory school regulations and the formation of juvenile courts, and Ingram also became involved in those issues in Louisville and statewide. In 1900 Kentucky passed a compulsory school
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law, the first state in the south to do so. However, lax enforcement by too few truant
officers left children free to work.\textsuperscript{178} Some proponents for the formation of juvenile
courts and compulsory school laws claimed that working with adult men encouraged
delinquency, by placing them “in conditions that are … unhealthy and equally injurious
morally.”\textsuperscript{179} The introduction of “scholarships” for low-income children, giving “the
family the equivalent of what the child could earn,” so that the child could attend school
helped to alleviate both the truancy and child labor issues.\textsuperscript{180} The Scholarship Committee
of the Child Labor Association, chaired by Frances Ingram, administered this fund.\textsuperscript{181}
The scholarship model of aid had been presented by the New York Child Labor
Committee at the 1905 and 1906 meetings of the National Child Labor Committee, and
subsequently implemented in Louisville.\textsuperscript{182} A stopgap measure to be sure, but it had the
twofold benefit of ameliorating some level of poverty while providing educational
opportunities for affected children.

Neighborhood House also trained settlement workers from all over the country,
playing a national role in the development of reform professions. They awarded
scholarships to provide training in social work in. In addition to an educational
opportunity for the recipient, it brought an additional worker to the settlement house.\textsuperscript{183}

In 1906, Minnie Hanaw, resident at Neighborhood House, spent several months in
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Mobile, Alabama starting “a new movement in the South in establishing scholarships for settlement workers.”184 One scholarship a year would “be awarded for a student to study in Louisville at Neighborhood House.”185 Women came from the south and Midwest to train at Neighborhood House, and several of the residents, including Hanaw, progressed to higher level positions at other settlements and in other forms of social work.186

As the settlement house movement spread across the United States, increasing numbers of civic-minded Louisvillians embraced the model. The Woman’s Board of City Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church founded the Louisville Settlement House at 834 East Jefferson Street in 1903. They hoped “to make it possible for the poorer classes to secure educational advantages which otherwise would be unavailable.”187 In 1908 the Louisville Settlement House moved to larger quarters at 809 East Main Street and became Wesley House in honor of John Wesley, the founder of Methodism.

Wesley House leadership balanced two goals, providing social and educational services for the urban poor, and spiritual guidance as a tool for uplift. Early activities included a milk depot, kindergarten, a Sunday School, and the Barclay Boys Chorus Club.188 Clubs for young men and women facilitated church-approved wholesome activities in the community, another effort to mold the morals of the young. Industrial classes offered a pathway out of poverty for many. Mother’s meetings provided
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acculturation for immigrants and hygiene and health information for the poor. Wesley House also held prayer meetings and Sunday School lessons to fulfill the spiritual needs of the community. In 1934 they introduced a summer camp program, Camp Merry Ledges. Wesley House Community Services, as it is now known, continues to serve its community by providing educational and social services.

Another residential organization that addressed local neighborhood needs, the Cabbage Patch Settlement House resulted from a small charity funded by members of the Stuart Memorial Presbyterian Church. It incorporated in 1910 and its administrators constructed a new house on the east side of Ninth Street, just south of Hill, in 1911. President of the Association, twenty-two year old Louise Marshall also served as Head Resident, and her father, attorney B. K. Marshall, purchased the lot for the building. Marshall gathered her friends, family, and church community to assist in the effort. She volunteered daily at the settlement until she moved to a nursing home at the age of ninety-one. Although not a religious mission, Cabbage Patch Settlement House taught Bible study classes from the beginning and provides spiritual enlightenment and guidance today. The Cabbage Patch Settlement House continues to maintain its dedication to helping the children of their community, and serves around 3,000 clients each year.

---

Strictly segregated, the few early settlement houses and missions aimed at Louisville’s African American population were located in the western portion of the city. The most enduring of these is Plymouth Settlement House, established as an outreach project of the Plymouth Congregational Church, an African American congregation located at Seventeenth and Chestnut Streets. However, another of the most notable and successful black missions could be found in the eastern part of the city known as Smoketown, south of Broadway, between Floyd and Logan Streets. First known as the Presbyterian Colored Mission, six white students from the Presbyterian Theological Seminary started it as an outreach of their home mission committee. Originally intended as a three-month seminary project, the mission evolved from one small room for Sunday School lessons in 1898 into the comprehensive Peace Presbyterian Community Center, which closed after 115 years of service in 2013.

At the beginning of the project, while the seminary students visited the neighborhood to call on children who were absent from Sunday School and evangelizing others to boost attendance, they were confronted by the conditions of the homes and neighborhoods where the children lived. John Little, who would serve as the Mission’s administrator for almost fifty years, recalled being “appalled as they saw the poverty of their wards, the dens of iniquity in the neighborhood, the saloons and gambling holes…” Planning to continue the Sunday School only until the end of the seminary

---
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school year in 1898, one student stayed in Louisville to continue teaching through the summer.\textsuperscript{200} Women from the city’s Presbyterian congregations agreed to volunteer at the Sunday School, including Lucy Belknap and Louisa Speed, both from wealthy families; each of these women would continue social work on a full-time volunteer basis for the rest of their lives.\textsuperscript{201}

The Mission soon increased its educational offerings beyond weekly Sunday School lessons. As with most successful settlement efforts, the Mission’s outreach expanded to fill the needs of its community. In 1900, soon after Little had been officially appointed to oversee the Mission, two girls from the Sunday School asked if some of the volunteers would teach them how to sew. One woman organized a sewing class, which quickly filled to capacity. Class began with a twenty-five cent donation – eighteen cents paid for thread and linen for six girls to make a handkerchief, with seven cents being returned to the treasury.\textsuperscript{202} By 1911 there were 237 girls enrolled in the Mission’s sewing classes.\textsuperscript{203} Boys began to petition for a class of their own, and volunteers started a basket making course. The boys made baskets for use in their own homes, at the mission, and to sell. When benches and bookcases were needed for the classrooms, Little began to teach the boys how to build simple projects.\textsuperscript{204} Knowing next to nothing about woodworking, he contacted the local School of Reform and arranged to take lessons alongside their industrial arts students in order to learn carpentry skills he could then pass on to his
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pupils. He continued as instructor of carpentry for several years. From this beginning, the Mission filled needs as they saw them, and responded to requests from the Sunday School pupils and their parents for more educational opportunities, social programs and entertainments. Responding favorably to the requests of the community members endeared the theology students to the community in a way that could not have been planned. Although Bible study had been the initial focus, the workers at the Mission found people in need of food, clothing, education, and uplifting entertainment. They then attempted to minister to the whole person by providing a healthy atmosphere for the community to meet and fellowship. Little encouraged the pupils of the Mission to attend or join the affiliated churches, but makes several references in his manuscript to avoiding pressure on the children to join or attend the churches, particularly if their families already belonged to a different church. Children of all denominations attended the Sunday School and other classes at the Mission and no one seemed to be excluded due to their religion, or lack thereof.

John Little traveled widely to lecture about the work of the Mission, mostly in the south. References to his travels on the road lecturing with his stereopticon are available in newspapers, the annual reports of the Mission and his unfinished manuscript. At one point he bought a “gas outfit that would enable [him] to give the lecture on the side of the road” complete with slides. In 1910, he visited twenty-nine colleges and institutions

206 Ibid.
207 Little, manuscript.
208 Ibid.
209 Ibid.
over the course of thirty days. Every year, he lectured at church conferences of various Protestant denominations, social worker conventions and anywhere else people would be interested in his work with Louisville’s African American community.

