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in Social Settlement Literature, 1880-1930
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This dissertation investigates how motherhood and charity are complicit producers of disabled figures in Progressive Era (1880-1930) social settlement literature: including non-fiction texts, reform fiction, and autobiographically inspired stories. Motherhood, as maternal rhetoric, and charity, as an idea and act, are especially pertinent to depictions of disability in settlement literature. Disabled figures are portrayed as stricken, impoverished, and childlike entities in need of maternal care that social settlements and settlement workers, or charitable institutions and charity workers provide. I establish the theoretical basis of this examination using intersectionality theory, benevolent maternalism, deformance, and stigma to analyze settlement literature. I explore how fiction that centers on social settlement workers depict maternal heteronormative female protagonists who are committed to a paradigm of
charity, consistent with benevolent maternalism and, where applicable, are proponents of eugenic thought and technologies. These protagonists deform the objects of their benevolence. Disabled characters in these books are never central; they characters serve as objects of attention for the fit, American social worker. The worker becomes a symbol of Progressive ideology, representing conventional ideas of motherhood and charity, which in turn deform and construct the disabled characters in the first place. Other texts, written by authors with intimate knowledge of the communities in which settlements are established, create texts that comment on the work of the settlement. The middle class reader witnesses deforming acts as they encounter the relationships that arise in these cross-class, multi-ethnic spaces.

However, on occasion, settlement literature creates empowered, independent characters with impairments or non-normative identities. These agents contest the traditional tropes of motherhood and charity and these texts overturn the established literary expectations about disability. Texts by Jane Addams and Alice Dunbar-Nelson’s resist and nullify this deforming process. These atypical representations of social settlement literature avoid or reverse the deforming forces of charity and paternalist/paternalist rhetoric by performing prenormalization, an act that does not deform, but attempts to return the character and reader to a time before the hegemony of normalcy.

Settlement literature is a rich, relatively underexplored set of texts, and scholars should embrace the breadth of written works that fall into this collection. For instance there is a rich trove of newspaper and magazine articles about the 1915 case of baby Bollinger who was left to die because he had physical disabilities. In this case
settlement directors were solicited as national experts on disability, education, and social practice. Examination of the social creation of disability is rife in these fictional and non-fiction texts. Clearly the ubiquitous examples of motherhood and charity in these texts are frequent complicit producers of disability. This is only part of the story though. Examples of fierce resistance to the deforming power of motherhood and disability are evident as well. Examinations of progressive reform initiatives will benefit from the depictions and descriptions in settlement literature. These texts transmit experience and knowledge about the unique powers of maternal rhetoric, benevolent maternalism, charitable efforts, and deformance, but they also transmit powerful messages about resistance and agency that are just as important.
Introduction

From City Streets to Intersectionality: Historical and Theoretical Foundations

On November 17, 1915, Allen and Anna Bollinger’s five-day old baby died because Chicago surgeon, Dr. Harry J. Haiselden had withheld life-saving surgery from their son. Baby Bollinger was born with numerous impairments including only one ear and structural abnormalities in his shoulder and chest. Without a relatively simple surgical procedure, the baby would die from a blockage in his lower intestinal tract (Pernick, Robertson). Dr. Haiselden counseled the parents who never saw their son, to let him die because he would be physically and cognitively impaired. Dr. John Dill Robertson, Commissioner of Health of the City of Chicago, also examined the child while he was still alive and ordered two separate autopsies after his death. However, Robertson testified he saw no evidence for Dr. Haiselden’s assertion that the child would be “mentally defective except that which would come from the absence of the sense of hearing on the right side” (Robertson 2025). From this dramatic incident, Dr. Haiselden’s past actions were exposed; he had allowed several other disabled infants to die from lack of care. In the months and years after baby Bollinger died, numerous families contacted Haiselden to withhold treatment and end the lives of their children, or attempt very risky corrective surgeries that the children did not survive (Pernick 4-5).

Newspapers cataloged statements by experts and average citizens alike on the ethical and social consequences of Haiselden’s actions. Newspaper descriptions of the powerlessness of disabled individuals and their miserable lives barraged the public. The media-fueled controversy about baby Bollinger’s life and death raised arguments
about good breeding and the careful culling of defective children who were imagined as potentially criminal and positively menacing. Members of the public felt that they knew what being disabled was like and that they were obliged to intervene on behalf of disabled individuals as responsible caretakers of national fitness.

Dr. Haiselden, a proponent of eugenics and self-appointed caretaker of the national body, had determined that baby Bollinger was unfit for life and let him die. In addition, he made sure that his decision became a huge public spectacle. He was determined to continue public discussion about the moment when eugenics, meets motherhood and disability, so Dr. Haiselden co-authored and starred in a fictionalized movie version of the Bollinger case (Pernick 143-50). His professional practices and his cinematic creation constituted an abhorrent spectacle of defining, stigmatizing, vilifying, and then eradicating disability. This historical example illustrates the approach that countless eugenicists and numerous progressive reformers took toward disabled individuals—guardianship and/or extermination were technologies that refined the quality and power of the nation.

Lillian Wald, a nurse and Henry Street settlement founder, offered qualified support for Haiselden’s difficult decision, “extraordinary measures are not justified in prolonging life in a being who is destined to misery and suffering and who may be a positive menace to society” (The Independent 25). However, Hull House founder and public figure Jane Addams spoke out vehemently against the death of baby Bollinger. Addams argued that this child was a son and a citizen, not the menacing criminal and dependent cripple he was depicted as. He deserved fair treatment as a citizen, Addams stated, and should receive an education due any of the nation’s children. The debates
about the fate of baby Bollinger furnishes historical example in which motherhood,
disability, and the national quest for an able-bodied nation converged as rhetorical
actors upon the pages of the nation’s magazines and newspapers. Authors of fiction
and non-fiction texts explored the role of literal and figurative motherhood, and
charitable work with working poor and immigrant populations. This dissertation
explores the literary production of disabled characters in novels, short fiction, and
non-fiction texts about social settlements. In particular, I consider how maternal
rhetoric and charitable efforts create disabled characters or disrupt narratives about the
treatment (or creation) of disability and disabled people in Progressive Era literature
about social settlements.

Social settlement literature reproduces the urban locales where settlement and
charity workers—representatives of an empowered national identity—lived and
worked side by side with impoverished, disenfranchised, and disabled participant-objects of social reform and benevolence work. Within the literary representations of
these turbulent spaces and fraught relationships, I first explore maternal and charitable
discourses that create deformed and weakened characters. Secondly, I show a few
compelling examples of characters rising up and denying these pressures to deform
and impair. Lastly, I analyze texts that decry the disfiguring and destructive results of
maternally conceived benevolent or social reform work.

Social settlements are a phenomenon of the Progressive Era. Social settlements
were protean urban spaces in impoverished neighborhoods where educated, upper-and
middle-class, usually white women lived and worked, sometimes collaboratively with
their neighbors. These neighbors were generally impoverished and working poor
individuals and families. Many of the neighbors were immigrants, particularly immigrants from Europe. Well-established communities that they entered often considered these neighbors not exactly white. In some areas of New York and Chicago, the neighbors were African American transplants from Southern states. By the late nineteenth century, Chicago and New York were the two most populated cities in the United States and were home to numerous settlements. Thus, I analyze texts published from the late 1880s to the late 1920s that depict settlements in Chicago and New York, though I will make a short sojourn to the streets of the mid-Atlantic region of the country with an essay by Sarah Collins Fernandis (1863-1951) who worked with the Colored Social Settlement in Washington D.C.

This project explores how writers reflected the cross-class interactions in collaborative or unidirectional projects among middle-class female settlement residents or workers and their neighbors. Mothering and charity were common templates for these relations, and could yield deforming results. Other relations by contrast, those that were collaborative or grounded in mutual respect, could yield empowering results. These outcomes were sometimes empowering for both the neighbor and worker. These dynamics warrant a close look because analysis often flattens them as wholly destructive or ameliorative, when in reality, such interactions depicted in non-fiction and fictional texts about the social settlement are far more complex and nuanced. Settlement writing encompasses a variety of genres—the novel, short story, poetry, essay, and memoir. The authors occupied multiple subject positions including—reformer, philosopher, activist, journalist, novelist, neighbor, and object of reform. The social settlement links these writers and their texts. In these
texts, the settlement can be a home, a part of an urban setting, an inanimate character, or a representation of ideology.