Black citizens in the western part of Louisville could find assistance, education, and recreation at a mission founded and operated by African Americans. The Plymouth Congregational Church at Seventeenth and Chestnut Streets, consisted of mostly educated and well-to-do black Louisvillians, and in 1911 Reverend Everett G. Harris proposed to the church his idea of a settlement house for the African American community in west Louisville. Harris ministered to the domestic workers and children of the area and knew the necessity of such a program. The Plymouth Settlement House opened in 1917 as “an endeavor by the colored people of Louisville to help themselves.” The settlement housed a youth program, provided a dormitory space for employed single black women, and extended the services of the church to its local community. They also “offered classes that prepared young women for domestic service, marriage and motherhood,” with an employment service to place the women in homes as domestic helpers. This type of education and employment assistance helped young African American women coming to the city from other parts of the state and further south, since they had begun to enjoy a greater social autonomy as they left farm households in the rural south to live and work in cities.

______________________

210 Ibid.
211 Benjamin D. Berry, “The Plymouth Congregational Church of Louisville, Kentucky,” *Phylon* 42, no. 3 (Clark Atlanta University, 1981): 226. E. G. Harris was a native of Virginia, educated at the School of Religion at Howard University.
212 “Fiske Jubilee Singers to be Heard Here Tuesday,” *Courier-Journal*, July 8, 1916, 5.
214 Odem, 2.
residence hall for a small fee provided safety, security, and opportunity for many who would have been unable to leave home otherwise.

Plymouth Settlement House was one of the few black-owned and operated social welfare agencies in the United States. The well-equipped original building held offices and a large auditorium on the first floor. The second floor held an assembly room with a movie projector, a kitchen, and classrooms. The women’s dormitory on the third floor had an entrance of its own. Harris had presented the dormitory as one of the primary purposes of the settlement, and it met an important need, plus provided a small income to the organization. However, the settlement house quickly became the community outreach ministry for the church. In addition to classes in sewing, cooking, and general homemaking, an African American Boy Scout troop and a small theatrical group, the Ida Aldridge Community Players (part of the national Little Theater movement), thrived at the settlement house.215 This wide variety of services, education, and community activities made Plymouth a significant asset to its neighborhood.

In many cities a distinct difference existed between a ‘mission’ and a ‘settlement house’ – church affiliated outreach projects are missions and secular community centers are settlement houses. Louisville’s settlements and missions eschewed that clear distinction between ‘mission’ and ‘settlement house.’ Given the longevity of the settlement houses and missions discussed here, this lack of definition was not a deterrent to success. The Presbyterian Colored Mission began as a Sunday School, but ultimately founded two churches in the neighborhood which assumed most of the religious

instruction, while the Mission continued to provide secular instruction, social services, and entertainment. Plymouth and Wesley House identified as settlement houses, not missions, even though closely affiliated with and founded by church congregations. Cabbage Patch, with no church oversight, taught Bible study from the start and the founders were a group of church members.

The religious affiliations and beliefs of the institutional founders played a large role in the programs offered and the direction of these organizations. Labels of ‘settlement house’ and ‘mission’ in Louisville did not adhere to the norms established early in the movement which delineated a sharp difference between the two types of organizations. All of the settlement houses and missions in Louisville relied on religious communities for guidance and support, particularly in their beginnings. I maintain that determining a difference between Louisville’s missions and settlement houses during this period is virtually impossible. Religion influenced community and social life in Louisville so deeply that it would be difficult to detach its effect from the motivations of reformers. As a result, settlement work in Louisville had a distinct Protestant moralistic character and generally, if not consistently, observed the rules of southern Jim Crow racism and segregation.

---
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CHAPTER 4
A NETWORK OF CHILD WELFARE EFFORTS

In this chapter I argue that specific social reforms benefitting children arose as a consequence of Louisville’s settlements and missions. These foundational organizations fostered other reform efforts, and the network of activists involved in the settlement movement were able to see more clearly where reform was necessary because of their work with the settlements. These additional child welfare efforts include: free kindergartens, child labor reforms, juvenile justice programs, and pure milk depots. Northern reform efforts provided some inspiration to Louisville’s activists, who reshaped them to suit the city’s culture. Louisville’s child welfare activities became examples for other southern cities as they came to recognize the effectiveness and necessity of such efforts, with information gleaned from speaking tours and other national activities of the Louisville advocates.

Through their settlement work, social workers in Louisville became aware of other child welfare issues in the city and across the state. They focused on efforts to address education, recreation, nutrition, and social justice for children. Free kindergarten classes originated at a mission, and were offered at most of the missions and settlement houses by the turn of the century. Those efforts were instrumental in instituting kindergartens throughout the city and, eventually, in the public schools. Neighborhood
House workers requested a pure milk station two years before the establishment of the Babies Milk Fund, and hosted the first depot. Milk depots soon expanded throughout the poorer sections of the city, and the nurses provided important hygiene and nutritional information to mothers, many not used to cramped, dirty, urban conditions. The Louisville Woman’s Club piloted playgrounds for the enjoyment and physical well-being of low-income children, who had mostly played in the streets – and club members volunteered at settlement houses and welfare organizations. Volunteers soon established a playground and recreation association, and settlement workers were among those who provided playground supervision. Settlement, mission, and social workers in the city supported the abolition of child labor, serving on local, regional, and national anti-child-labor committees. This same network of people helped to establish the juvenile justice system in Louisville and across the Commonwealth.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, children of immigrants and low-income families could usually only attend a few years of elementary school, ending when the children became old enough to work, usually age eight or ten. Kindergarten not only allowed these children another few years of education, it aimed to “set in motion the physical, mental and moral machinery” of the child, thus attempting to create a better adult citizen as determined by the white middle-class. German educator Friedrich Froebel founded the kindergarten movement in 1837 to develop the mental, moral, and

---
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expressive capabilities of children before elementary school.\textsuperscript{219} During the Progressive Era, Americans applied his philosophy to the social problems surrounding them.\textsuperscript{220} The first free kindergartens in the United States were supported by private funds and usually founded near tenements and slums. In 1900, Eva Harding, MD, declared, “The greatest advance (in education) has been made in the way of caring for the waifs of humanity, in plucking little children from the environments of vicious and hopeless situations and bestowing upon them the refining and directing care of the kindergarten.”\textsuperscript{221} The reformers believed that kindergarten’s emphasis on helping one another, cleanliness, orderliness, and good manners prevented crime and poverty, particularly important in crowded urban centers.\textsuperscript{222}

A desire to Americanize recent immigrants also motivated kindergarten activists who saw early childhood education as a tool for such. Kindergarten gave educators a first opportunity to make contact with immigrant families. They knew that children could learn English more easily, and adapt to American customs and activities more quickly than adults, so children became the open door through which Americanization could slip into the immigrant home.\textsuperscript{223} Kindergarten held the promise of a way to impose white middle-class morality, teach good work habits, and reinforce American values in immigrant children young enough to be pliable and easily molded.\textsuperscript{224}
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‘Kindergarten,’ appeared in the Louisville press as early as 1868, but most, if not all, of these notices seem to only refer to the teaching of very young children (ages three to six), not the kindergarten developed by Froebel, and all were at private, for-profit schools.225 One German-English School advertised a kindergarten which might have used the Froebel method; however the information given is unclear.226 In 1873, a “Miss Sawyer” on Breckinridge Street opened a private “English” kindergarten using the “so-called gifts and games of Froebel.”227 The introduction of kindergarten also encouraged parents to realize the importance of an education for their children, since many parents had received little or no formal schooling themselves and possibly felt it unnecessary for their children. The idea of education for all, the attitude that everyone deserved at least some education, expanded during late nineteenth century.