The texts chosen for this examination span the familiar to the forgotten. Jane Addams’s (1860-1935) *Twenty Years at Hull-House* (1910) and William Dean Howells’s (1837-1920) *A Hazard of New Fortunes* (1890) are central texts in the Progressive Era canon. Whereas in comparison to these well-known texts, I examine less familiar texts by familiar authors such as the story “Eleanore Cuyler” from Richard Harding Davis’s (1864-1916) collection *Van Bibber, and Others* (1892), the novel *Salome of the Tenements* (1923) by Anzia Yezierska (1880?-1970), and a collection of short stories *Annals of `Steenth Street* (1900-10) by Alice Dunbar-Nelson (1875-1935). Lastly, I include Elia Wilkinson Peattie’s (1862-1935) novel *The Precipice* (1914). Last published in 1989, scholars have largely ignored *The Precipice*. This collection of texts allows me to expand the expected canon of Progressive Era literature both by naming settlement literature as its own genre, and broadening the corpus of texts worthy of further analysis.

“Eleanore Cuyler” and *The Precipice* feature the settlement as setting and the driving force for the expectations and goals of the female protagonists. These settlement stories are compared to William Dean Howells’s realist social critique novel *A Hazard of New Fortunes* that lacks a social settlement, but is partially set in the Lower East Side of New York City amid the streets that surrounded the College Settlement established in 1889 and the Henry Street Settlement established in 1893. Howells’s novel explores questions of charity, poverty, and motherhood within the
bustling city streets. *A Hazard of New Fortunes* raises questions of individual agency in the face of powerful social and economic forces.

This project also engages autobiographically inspired works by writer-neighbors who describe the lives of the women, men, and children who lived in east side New York City neighborhoods where settlements existed. In particular, I examine Alice Dunbar-Nelson’s *Annals of ’Steenth Street* (1900-10), which tells the tales of a neighborhood of immigrants and first generation Americans where the saloon-cum-community center meets its match when a social settlement is established in the neighborhood. Anzia Yezierska’s semi-autobiographical novel *Salome of the Tenements* (1923) furthers Dunbar-Nelson’s critique of the social settlement. These authors share identities with the settlement neighbors that populate their stories.

Lastly, I turn the critical lens to Jane Addams’s texts “Charitable Effort” (1902), “The Home and the Special Child” (1908), “Problems of Poverty” from *Twenty Years at Hull-House* (1910) and her statements about the death of baby Bollinger in 1915. The selections from Addams’s voluminous corpus focus on her own critical examination of charity, motherhood, as they relate to disability and poverty in isolated urban neighborhoods of America. Through an exploration of these texts, I identify the relationship among maternal rhetoric, charitable and social work interventions, and stigmatized and disabled bodies modulated by a progressive ideology—an ideology that harnessed the powers of science and nationalism into relationships that worked to empower, disable, and/or reform. The death of baby Bollinger in Chicago’s German-American Hospital is just such an example of the treatment of impaired and
stigmatized individuals, as they were understood in a time of scientific progress, eugenic ideology, and in a nation soon to be embroiled in World War I.

Turning back the focus to the late nineteenth century, American cities, particularly New York City and Chicago were experiencing incredible growth and change. Industrialization, urbanization, and immigration from Europe and Asia transformed Northern cities. Within the United States the Great Migration of African American men and women from the South to the North to the cities for work and greater freedom, in part creating black ghettos apart from but just as isolated and even more impoverished than the ghettos of poor and foreign European Americans. Unhealthy, unsafe, and overcrowded living conditions as well as dangerous and unregulated working conditions resulted in rampant disease, disability, crime, and death. Thus, the communities depicted in social settlement literature were rife with poverty, disability, racial and ethnic prejudices, and problematic cross-class interactions with charity and social workers. Social settlements and charitable organizations were a nexus of these disparate identities and forces and, I will argue that in some cases this very contact of difference created the stigmatized identities that members of the local community came to embody. However, I will also show that some writers recognized this debilitating process and worked to uncover it, counteract it, and reverse it.