Interest in the kindergarten movement changed over time. Both the anti-kindergarten and pro-kindergarten sentiments used the same argument – children needed to be ready for elementary school. The anti-kindergarten argument, best presented in an 1880 Courier-Journal report of a School Board meeting, which described a Mr. Morris proposing a resolution that children be prohibited from attending school until they reached the age of seven.228 Morris argued that “experienced educators” were “nearly unanimous in favor” of such a resolution.229 The “injurious physical results of too early confinement in a ward school-room” on children “too young to be subjected to the
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“discipline” at school was behind his reasoning.\textsuperscript{230} (At this same time, however, people of all classes found it perfectly acceptable for children as young as eight to work in factories and mines.) Five years later, in 1885, the same newspaper published a pro-kindergarten column written by Eunice Butler, a member of the Union Gospel Mission and former private kindergarten teacher. She wished to “lay before the public the great importance of introducing the (kindergarten) system in all public schools.”\textsuperscript{231} Butler proposed the kindergarten would prepare the child for school, but not in a ‘confining’ or ‘injurious’ manner. The five years between these two published points of view is indicative of the rapid growth of the kindergarten movement in the United States. According to one source, free kindergartens in America doubled between 1880 and 1885.\textsuperscript{232}

Louisville’s private schools had operated ‘kindergartens’ as early as 1868.\textsuperscript{233} Free kindergarten, employing kindergarten teachers trained in the Froebel method, began at the Holcombe Union Gospel Mission in January 1887.\textsuperscript{234} At the same time, “a training class for young women desirous of perfecting themselves in the Froebel system of education for the young” began at the Mission, staffed by Susie F. Tuite, a teacher trained in Cincinnati, and Superintendent Mamie Clark.\textsuperscript{235} That fall, Anna E. Bryan, a Louisville native, returned from Chicago to run the Kindergarten Training School at the Holcombe Mission. She graduated with honors from the Kindergarten Association of Chicago in
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1884, and served as Principal of Chicago’s Trinity Kindergarten beginning in 1885.\textsuperscript{236} The education of kindergarten teachers contrasted sharply with the training for elementary education. Most elementary schools taught reading, writing, and arithmetic, and elementary teachers trained to teach only those subjects.\textsuperscript{237} However, kindergarten training centered on games, songs, storytelling, and crafts.\textsuperscript{238} By 1880 ten kindergarten training schools, mostly private, had opened in the United States.\textsuperscript{239} When the Louisville school opened in 1887, there were fourteen other schools in the country, with Louisville’s being the only one in the south.\textsuperscript{240}

As kindergartens proliferated, so did the training schools. By 1913, 147 institutions of higher education offered kindergarten teacher preparation courses. As kindergarten teacher training at state normal schools increased, the privately run kindergarten-training schools declined.\textsuperscript{241} A federal report in 1915 listed 126 kindergarten training programs, with only twenty-four in freestanding schools.\textsuperscript{242} Soon, kindergarten training schools would become extinct, and all kindergarten teacher education would take place in normal schools, colleges, and universities.
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The Louisville Free Kindergarten Association incorporated in 1889, although it had been operating throughout most of 1888 in conjunction with the Training School and kindergarten program at the Union Gospel Mission. The incorporators included Superintendent Mamie Clark, her husband James, and teacher Anna Bryan, among others. Free kindergarten in Louisville rapidly expanded, with the opening of a new kindergarten class at the Home of the Innocents in February 1888 and another at the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in May. At the end of that spring there were one hundred and thirty students enrolled in Louisville free kindergartens. By 1890, there were six or seven “flourishing kindergartens” run by the Free Kindergarten Association of Louisville. A May article claims seven without listing them, while a June report claims six: the Sunbeam Baptist Kindergarten, Knox Presbyterian Kindergarten, Stuart Robinson Presbyterian Church Kindergarten, the New Albany Kindergarten, Louisville German Free Kindergarten, and the Tobacco Exchange Kindergarten. The 1898 Association report listed nine schools with enrollment of 1,000 children. In addition to those listed above, these included the Temple Kindergarten, Hope Kindergarten, Mary Belknap Kindergarten, and the original Union Gospel Mission Kindergarten. No mention of the Knox or New Albany schools appeared in this report. The map (figure 1) shows the congestion of the area covered by these kindergartens, particularly the area north of
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Broadway. Now mainly commercial and industrial areas, this section of Louisville at the turn of the century included a large number of residents.

Patty Smith Hill, the most celebrated of Louisville kindergarten teachers, revolutionized the kindergarten movement in the United States. Known widely for co-writing the song “Happy Birthday” with her sister Mildred, she graduated from the Louisville Free Kindergarten Training School in one of the first classes under Anna Bryan. In 1889 she became principal of the Parent Free Kindergarten. In 1893, Bryan left Louisville and the Training School named twenty-five year old Patty Hill as her successor.249 That same year, Hill mounted an exhibition of her revised kindergarten methods at the Chicago World’s Fair, which drew a great deal of attention to her and to
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Louisville, securing her place as “a prominent lecturer and leader of the International Kindergarten Union.” In 1905, she accepted a visiting lecturer appointment at Columbia University Teachers College. In 1906 her position became permanent and she left Louisville. In 1910 she rose to Head of the Kindergarten Department. Columbia promoted her to full professor in 1922, awarding her an honorary doctorate in 1929.

Patty Smith Hill and others who worked diligently to foster kindergarten education in Louisville are all but forgotten locally. Even during their own time, they were more celebrated outside of Louisville than at home. Hill herself lamented that the kindergarten work in Louisville was “much better known at a distance than here in the city. Graduates of the Training School… are teaching in many states, from Connecticut to Florida, from Wisconsin to Texas… A prominent educator from the North wrote: ‘I know of no place where the principles of Froebel are worked out so thoroughly, originally, and in detail, as in the Louisville kindergartens.’”

The development of early childhood education in Louisville outpaced other southern cities during the first decades of the twentieth century, and reflects the leadership role Louisville played in southern urban history at this time. As early as 1903, there were kindergarten classes in the Louisville public schools. These continued until 1956, when funding disappeared, eliminating public-school kindergarten. Private and church-based kindergartens provided some measure of early childhood education to those
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who could afford them, but the marginalized children benefitting from the original free kindergarten movement were left behind. Kentucky funded public school kindergarten again in 1973 – although not in all schools, since state and federal funds were limited.\textsuperscript{255} A statewide mandatory kindergarten law finally passed the Kentucky Legislature in 1985.\textsuperscript{256} The future of early education in turn-of-the-century Louisville looked bright, however mid-century politicians deemed pre-elementary education for all children unworthy of funding.

During the late nineteenth century, infant mortality began to serve as a barometer of the overall health of a city. Of every 1,000 babies born in Louisville during 1900, 155 children under the age of one died.\textsuperscript{257} Cities farther south fared even worse – Atlanta’s figure for the same year revealed 258 deaths per 1,000 births.\textsuperscript{258} Much of this mortality can be accounted for by the increase in infant deaths during the summer months. The medical community understood that breastfed babies were more likely to live through the summer than those fed with a bottle, however, the rise in urbanization and the increase in bottle-fed infants went hand-in-hand.\textsuperscript{259} Physicians suggested that children be breastfed “two or even three summers” to avoid the rampant diarrhea and resulting dehydration and
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malnutrition that killed so many.\textsuperscript{260} It is a simple historical fact that across history and geography, humans have more commonly drunk breast milk and any other kind of milk.\textsuperscript{261} However, some women’s inability to breastfeed, due to their own poor nutrition or illness, being infected with venereal disease, or the necessity to return to work as soon as possible, meant their children had to be bottle fed.\textsuperscript{262} Unsurprisingly, babies born to women in these groups had a higher mortality rate than average.