In this introduction, I contextualize the conditions, community, and struggles of those people who resided in and around social settlements in the northern American cities during the Progressive Era in order to set up the historical framework to support my analysis of social settlement literature. In particular, I am not only interested in the
women who established, lived in, and worked with the social settlements, but also the neighbors who engaged with the settlement through their contributions, participation, and solicitations. In addition, I develop pertinent literary theories and critical interventions in order to offer a nuanced examination of this relatively unexplored genre of social settlement literature and its historical circumstances. Settlement literature needs a recognized place, alongside and within other groups of texts such as reform, benevolence, and protest literature. As I am historically contextualizing populations and places while simultaneously interweaving genealogies of different and overlapping schools of critical thought, the boundaries between history and theory will necessarily become porous. Lastly, I equip the reader with the analytical paradigms central to my investigation of the texts to come. These key notions include: stigma, deformance, intersectionality theory, and benevolent maternalism.

**The American Metropolis, 1880-1900**

The U.S. in the late nineteenth century had crossed a threshold in terms of industrial production, financial influence, urban density, and political power. Having secured land from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, the United States became preoccupied with international expansion. Domestically, in cities like Chicago and New York City, manufacturing was prospering; people were flooding urbanward from the farmlands and Southern cities, and from the cities and countryside of Europe (and beyond). At this time, women were entering the workforce and living independently in large numbers for the first time, and science was advancing and exerting authority over new quarters of human life.
Social and political upheavals, widespread poverty, and natural disasters abroad combined with greater access to transportation triggered mass migrations of people to the U.S. from around the world. Multitudes arrived to the U.S. hoping to find The Promised Land, where work and food were plentiful. These successive waves of immigration to America, particularly to the cities, pushed metropolises beyond their capacity. Many cities suffered under the weight of problems unprecedented in their nature or scale. Problems such as lack of sanitation, scarcity of childcare, rampant poverty, widespread disease and disabling accidents, as well as unchecked crime needed to be fixed or ameliorated. Manhattan’s Lower East Side and Chicago’s Nineteenth Ward bristled with newly arrived immigrant populations, and factories and workshops that churned along on the toil of cheap, replaceable laborers. Individual neighborhoods had fluctuating populations and demographics, which exacerbated the difficulties. The city was incapable or unwilling to fix these problems, especially as many issues needed local fixes. Social settlements addressed the evolving needs of the community, while bringing systemic problems to the attention of municipal leadership. America’s two great urban centers, Manhattan and Chicago, were germinal locations in the establishment of the settlement movement. For this reason—and because these cities were tied to each other by the Erie Canal and the railroad system—the geographical focus of this project is mostly confined to New York City and Chicago.²

In the late nineteenth century scores of women moved from the countryside and small towns of the U.S. to seek jobs and a new kind of life in the city. Young women flocked to these bursting metropolises from across the country some with
vocational training, some with formal education, some with limited options, and some with more hope than skill. Upper-and middle-class women who could afford to were going to college in record numbers. Some went to schools that honed the skills needed by wives in cultured circles. The rise of normal schools, particularly in the Midwest, helped produce trained teachers and other educational and managerial workers from the middle and working classes. With increasing frequency women attended colleges that focused on academic and practical subjects and some women went on to graduate schools and professional careers. These institutions instilled a sense of purpose. These schools did not assume that women were going to spend their entire lives in domestic pursuits.

For instance, Vida Dutton Scudder (1861-1954) who helped to found the College Settlement Association, which in turn opened the Rivington Street Settlement (1889) in New York City and Denison House (1891) in Boston, attended Smith College. Scudder went on to Oxford and then took an academic position at Wellesley College. She was both an English professor and a social activist and reform-minded novelist. So too, Florence Kelley (1859-1932) was a Hull House insider and central to turn-of-the-century labor reform. Kelley graduated from Cornell University, and then traveled to Switzerland to pursue a PhD at the University of Zurich. Kelley, an ardent Socialist, arrived at Hull House in the winter of 1891. She was key to transforming Chicago’s famous social settlement from an institution that served the various needs of the neighbors to one that brought its neighbors and their concerns to the state and national stage, organizing unions, investigating and prosecuting labor abuses, and helping to pass legislation that sought better working conditions for those in the
Nineteenth Ward and beyond. For instance, white women Scudder and Kelley were definitely privileged exceptions in terms of educational and professional opportunities for women in the 1880s; however, women like them, few though they may be, were pivotal to the establishment of the settlement movement in America.