Bottle-fed babies needed clean, unspoiled milk in clean bottles in order to stay healthy, and Louisville physicians, nurses and child welfare reformers looked to provide a solution to what seemed a simple problem. No federal standards for the production, transportation, or sale of milk existed until the passage of the Standard Milk Ordinance in 1924.\textsuperscript{263} Instead, udders were routinely unwashed before milking, buckets were rarely washed (and with dirty water if they were), milk was shipped in and sold out of open containers, usually with an unwashed dipper.\textsuperscript{264} Farmers, shippers, and retailers considered refrigeration unnecessary, and inhabitants of tenement housing had no way to cool perishable foods in hot weather.\textsuperscript{265}
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Efforts to secure an uncontaminated milk supply in Louisville were vehemently resisted by dairy farmers and merchants.\textsuperscript{266} With no support from the supply chain, activists worked to make the contaminated milk as healthy as possible. As early as 1906, Neighborhood House noted in its annual report that, “a pure milk supply would cause less sickness and suffering among the babies, and therefore would be a source of benefit to the whole community.”\textsuperscript{267} Settlement houses had long been active in the pure milk movement in other parts of the country, and Frances Ingram of Neighborhood House would have been well aware of those efforts through her social work contacts and connections. In addition, Dr. Letchworth Smith, another proponent of clean milk, had moved to Louisville in 1905.\textsuperscript{268} Dr. Smith had been active in the pure milk crusade in New York, and helped found the Babies Milk Fund Association in Louisville.\textsuperscript{269}

Between high infant mortality statistics and clean milk becoming an issue on several fronts (tuberculosis inoculations for cows, dairy cleanliness, and milk refrigeration), Louisville found itself in need of a way to provide pure milk for infants and toddlers. On July 9, 1908, a Louisville \textit{Courier-Journal} article headlined, “To Save Lives of the Babies,” announced the formation of the Babies Milk Fund Association and the opening of the first summer milk depot at Neighborhood House.\textsuperscript{270} By the next August, five stations run by the Babies Milk Fund Association existed in the city, and
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nurses started to visit sick babies in their homes. About this time Mother’s Meetings began at the milk depots every two weeks to educate (mostly poor or immigrant) mothers on how to properly care for their children.\textsuperscript{271} Immigrant parents from rural villages did not have the knowledge or ability to provide the clean environment necessary for safe bottle-feeding in the crowded, filthy conditions of tenements.\textsuperscript{272} As late as 1910, Louisville continued to be the only southern city to have a milk dispensary program.\textsuperscript{273}

Louisville’s milk program had become noteworthy enough to be featured in national publications by 1911, positioning Louisville reformers to serve as a model for other cities. Elisabeth Shaver, Supervisor of the Louisville Babies Milk Fund Association, published an article in the \textit{American Journal of Nursing} titled “How One City Saves Its Babies.”\textsuperscript{274} For the first time, educating the mothers in hygiene, sanitary methods of preparing bottles, proper cold storage of milk, and the perils of “soothing syrup” were given a more prominent role in the work of the Association than the provision of clean milk.\textsuperscript{275} Myrtle McClelland, nurse for the Association at the Louisville Children’s Free Hospital, published an article on the duties of a competent infant welfare nurse in the same journal in 1913. McClelland focused on the eradication of ignorance, carelessness, and indifference through “constant and relentless battle” between the
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parents and nurses.\footnote{276} She considered the nurse’s responsibility to be “more than giving instructions to the mother. She must arouse public interest as to the conditions existing which are detrimental to good motherhood.”\footnote{277} Both articles helped to spread information regarding the proper organization and operation of milk stations, and their subsequent outreach efforts.

Along with providing clean milk and hygiene instruction, the infant welfare nurse’s responsibilities included Americanization indoctrination. The ideas mentioned in McClelland’s article promoting “good motherhood” embodied yet another means of Americanizing immigrants, particularly mothers of small children. McClelland noted that “having the foreign element to deal with” could be a problem, given that “Syrians and Italians” wanted to overdress babies.\footnote{278} Immigrant mothers were “urged to maintain the new American standard of living in diet, hygiene and infant and child care,” and always be mindful of her role in producing a “true American” child of the next generation.\footnote{279} McClelland’s suggestions for welfare nurses included being sympathetic and kind, but advised that “a large number of the mothers whom we visit are very ignorant,” and nurses must teach “better habits, hygiene and morality.”\footnote{280} Although the public press tacitly acknowledged poverty to be the main reason the Association and other welfare programs
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existed, the literature of the Babies Milk Fund Association ignored the issue, perhaps due to an inability by this small organization to properly address widespread poverty.

Louisville’s infant pure milk and education program grew exponentially due to its success. In 1909, the first full year the Association operated, it registered 284 children in the program and numbers rose every year until 1918, when figures show approximately 2,000 children enrolled.\textsuperscript{281} Expansion of staff and milk depots became necessary because the role of the public health nurse had greatly increased during the course of the program. In addition to continuing the modified milk program (including rental of small ice boxes to store the milk), and providing education on infant feeding and hygiene, the nurses cared for sick children year-round, reported sanitary regulation violations to the appropriate authorities, and assisted with the registration of births and deaths among children.\textsuperscript{282}

The financial impact of World War I led to the Babies Milk Fund Association merging with the District Nurse Association in 1918. The scope of this merged organization became somewhat broader, encompassing “bedside nursing, prenatal and child health.”\textsuperscript{283} In 1935, the Infant Welfare Stations were turned over to the City Health Department, where pre-natal visits, infant care, and preschool visits were incorporated into the ongoing work of the Health Department.\textsuperscript{284} In 1939 the organization’s name
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changed from the District Nurse Association to the Visiting Nurse Association (VNA).\textsuperscript{285} From the relatively simple objective of providing clean milk to infants and toddlers to prevent lethal diarrhea, the Babies Milk Fund expanded to deliver a full range of sick and well-baby care to a growing segment of Louisville’s population.

The doctors, nurses, and volunteers who founded and worked for the Babies Milk Fund reached for the “nearest and most convenient weapon” they could find to prevent infant mortality – clean milk, hygiene, and education.\textsuperscript{286} With no way for such a small organization to alleviate widespread poverty, these reformers provided a reasonable form of assistance that produced positive results. The Babies Milk Fund Association operated in Louisville from July 1908 until 1918, and infant mortality declined from 145 infants under one year of age per one 1,000 births in 1910 to ninety-seven deaths per 1,000 births in 1917.\textsuperscript{287} A slight rise in the infant mortality rate to 114 during 1918 can most likely be attributed to the influenza epidemic.\textsuperscript{288} The Association contributed to this decline in infant mortality by providing clean milk, education, and support for disadvantaged babies and their mothers.

Child advocates of the Progressive Era considered supervised playgrounds for city children to be an important aspect of civic child welfare reform.\textsuperscript{289} The physical and moral well-being of children who lived in crowded, dirty tenements appealed to those in
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the playground movement. Reformers also saw team sports and other forms of organized play as a means to indoctrinate an American work ethic and social skills into young people, particularly those of poor and immigrant backgrounds. These motives were apparent in the effort by the local Woman’s Club to establish the first supervised public playground in Louisville during the summer of 1899, located on a 70’ x 200’ lot on Main Street between Brook and Floyd Streets. Shortly after, another playground opened on Walnut Street between Brook and Floyd. Mary D. Anderson of Neighborhood House chaired the playground work committee, and Henrie Barrett Montfort, a Presbyterian and steadfast supporter of the Free Kindergarten Association, chaired the Woman’s Club Outdoor and Playground Committee. In 1900, sponsors and friends of Neighborhood House asked the Louisville Commercial Club to sponsor more summer playgrounds throughout the city to keep “children off the streets and out of trouble.” The Recreation League soon formed, and their official motto, “Better bodies, better manners and better morals for our future citizens,” made the group’s mission clear.

The playground and recreation movement quickly became popular with child welfare reformers across the nation and in Louisville. By 1901, the Recreation League
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had established six public playgrounds in various parts of the city during the summer, mostly in congested downtown areas near low-income housing.297 Organized team play became part of the fabric of the playground, probably due to the influence of the newly hired playground supervisor, Arthur Leland, a recent graduate of the YMCA Training School in Massachusetts.298 As Dominick Cavello notes in *Muscles and Morals: Organized Playgrounds and Urban Reform, 1880-1920*, team spirit fostered immigrant acculturation, enhanced democratic values, and exposed children to the give and take of the public world.299 Mr. Leland would have learned these theories and methods during his studies with the YMCA. Success in 1901 pushed the Recreation League to announce a winter playground that fall. Neighborhood House hosted the winter playground featuring “horizontal bars, punching bags, gymnasium ladders, swings, a basketball space, and a handball court.”300 By 1903 public playgrounds were well-established in Louisville. That year Arthur Leland made “an extensive visit to the East, where he looked over the playgrounds in the largest cities in the country.”301 He reported that “the playgrounds in this city compare favorably with those in other cities, and they do not suffer by the comparison.”302 The playgrounds of Louisville had been compared to those in larger cities in the north and east and stood up to the test.