The transformation that women, especially middle-class, native-born white women were enjoying was not without backlash. Newspapers and politicians cited white extinction as frightening possibility as the women, who were symbols of American motherhood, became more professionally and politically active and bore fewer children than immigrant or non-white mothers. In 1906 Theodore Roosevelt warned the nation about the possibility of “national death, race death” in his annual speech to Congress. “Roosevelt's warning that the falling birthrate among native-born women would lead to ‘race death’ reflects both his own fear that college-educated, middle-class women might choose vocations other than marriage and motherhood” Allison Berg writes (1). Waves of Europeans and Asians immigrating to the U.S. further exacerbated this fear.

**Mother, Reformer, Visionary, Disabler**

These middle- and upper class, white professional women, such as Scudder, Kelley, and Jane Addams, were breaking new ground for the women who followed by choosing education and employment over full-time domestic and maternal commitments. While women did not yet have the vote, they were not without considerable influence. Women reformers and activists influenced in the improvement of social services in America and abroad. For instance, Seth Koven and Sonya Michel
draw a line between women's efforts to improve the lives of men, women, and children in terms of basic social services and the rise of the welfare state due to a maternalist movement, which moved across Great Britain and Europe as well as in America. Koven and Michel's article, “Womanly Duties: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of Welfare States in France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, 1880-1920” describes the shift from maternalist to feminist rhetoric. Koven and Michel place the persuasive use of motherhood in women's reform work into an international context. Jane Addams, for instance, became an international figure in dialogue with reformers on both sides of the Atlantic. This scholarship is relevant to my analysis because settlement leaders made use of both maternalist and feminist rhetoric in their work. Social settlements became an important force in the creation and reform of many social welfare institutions, such as the juvenile justice system. Moreover, some of the women who led American settlement work were influential in national and international reform work. Maternalism, according to Koven and Michel encompasses “ideologies that exalted women's capacity to mother and extended to society as a whole the values of care, nurturance, and morality” (1079).

In practice social activism in the name of the mother often led to a conflicting use of maternalism as a justification for women's role in government and social initiatives. "Maternalism always operated on two levels: it extolled the private virtues of domesticity while simultaneously legitimating women's public relationship to politics and the state, to community, workplace, and marketplace,” but it also worked to redefine distinctions of public vs. private or male vs. female domains (Koven and Michel 1079). Historians have explored at great length gendered public and private
spheres as social constructions. However, the notion of separate spheres now accepted as an over simplified dichotomy, though it was once a useful distinction.⁷

Women working under the banner of maternalism brought important issues under civic control, establishing or expanding municipal funding and oversight of juvenile justice and workplace safety in new ways. Koven and Michel suggest women were generally, “the first to identify the social welfare needs of mothers and children and respond to them through a wide array of charitable activities” (1079). Many women were able to take up reform initiatives by casting their work as municipal housekeeping. Sanitation enforcement and the care of the disabled became the purview of women. The juvenile justice system became the work and responsibility of women like Hull House resident Julia Lathrop (who was childless). President Taft appointed Lathrop (1858-1932) as the first director of the Children’s Bureau in Washington, D.C. and she then staffed her offices with a cadre of women professionals (Scott xviii-xix).

As Koven and Michel point out, maternal discourse was integral to the ability of women to access and justify participation in the socio-political realm. While this participation and change was beneficial to the women and often to the community, it also allowed women to seize opportunities for meting out services. Acting as purveyors of services and arbiters of needs, these women put themselves in a position of power that led them to take up roles as deformers of a new stripe. This increased participation in the institutionalization of services put more and more women in positions to disable their neighbors, while simultaneously deeming them worthy of charity.
This complex relationship between women reformers and activists who work in settlement houses is one focus of this project. For instance, Heather Ostman’s article “Maternal Rhetoric in Jane Addams’s Twenty Years at Hull-House” claims that Addams used the rhetoric of motherhood to empower herself as a uniquely qualified speaker and as an individual who had the care-giving skills most needed by society. Ostman’s observation is correct, but I contend that Addams’s rhetoric of female empowerment went much further to argue that women, especially educated middle-class women, have the right and duty to work away from their families, delaying or eschewing domestic obligations. Addams’s uses maternal rhetoric to describe her own special skills, but tweaks the rhetoric in order to make a feminist argument for liberating young women from the bonds of marriage and children. She argues that daughters should bring their talents, education, and maternal abilities into the cities where they can share the cultural capital of their educations with individuals and communities disenfranchised by middle- and upper class society and systematically ignored by municipal government. According to Addams, no liberty or social good is secure for anyone as long as there is such a disparity of wealth and opportunity (“Subjective Necessity” 17-18; Twenty Years 76). Sending America’s women, along with their education, labor, and in some cases financial support, to the communities with the most need was an expedient method bringing the national inequality of resources and opportunities into balance.

The manipulation, abandonment, or embrace of “maternal” identities by female settlement workers in order to have a professional life away from their families is evident in the fictional social settlement literature also. At the climax of Elia Peattie’s
*The Precipice*, Kate Barrington claims that she cannot be a biological mother because she is “mother” to multitudes of children, many yet to be born. Only her maternal interventions separate the children from grinding forces of poverty, sickness, and disability (235). This example shows that a female reformer or social worker can use an appeal to motherhood to create a real or perceived power imbalance. Charity and the “treatment” of impairment is the basis for the relationship between a social worker and America’s poor, dirty, abused, and disabled children. By naming herself mother to children she deems needy, Kate has stigmatized all the children who might come under her gaze—these children have been judged deficient and thus become deformed, so that she can rehabilitate them. At her public speeches in Washington D.C. and Los Angeles about the incredible needs of America’s poor and disabled children the reader can envision the social creation of disability spreading across the nation everywhere like streams of transformative energy from her fingertips.

This relationship between settlement worker and neighbor child is *benevolent maternalism* writ large (Garland-Thomson). Benevolent paternalism is a relation of charity that is by nature unbalanced in terms of access to resources and social power. Benevolent maternalism first works to impoverish and then enrich the recipient in order to bolster the moral standing of the benefactor. Additionally, in the exchange of services or assistance found in benevolent maternalism, the benefactor recognizes the recipient as a member of the worthy poor; an act in of itself constitutes an expression of the power relation between the two parties. The worthy poor or “disabled figures thus legitimated the middle-class woman’s move out of the sequestered home while remaining within the maternal role” (Garland-Thomson 89). Behaviors such as
gratitude, moral uprightness, and the pursuit of cultural values such as thrift, cleanliness, and productivity determined the worthiness of the destitute and disabled. Thus, maternal rhetoric and benevolent maternalism can liberate women from the cultural constraints of class-based domestic and familial expectations into the roles of settlement, charity, and social worker as deformer.

**Mutable Social Settlements**

Social settlements were, and are still, usually located within communities of women and men who embody an array of ethnicities, races, classes, impairments, and social, religious, and political allegiances. Social settlements began in England in 1884 when Samuel and Henrietta Barnett founded the University Settlement at Toynbee Hall. Shortly thereafter American reformers began to establish settlements. By 1897 there were more than 70 settlements in the U.S., most of which were founded in Chicago and along the East Coast. The social settlement was not an institution with a clearly defined structure or purpose; therefore, there was a great deal of variation between the missions and organization of different settlements. The vision of individual founders and the specific demands of the local community guided these mutable establishments.

For instance, the College Settlement opened in 1889, just one week before Hull House opened in Chicago. Upper and middle-class white female graduates from Wellesley, Smith, and Vassar colleges staffed it. The College Settlement was established as a women-only endeavor. Addams and her partner, Ellen Gates Starr (1859-1940), began Hull House with a commitment to help the neighbors, but the
young women did not know what the neighbors needed in the beginning and they did not discriminate about who could join them: Hull House included women and some men, people with and without college degrees. Settlement workers, in the early years, were upper and middle-class, and white. However, over time the staff at Hull-House became more diverse, as people from the surrounding neighborhood began to fill positions.  