Like many other public accommodations in Louisville, the playgrounds maintained a racial hierarchy through segregation. A 1900 article in the *Courier-Journal*
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extolling the virtues of the newly instituted “public” playgrounds noted that “some little colored people have gathered about the gates of this white child’s paradise, asking wistfully: ‘Ain’t they goin’ to have nothin’ like this at our school?’” Public’ spaces such as playgrounds triggered a southern insistence on separate accommodations for the races, and providing separate playgrounds for black children would not be a priority in Louisville.6 Six years later, under the leadership of Lafon Allen, League President, the Recreation League opened a playground for African American children at Sixteenth and Magazine Streets, “the first of its kind in Louisville, and may be made permanent,” noted the headline.7 In 1907, the committee lauded the previous summer as a great success and scheduled the African American playground to open again, but only if “the friends of this movement will not allow the good work already done to go for naught.” However, the same story announced that two new playgrounds – for white children – were to open at “Shelby and Oak Streets and at Tyler Park, in the east end of town.” Finally, on August 1, 1907, the announcement that

…a new (playground) will be started for negro children. … the playground there was a success last summer. The Recreation League has only a limited fund for the conduct of this ground, but it hopes to receive some financial aid from the negro societies that have been working on the project for some time... Unless such assistance is received it is doubtful whether the playground can be operated (for) the one month remaining of the season.8
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Never before had the residents of an area been made responsible for raising the funds used to run the playground in their neighborhood, an undue burden on a public resource that put black children at another disadvantage. It had taken Louisville residents six years to open one playground for African American children, and they expected the black community to pay for it. This is another instance indicative of the so-called ‘polite racism’ prevalent in Louisville – to offer a small, separate, unequal accommodation, expect praise and gratitude for the generosity, then ask the black community to pay for what is given freely to the white community.

John Little of the Presbyterian Mission understood that none of the public playgrounds in the Mission’s neighborhood were open to the children he served, and he determined to remedy the situation. His students mostly still played in the streets. A very small playground in the rear of the Mission building at Preston and Pearl Streets consisted of only four simple swings, a sand box, and a beanbag toss game, yet stayed full of playing children, and Little knew more children could play safely if space increased.\(^309\) Also, the children who took advantage of the playground were more likely to join the Sunday School.\(^310\) As in the white playgrounds, the attendants at the Mission playgrounds noted that the children received “a wholesome moral influence” at the playground.\(^311\) In 1909 the owner of a recently razed house gave permission for the Mission to use the lot for a large playground, and the boys of the neighborhood cleared debris themselves so they could use the space.\(^312\) The opening of this playground at the
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Mission during the spring of 1910 proved to be a great success. In many of his annual reports, Little boasts of how well the playgrounds fulfilled and surpassed the goals of the Mission. In 1913, he explained the value of the playground at the Presbyterian Mission, but his first two points speak for all public playgrounds opened in Louisville beginning in 1899,

The playground has a three-fold value. (1) It provides the needed recreation for children who have little opportunity. (2) It provides recreation under supervision, making it safe for the physical and moral welfare of the child. On one block, three children were crippled while playing in the street. (3) It has always increased attendance on all religious services. Our first acquaintance with some of our Church members was made in the playground and they are today some of our most useful Christian workers. Even the policemen on the beat have been impressed with the value of our playgrounds and have become our valued friends and helpers in the work.\footnote{Presbyterian Community Center Papers, Annual Report 1913, Box 3.}

Progressive Era reformers saw supervised public playgrounds as a wholesome respite for tenement children, away from the unhealthy environment of their crowded, dirty, and sometimes airless homes. Playgrounds also provided a way for children to play safely out of the streets, and the children learned to follow instructions and the rules of organized games, preparing them for the strictures of school and work.

Child welfare advocates’ efforts to outlaw child labor increased during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. However, in many states, particularly in the south, resistance to the abolition of child labor was strong.\footnote{Michael Schuman, "History of Child Labor in the United States—Part 2: The Reform Movement," Monthly Labor Review, US Bureau of Labor Statistics, January 2017, https://doi.org/10.21916/mlr.2017.2.} In the United States during 1870, one of eight children fourteen years of age and under worked; this figure increased in 1900 to one out of six children working. These statistics do not include children who
worked on farms, sold newspapers or other items on the streets, produced piece-work commercial goods at home, or were employed in domestic service.315 In the south, the percentage of children working were higher, particularly when factoring in agricultural labor.

Before child welfare reformers in Louisville took up child labor as a key issue, organized labor campaigned against it. As early as 1890, labor union members in Louisville agitated for child labor laws, mostly regarding children who worked in factories, combining the child labor issue with concerns such as the eight-hour day, the use of convict labor and working women.316 The union members concerns were more about raising wages for working men than about the perils of children working, although some groups mentioned the physical toll and lack of educational opportunities for working children. In 1898, the Retail Clerks’ National Protective Association met in Louisville and discussed child labor at their convention. “The Association is, to a certain extent, opposed to child labor, the opposition being due mainly to the belief that it interferes with the education of a child, and is apt to bring evil to young girls,” another indication of the perceived immorality of the workplace.317 The Kentucky Irish American published an editorial in 1899 unfavorably comparing the labor laws of Kentucky to those in Indiana, which they considered more enlightened. They described Kentucky as carrying child labor “beyond slavery to the verge of barbarism.”318 Twelve years after
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local union members first spoke publicly against child labor, the Legislature finally voted
to pass a bill limiting it.\footnote{New Laws,” \textit{Courier-Journal}, June 16, 1902, 8.}

The endangerment of children’s morality, physical risks, and general debility
resulting from hard work at too young an age became pressing issues for the child labor
activists in the late nineteenth century. As early as 1892, public speakers in Louisville
discussed child labor from “the standpoint of the injury done to the children … by the
crippling of their forms, the retardation of development of their muscles and the

According to the sometimes controversial Professor of
Economics and History at Vanderbilt University, Edward W. Bemis, “the industrial
efficiency of the whole population is impaired as wages are reduced – and the children,
for lack of education and training, are never able to earn a decent pay.”\footnote{Ibid; “Edward W. Bemis,” \textit{Industrialist} (Manhattan, KS), June 15, 1897, 5.}

He encouraged
a plan for compulsory education to counteract child labor, which proved to be more
forward thinking than many of his ideas.\footnote{Bemis, “Education and Child Labor,” 6.}

Dr. Bemis felt that moral depravity was a
result of the workplace, “for a craving for liquor is engendered.”\footnote{Ibid.}

Although this
particular opinion is absurd, arguments about the moral deterioration of working children
were common. In the fall of 1895, the Reverend B. Fay Mills, an evangelist who used his
pulpit to advocate for social reform, arrived in Louisville for a month long gospel
meeting sponsored by the local Ministerial Association. Mills spoke of “enemies of the
home,” citing child labor as one of them, which he claimed stunted the physical growth
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and blighted the mental and moral development of working children.\textsuperscript{324} Louisvillians were more receptive to this moralistic argument against child labor than they had been to the economic complaints of the labor unions.