Social settlements were not explicitly institutions of charity, but they sought to meet community needs. Particularly in the beginning, the neighbors of the settlement house, not the residents, identified needs. Hull House tried to offer services rather than handouts. Neighbors and not by the residents initiated many activities. It was common for the residents to work collaboratively with the neighbors, instead of in a unidirectional, hierarchical manner. This sort of two-way relationship has become the foundation for the philosophical scholarship that examines Jane Addams as a care ethicist. Many times Addams and other Hull House residents were able to lend their cultural and political capital to residents in order to empower community members to enact change or get their concerns noticed—though this interaction is not without its own critical complexities. Workers and neighbors gathered data about the irregularity of trash collection and used that data to push for enforcement of their due municipal services. Using the data that was gathered and analyzed, new city standards regarding sanitation and legislation about child labor, and other such relevant issues were established.

The nature and missions of different settlements varied and institutional trajectories evolved over time. Certainly in the settlements that Yezierska describes in
her 1920s fiction, the workers do not perceive themselves as in collaborative relationships with their neighbors. Yezierska depicts the settlement employees as low-paid, unskilled, unreflective charity workers or self-righteous scientifically trained social workers that have no insight into the nature of their objects of charity or reform. In *Salome of the Tenements*, the social workers have a Tayloresque view of family life and no evident humanity. Yezierska’s protagonist Sonya, and Lower East Side neighbors resent these unappealing settlement workers. However, as Jane Addams conceived of Hull House the settlement was not a site of unidirectional charity, but a site of collaboration and reciprocal relationships.

Addams provides an anecdote in the chapter “Problems of Poverty” to illustrate the difference between charity and collaborative intervention (*Twenty*). One winter a neighborhood family needed material support from the settlement during a period when the father, and primary breadwinner, was out of work. Before coming to Hull House for help, they had pawned most of the furniture and were keeping the children home from school for lack of shoes. Hull House gave the family material assistance to get them through their rough time. Two years later, when the family was back on their feet financially and had recovered their former domestic circumstances they invited Addams to Sunday dinner. The dinner invitation, explained the wife, was to make sure that Addams really knew the family as they had lived the bulk of their life. For the wife, it would not do for Addams to only know them as living in a crisis, when in fact they were generally a self-sufficient family. Addams recounts the wife’s explanation: “She said that it was as if she had met me [Addams], not as I am ordinarily, but as I should appear misshapen with rheumatism or with a face distorted
by neuralgic pain; that it was not fair to judge poor people that way” (Twenty 109-10). The wife equates her family’s poverty, displayed publicly by taking charity, as similar to the public display of a facial disfigurement. In these two situations, the naïve viewer has little to base an assessment of the other upon but visible circumstances, be it poverty or disability. Not only does this story highlight how individuals analogize poverty with disability, but this example, according to Addams, demonstrates the difference between charities and settlement: charities are there *for* people when they are in need, settlements are there *with* people in need and plenty.

The fact that Hull House and the residents were a part of the neighborhood day in and day out, allowed the neighbors to maintain or regain their sense of dignity if they fell on hardship and needed to accept help from the settlement. The residents were witness to the neighbors’ good times as well as their hardships unlike a charity with workers who come into the neighborhood and then leave. The relationship between the settlement, its residents, and the neighborhood it served is profoundly different from that of a charity, its workers, and the needy recipients. Yet, despite this difference, there is a constant normative pressure for the settlement neighbors or objects of charity to conform to middle-class values of dress, hygiene, and behavior. The settlement workers’ mere presence in the neighborhood and the homes of the neighbors exerts a tacit pressure to conform. Addams’s vignette about the family suggests that the family did not feel the settlement could preserve their dignity while they were in need. While the family was in need, the help of the settlement was no better than that of a charity. The difference lies in the fact that the family had the opportunity to regain their dignity. Their dignity is restored in the eyes of the
community at large, in the eyes of the settlement workers, or in the eyes of the Jane Addams through their ability to provide a good meal in a comfortable setting to Addams, arguably the most well known resident in the neighborhood.

Addams’s story offers the intended audience, likely a middle-class reader living outside Chicago’s Nineteenth Ward, a sense of this female neighbor’s feelings about taking help from the settlement. This anecdote is an excerpt from *Twenty Years at Hull-House*. *Twenty Years at Hull-House* is not just Addams’s memoir, but it is a persuasive treatise intended to bring the streets, tenements, and residents of the Nineteenth Ward into the sitting rooms and hands of suburban readers. *Twenty Years* allows people living far from inner-city Chicago a chance to see the world through the eyes of working poor families, immigrant children, single mothers laboring in sweatshops, and other members of America whose lives might always be hidden. However, Addams always manages this gaze. The narratives of local lives fulfill the rhetorical purposes of creating a public sense of what life in the Nineteenth Ward was like, making the local residents seem human and admirable, and calling critical attention to the problems of charity. These were Addams’s goals.