Concerted efforts by anti-child labor crusaders lobbying the state legislature over the course of several years led to restrictions on the hiring of children. During the 1896 session of the Kentucky Legislature, Representative Andrew Thompson of Louisville introduced a bill written by the Central Labor Union of Louisville to prevent the employment of children.\textsuperscript{325} The bill never came up for a vote during the session. According to James Marten, the southern agrarian influence in Kentucky can account for some of the resistance to child labor reform in Kentucky as “southern parents put their children to work because they believed in the intrinsic value of work… (and) held producer values … which placed a premium on the physical production of goods.”\textsuperscript{326} “In this worldview, work built character and kept children from idleness and laziness.”\textsuperscript{327}

However, the era of the self-sufficient farmer was yielding to the more urban and consumer-oriented society of the twentieth-century, and those agrarian values were quickly becoming obsolete.\textsuperscript{328}

The labor unions eventually joined with social reformers, including Frances Ingram of Neighborhood House and Eleanor Tarrant Little, who served as the Consumer’s League Chairman on Child Labor. The proof of physical and mental damage inflicted on working children finally prevailed. During the 1902 Legislative session, a bill
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finally passed to restrict child labor in Kentucky. The bill had faults however. It prohibited children under fourteen from being employed in mines, factories and workshops, but several exceptions virtually nullified the bill.\(^{329}\) It exempted children of widows, or children having the consent of their parents – and almost all children worked with their parent’s consent, if not insistence.\(^{330}\) In Louisville, many parents appealed to the County Judge to allow their children to work, because illness made them dependent upon their children for support.\(^{331}\) Until enforceable compulsory school laws were enacted in 1909, no real action on eliminating child labor in Kentucky advanced.\(^{332}\) It is, however, ironic that women were able to contribute to the shaping of public policy and legislation regarding child labor almost two decades before they were allowed to vote.\(^{333}\)

Early nineteenth-century criminal intervention typically did not make a distinction between delinquent children and criminals. Any child picked up by the police for homelessness or vagrancy usually ended up at the local house of reform with those held for criminal acts. Authorities assumed that any child without supervision benefitted from the structure and strictures of an institution. Administrators of courts and institutions faced increased criticism by the end of the nineteenth century for treating
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After two young boys, ages eleven and thirteen, were incarcerated in the Kentucky state penitentiary in 1899, reformers in Louisville began to advocate for revisions in the criminal code specifically applicable to those under sixteen years of age.\footnote{“Juvenile Criminals…,” \textit{Courier-Journal}, December 10, 1889, 4. (One boy arrived at the penitentiary shackled to his father.)} In 1890, an editorial in the \textit{Courier-Journal} had expressed the opinion, “that there is a lamentable and sorrowful insufficiency in Kentucky laws for dealing with” the question of child criminals “cannot be denied. It is a fact that in every community … there is a percentage of boys whose evil instincts are hereditary, and who cannot be controlled and molded by the ordinary influences under which average children develop into average men.”\footnote{“Children in the Penitentiary,” \textit{Courier-Journal}, June 6, 1890, 4.} The writer mentioned the House of Refuge as a solution for boys from Louisville convicted of crimes, but no place existed for boys from the rest of the state. The boys sent to the adult prison were “subject to the depraved and deadening effects of association with a horde of society’s lowest creatures,” according to the author.\footnote{Ibid.} In 1891, an address regarding the new Constitution of the Commonwealth of Kentucky cited the lack of an institution for juvenile offenders as a problem, but offered no solution.\footnote{“The New Constitution,” \textit{Courier-Journal}, April 11, 1891, 1.} Finally, in 1896, the Kentucky Legislature signed into law an act for the formation of a State School of Reform, and a year later allocated funding and purchased a
lot near Lexington. The school for boys opened in July 1899, but with no official mechanism in place for sentencing or referring juvenile offenders through a juvenile court. Boys still faced judges in adult courts before sentencing to the Reform School.

The lack of a criminal court for hearing juvenile cases exposed a weakness in the slowly developing juvenile justice system in Louisville. Accordingly, the fight for a juvenile court ensued. Chicago, Illinois had been the first city to bring cases involving delinquent, neglected, and dependent children under the jurisdiction of a separate court. In 1901, a half-page article, complete with many photographs, appeared in the Courier-Journal extolling the virtues of the Chicago juvenile court system – the headline screamed, “Great Work of the Juvenile Court in Chicago.” No blatant words of support for a court in Louisville (or Kentucky) appeared, but the intent of the piece appears obvious.

Articles noting the positive aspects of juvenile courts in other cities appeared sporadically, denoting a sympathy for the subject by newspaper editors. In January 1902 the Courier-Journal published “Louisville’s Juvenile Offenders: How They Are Cared For and What Effect the Proposed New Jail Would Have Upon Their Reformation.” Interviews were conducted with the jailer, the Chief of Police and a detective. Only the
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jailer favored proposed separation at the jail. The Chief opined that, “Louisville has not nearly as many juvenile criminals as it used to have because there has been strictness with them. A juvenile court here? No. … Most of them are colored boys. They would not appreciate a juvenile court – indeed it would do harm there. They need to be afraid of the law. Ninety percent of the offenders are colored.”

The detective’s comments were no more enlightened than the Chief’s. He said “juvenile offenders of the city well under control.” He recounted a “private trial” procedure in place for juveniles. He thought that “this, in effect, answers to a juvenile court and should such a case come up tomorrow, the same procedure would occur.” However, this ‘procedure’ only pertained to white juvenile offenders, while black offenders needed to be “afraid of the law.” As with other public and social services in Louisville, separate and unequal sometimes verged on the norm.

The court officer with the most hands-on experience supported the idea of a juvenile jail. The jailer, John R. Pflanz, said, “The greatest argument in favor of the building of a new Jefferson County jail is that we could heed the present sentiment for the entire separation and reclamation of juvenile criminals. Already the agitation in Northern cities has reached Louisville. I am doing the best I can, but I have no way of doing such a work as should be done.” Pflanz seemed to have a better appreciation for public sentiment than his superiors.
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Three years later, the issue remained at a standstill, with no juvenile jail or court in Louisville. An opinion published in the Courier-Journal pled for both:

One of the hopeful signs of the times is the growing interest in the preservation of the characters of children, in their education, training and health. This concern has resulted in laws compelling parents to send their children to school, prohibiting them from making boys and girls of tender years work for a living and in other measures of the kind. One of the most important developments of the agitation is the “juvenile court,” which has been adopted in some of the States with marked success… The effort now making to establish similar tribunals in Kentucky has in its purpose the accomplishment of the same good among little Kentuckians.  

During the 1906 session of the legislature, a bill finally passed for a juvenile court in Louisville.  

With the advent of a juvenile court in Louisville, a need for juvenile probation officers arose; female officers would prove to be more reliable and proficient in their duties than male officers. In 1907, Helen W. Rogers of Indianapolis came to Louisville as the temporary Chief Probation Officer and resident at Neighborhood House, while a search ensued for a permanent Chief. A former Juvenile Court officer from Indianapolis, Rogers was “much interested in settlement work and its problems.”  Hugo Krause, Superintendent of the Anti-Cruelty Society of Chicago, replaced Rogers, but stayed only a year and a half.  

Keeping a Probation Office proved a difficult task over the next decade due to ineptitude and mismanagement by the court. Reverend James McCullough,
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appointed in January 1910, stayed less than a year. In 1911 Judge Muir Weissinger appointed his chauffeur, Harry Stone, as Chief Probation Officer after the county declined to continue to pay for a court chauffeur. Two members of the Advisory Board resigned immediately in protest due to Stone’s lack of qualifications and the impropriety of the appointment. Two others, Eleanor Little and Patty B. Semple, delegates from the Louisville Woman’s Club, resigned after consultation with the Club. However, Stone received a dismissal notice on June 1, 1911 for spending the night in a local bordello, stealing money from the madam’s purse the next morning, and possessing an invalid police badge. The four resigning Advisory Board members were obviously correct in their assessment of Stone’s lack of suitability for the position.

Cora M. Bain took on the duties of Chief Probation Officer after Stone’s departure. An assistant probation officer for several years, Bain assumed the title “First Assistant Chief Probation Officer.” One can only assume her gender played a part in her not being simply named Chief. Ada S. Woolfolk replaced her in 1914, a highly qualified candidate with experience at Hull House in Chicago, and involvement in settlement work and school inspection in New York.
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Woolfolk remained until 1918, providing some much-needed stability to the office.362

Social workers involved in Louisville’s settlements dedicated themselves to efforts addressing education, recreation, nutrition, and social justice for children. Influenced by northern child welfare campaigns and northern reformers who chose to work in Louisville, these child advocates helped Louisville to become the most socially progressive southern city, and an inspiration to future southern reformers.

Upon introduction, kindergarten’s primary functions were seen as preventing crime and poverty, extending the brief school years of children before employment, providing education and social services for underprivileged children, and as a tool for Americanization of immigrant children and families. Louisville’s kindergartens and training school for kindergarten teachers proved that Louisville kindergarten, and its teachers, could have ascended to a position of prominence in early childhood education. Louisville led the south in kindergarten education, with Anna Bryan and Patty S. Hill at the forefront of the movement. Hill rose as a national and international leader in the kindergarten movement. After leaving Louisville, Bryan led the Chicago Free Kindergarten Association, the largest in the nation, until her untimely death at age forty-three.363 Louisville continued to provide free kindergarten in the public schools well into mid-century.

Both kindergarten and playgrounds served to acclimate first and second generation immigrants to city life, teaching social skills and lessons in American life. The playgrounds reinforced the idea that children should be allowed to play, and do so in a safe environment. The playground movement in Louisville began with one empty lot in 1899, and by 1920 there were eighteen supervised playgrounds, plus three in local parks.\textsuperscript{364} However, segregation of the playgrounds remained, and city officials persisted in their neglect to open new playgrounds for African American children or to improving those that existed.\textsuperscript{365} Nevertheless, in a 1928 study of seventeen southern cities, six had no public playgrounds, nine had playgrounds for whites only, and only two provided segregated playgrounds for African American children.\textsuperscript{366} The Louisville playground movement had not obtained perfection, yet it far surpassed other southern cities.

Children had become more valued as family size decreased during the nineteenth century. The founders of the Babies Milk Fund Association simply wished to provide clean, pure milk for infants to prevent death from dehydration and malnutrition, the result of persistent diarrhea caused by contaminated or spoiled milk. This effort expanded to provide health and hygiene information to mothers, and home visits by nurses for sick children. They also registered births and deaths of children, supplying more accurate statistics for welfare and

government organizations to appropriately distribute resources. In its decade of
operation as a stand-alone charity, the death rate of infants in Louisville decreased
by approximately fifty percent.

The reforms addressing the abolition of child labor, enforceable
compulsory school laws, and a juvenile justice system examined the role of the
child from a different perspective than reforms initiated to benefit infants and
younger children. These three efforts focused on older children, and addressed the
role of the adolescent as a viable member of the community and potentially
responsible adult. None of the issues could be easily solved without concurrently
undertaking the resolution of the others. Compulsory school laws alleviated the
problems of juvenile delinquency and child labor. Compulsory school could not
have been instituted or enforced, had child labor laws not changed. Some parents
would have continued to send their children to work instead of school.

Unfortunately, child labor continued to be an issue in the United States for many
years, but in 1920, Kentucky’s anti-child labor law was still considered to be the
best in the south.367 Although flagrant violations of the existing law were found in
rural parts of the state in 1919, Louisville had far fewer violations, most likely due
to the presence of state factory inspectors in the city and a full rank of truancy
officers.368

Child labor and the lack of a juvenile justice system contributed to
juvenile delinquency – children were more likely to commit crimes and develop
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perceived immoral habits when they worked alongside adults or were incarcerated with adults for benign juvenile status offenses. Louisville, the first jurisdiction in Kentucky to enact a juvenile court, had tried to model their court on that of Chicago, at the time the standard for a successful juvenile court. Although a law establishing juvenile courts in Kentucky passed in 1906, and juveniles had since then been tried separately, and with different standards from adults, by 1920 Louisville and Lexington remained the only Kentucky locations with reform schools.\textsuperscript{369}

Louisville has a unique character as a border city between north and south, and child welfare endeavors differed from those of their counterparts in both the north and south. Louisville kindergarten advocates had their roots in Cincinnati and Chicago, but Patty Smith Hill revolutionized the movement and used her position at Columbia University to influence kindergarten teacher training over the next decades. Louisville’s playground movement also had a direct impact on several other cities, most notably through the efforts of playground pioneer and innovator Arthur Leland. John Little also spoke about the Presbyterian Mission playgrounds on his speaking tours, bringing the idea of safe, supervised play spaces for black children to aspiring social workers and church congregations across the south. Louisville’s charitable milk program was featured in national publications, positioning Louisville reformers to serve as a model for other cities. The city’s influence across the south, and the nation, during the Progressive Era, was restrained but pervasive.

\textsuperscript{369} Ibid, 204, 222.
The child labor reformers in Kentucky, especially in Louisville, used nearby Indiana as an ideal, though Kentucky led the south in implementing child labor regulations for many years. However, the southern agrarian ideals held by most rural residents hindered stricter legislation against child labor. Simultaneously, businessmen were attempting to accelerate industrial progress in competition with northern cities. This impasse took years to overcome. The need for children to participate in agricultural work at certain times of the year also hindered school attendance across the state. Shortages of easily accessible, fully-staffed, and appropriately equipped schools complicated compulsory school enforcement in rural areas, too. Louisville and Lexington activists, connected through the Kentucky Federation of Women’s Clubs, lobbied for statewide enforcement of the south’s only compulsory school law. They persuaded business-minded politicians that industrial progress would be hindered by an uneducated populace.370 Louisville, like many other cities across the country, modeled its juvenile court on that of Chicago, but southern racism led to segregation and different standards for black delinquents. Women in the local network of reformers focused their efforts and influence to establish a juvenile court system in Louisville and eventually across Kentucky.

CONCLUSION

Considered in part a southern city, Louisville surpassed its deep south cousins in several ways during the Progressive Era. Just as all politics is ultimately local, all narratives take on their meanings from the way in which global motives connect locally.\footnote{Gordon, iv.} If we take the goals of this era to be the creation of institutions focused on public welfare and education, the impact of such work is mixed in its success. However, the efforts of Louisville residents to balance traditional southern cultural ideals with northern progress during the Progressive Era can be deemed largely successful. Louisville child welfare reformers found their own path, carefully negotiating the conflicting ideologies of race, religion, and politics that confronted them.

With infant mortality a barometer of the health of a city, Louisville’s milk program assisted in lowering the infant mortality rate to be more aligned with the national average, although still higher than many northern and western cities.\footnote{S. J. Crumbine, “A Statistical Report of Infant Mortality for 1926,” \textit{American Journal of Public Health} 17, no. 9 (September 1, 1927): 922.} Louisville can be as sweltering and humid as any city further south, and by 1910 it continued to be the only southern city to have either a Tenement Commission or a milk dispensary program.\footnote{Robert W. de Forest, “A Brief History of the Housing Movement in America,” \textit{Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science} 51, (January, 1914): 11.} Kentucky passed a restrictive tenement law in 1910, stipulating sanitary conditions inside and outside, ventilation requirements, and occupancy limits among other guidelines.\footnote{Thum, \textit{Supplement to 1909 Kentucky Statutes}, 690.} Nursing professionals found the milk dispensary program progressive enough feature
them in a major journal twice in the early twentieth century.\textsuperscript{375} A relationship between child health and breast feeding, even in industrialized countries, can still be found today.\textsuperscript{376} It is much simpler to point to adulterated cow’s milk than to income disparity as a source of child mortality, and if milk was the problem, reformers could concentrate on reforming the food provision system rather than addressing the inequalities of the economic system.\textsuperscript{377}

The reform of child labor regulations and compulsory school attendance laws became a turning point for building an increasingly educated and healthier adult population by the mid-twentieth century. In 1900, Kentucky passed a compulsory school law, the first southern state to do so, although lax enforcement made it somewhat impotent.\textsuperscript{378} An early adopter of the kindergarten idea, Louisville not only established classes for children, but also immediately opened a kindergarten training school in 1887, the only such school in the south.\textsuperscript{379} Currently ranking thirty-fourth in education, with five deep south states ranking higher on the list, Kentucky eventually failed to fulfill the educational promise of its Progressive Era reforms. In 1902, Kentucky reformers were successful in their efforts to pass a bill to restrict child labor, and though it had its faults, it remained the only child labor restriction written into law in the south for several years. For example, North Carolina attempted to pass a child labor bill in 1905 which did not receive a single vote.\textsuperscript{380} In 1909, the Louisville Child Labor Association began to supply
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‘scholarships’ for children who worked to support their families, providing the equivalent of the child’s wage so they could attend school.381 Undoubtedly a short-term solution, these scholarships allowed many children to attend school who would not have had the opportunity otherwise. Earlier estimates that children and their families did not benefit from child labor laws has been revised by recent scholarship.382 Although “many schools were inadequate and teachers frequently prejudiced against immigrants, education was an important route out of the grinding poverty that characterized immigrant neighborhoods.”383 Incrementally, these small steps led to more robust laws and regulations providing greater opportunity for Kentucky children to become healthy, successful adults.

During the Progressive Era, some of women’s most valuable public contributions were made as founders, workers, and volunteers in social service organizations.384 Women were generally seen as mother figures, or prospective mothers, and this idea made women “responsible for protecting not only the virtue of their children but the virtue and morality of the nation as well.”385 This often led to a maternalistic bent in the social work of women, since they were seen as ‘inherently’ motherly, and the preponderance of women involved in child welfare activism in Louisville reinforces this concept. However, activist women were not solely motivated by maternalism, “nor did middle-class white women simply impose an agenda on other women.”386 It can be more
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properly understood as a shared urban vision of cleaner, healthier cities with educated and successful residents.\textsuperscript{387} By the beginning of the Progressive Era, the role of women as “housekeepers” had been well-established, so it was not unexpected that they became “effective municipal housekeepers as well.”\textsuperscript{388} But ‘social housekeeping’ entailed more than wielding a broom and dust rag – it meant lobbying and working locally and nationally to fight for the welfare of women and children.\textsuperscript{389} Women were also well aware that championing the causes of children would be less problematic at home and in wider society than tackling more sweeping reforms affecting society as a whole. Women in Louisville came to this work through their clubs and churches, creating a space in the public sphere for themselves while influencing the social and political climate of their city. Most, if not all, of the women chronicled in this thesis participated in multiple child welfare reform efforts in addition to clubs, boards, charitable organizations and social societies. Even those employed full-time managed to participate in a surprising number of benevolent activities.

The changing role of women in America, altered in part by women’s increased access to education, led many of them to what would be today called feminism and a quest for social justice in issues affecting women and children. The shared experience of higher education led many women to search for work and a social identity that fit with their talents and utilized their education.\textsuperscript{390} Frances Ingram and Patty Hill are excellent examples of just such women. Ingram dedicated her life to fighting for social justice for
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children. She fought for restrictions on child labor, to establish juvenile courts, and to protect youngsters from perceived immoral entertainment and amusements. Hill revolutionized kindergarten teaching, both in Louisville and nationally. Neither woman married nor had children, which became more common during the Progressive Era. Some women felt emancipated from the pressure to marry and have a family, and took control of their destinies by pursuing careers or meaningful volunteer work. The irony of social housekeeping was that the purportedly “feminine and motherly service to society” was achieved by a significant decline in the rate of marriage and childbearing. Women born between 1865 and 1874 married later and less frequently than any group before or since; by 1900, almost one in five married women had no children.

Racial reform in the early twentieth century, even when regarding children, remained problematic across the United States, including in Louisville. Some of the reforms I have discussed focused on or included African American children, and those efforts were at times successful, but many times unbalanced. Louisville’s response to racial issues is different from those in the deep south, although not aligning completely with northern attitudes. One expression that often arises when discussing race in Louisville is ‘polite racism’—it remained polite as long as African Americans accepted ‘their place,’ “which was, of course, at the bottom,” according to author George C. Wright. During the Progressive Era, the racism against African Americans in Louisville may not have been ‘polite,’ but remained less overt than in the deep south, and although anti-Semitism manifested itself less vehemently than in the north, it lingered.

---
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Social welfare reform for African Americans in Louisville attempted to balance authentic assistance and compliance with white social norms. Segregation and exclusion of African Americans continued in varying degrees until after World War II. At the Presbyterian Mission and the Plymouth Settlement House, one operated by a southern white man, one by a southern black man, each had the same limited vision to “teach blacks simple skills and make them ideal workers in the homes of whites.” Why was this? Did they believe that blacks were incapable of more? According to Wright, “what troubled whites most was not black laziness or indifference, but attempts by blacks to better themselves.” Of course, many of the students of both institutions aspired to more than domestic service. Little’s manuscript mentions several students who graduated from Tuskegee and the Hampton Institute, and many Presbyterian Mission students were successful educators and business owners. Although the directors of these institutions may not have expected great things from their students, they provided the basis for many to succeed in life.

Most of the ‘public’ child welfare efforts either were segregated or completely ignored black children, and as such, Progressive Era reform reinforced the racial hierarchy of Louisville. The difficulty of racial control over these new ‘public’ spaces many times provoked an insistence on separate accommodations for black children. Two years after the founding of the Free Kindergarten Association it opened a school for
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African American children, and eight years later one for Jewish children. Black children had to wait seven years after the formation of the Recreation League to have one playground— and the League intended for the African American community to bear the brunt of the cost, unlike the other ‘public’ (white) playgrounds funded by community donations to the League. The black children in the eastern part of the city gained a large playground three years later, in 1909, as part of the Presbyterian Mission, not the Recreation League. The juvenile court system was not segregated, although the punishment / rehabilitation facilities were – the same judge and court served both blacks and whites, but the reform schools were segregated, and separate African American probation officers supervised the black juvenile defendants.

The child welfare movement in Louisville and those who worked within it had an impact outside the state in many ways. Louisville reformers received national recognition due to their service on national committees and task forces, while others left the city to initiate efforts in other places. Some used their experience and position to speak at conferences, conventions, and meetings. Frances Ingram of Neighborhood House lectured widely on subjects such as child labor, morality, Americanization, and playgrounds at the National Conference on Social Work, anti-child labor conventions, the National Federation of Settlements, and numerous state and local organizations. John Little traveled all over the south, speaking to church congregations, YMCA supporters, college students, and social workers about his work with the African American community in Louisville. Newspapers ranging from the New York Age to the Tuscaloosa
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News ran stories about Little’s Louisville Mission, and settlement workers across the south eventually attempted to duplicate his formula.402

I assert that Louisville reformers also exerted influence on the national level through child welfare workers from across the country who received training and professional experience in Louisville. Neighborhood House had for many years a mentoring program, with aspiring social workers coming to Louisville to learn settlement work ‘on the job.’ Arthur Leland held his first position in playground management in Louisville. He went on to St. Paul, Denver, and Newport, successfully establishing their first public playgrounds.403 Leland also became an innovator in recreational equipment design, received several patents, and opened a manufacturing plant for playground equipment.404 The Kindergarten Training School graduated students to teach all over the United States, and Patty Smith Hill influenced a generation of kindergarten teachers.405 Without tracing each person receiving professional training in Louisville it is difficult to ascertain the entire breadth of influence Louisville reformers had on child welfare reform, nevertheless, it was important. Both northern and southern cities benefitted from the expertise of Louisville reformers, and this impact is still evident today.

During the Progressive Era, the child welfare reform movement in Louisville, Kentucky did not adhere to strictly northern or southern ideologies, but blended elements
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of both regions and tried to respect traditional southern values while encouraging industrial and social progress. Race was the most contentious of these ideologies, and southern ideas of race relations struggled against the desire for northern industrial progress. Religion played a major role in Louisville’s child welfare reform efforts, yet it was a more northern, Social Gospel leaning faith than might be expected. Those common threads of faith – notably in the Presbyterian and Jewish communities – and Louisville’s long tradition of helping others in need, motivated those at the forefront of the city’s child welfare reforms. Louisville reformers’ affiliations with clubs, religious organizations, and charitable interests provided an informal network of support, strengthening each of their endeavors by association. Politically, social reformers eventually handed over many of their efforts to the state, finding them to be beyond the capabilities of the social and charitable organizations they had founded.406
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