This example from *Twenty Years* allows readers to understand that taking money from Hull House disgraced; she wants to restore her sense of dignity within the community. Addams frequently includes personal narratives in order to present the reader with an array of distinct viewpoints, (theoretically) through the eyes of the neighbors. Telling the story from the neighbor’s point of view, or at least attempting to tell their story, supports the notion that people from all areas of the community, city, or nation are or should be actors in the creation of a just, cooperative, and democratic
society. Maurice Hamington’s suggests that Addams’s work and philosophy reflects a commitment to what we now call standpoint theory. Hamington writes, “she believed recognizing alternative standpoints was important in promoting social progress through sympathetic understanding” and in practice that meant finding opportunities which allow the voices of the neighbors to be heard across community and class boundaries. (“Jane Addams”). This anecdote about the family that invites Addams to dinner after they have taken charity from Hull House is an example of the family’s situated knowledge about the implications of poverty and charity.9

Charlene Haddock Siegfried cites Jane Addams’s work and Hull House as examples of the convergence of personal commitment and vocational action. “The pragmatist position that values do and should guide scientific and philosophic projects supported women’s beliefs that as women they had something special to contribute . . .” (Siegfried, Pragmatism 68). Such an assertion about the goals of the female reformers comes off as a bit naïve, but Siegfried contends that female residents of Hull House lived in intimate relations with their neighbors and the living conditions of the Nineteenth Ward which guaranteed that they were anything but naïve (Pragmatism 76-77).10 “In settlement life it is impossible not to see how deep and fundamental are the inequalities in our democratic country,” writes Dr. Alice Hamilton, a twenty-year resident at Hull House (Exploring 75). Such observations, based on years of local experience with the evolving populations and environment of the Halsted Street neighborhood informed the feminist pragmatism of settlement founder, Jane Addams, and industrial safety pioneer Alice Hamilton. Not surprisingly then, the work and the texts of Addams and Hamilton, which call for radical social change, are in contrast to
social settlement literature by authors from Richard Harding Davis, to Elia Peattie, Alice Dunbar-Nelson, and Anzia Yezierska.

Theoretical Interventions in History and Historical Interventions in Theory

The essays, novels, stories, and memoirs examined in this study all take social settlements and the surrounding neighborhoods as their locus of activity. The work of Hull House residents Jane Addams and Alice Hamilton has shown that a central aspect of the settlement is the recognition and desire to change the “deep and fundamental . . . inequalities in our democratic country” (Hamilton, *Exploring* 75). This focus on the economic disparities and the inequity in the access to opportunity and municipal service pushes me to investigate how the texts convey messages about, nationalism, reform ideology, local power relations, and relationships that focus on gender, class, nationality, embodied identities, ability, ethnicity, and race.

To ground my exploration of these aspects of shared human experience and depictions of human identity and literary production I draw upon Erving Goffman’s foundational work on stigma. The stigmatized identity that Goffman theorizes becomes pivotal to my analysis of the textual representations of interactions between the settlement staff and the impoverished, foreign, and disabled community members. “Stigma,” Goffman writes: “refer[s] to an attribute that is deeply discrediting, but it should be seen that a language of relationships, not attributes, is really needed. An attribute that stigmatizes one type of possessor can confirm the usualness of another, and therefore is neither creditable nor discreditable as a thing in itself” (3).

Consequently, any negativity ascribed to the person with a perceived stigmatizing
attribute (whether it be physical, social, or cultural) is thus a result of a judgment that is culturally bound. In the context of these novels, essays, and memoirs, relationships that highlight differences in race, nationality, class, and ability are the focus especially as motherhood and charity are mechanisms by which characters contain and justify relationships of difference. A great deal of reform and charity work is predicated the need to rectify or make invisible a lack or deformation.

Disability, poverty, and racial or ethnic differences—which marked bodies as outside the norm of the white American—gave rise to stigmatized identities endured by those excluded from the white middle class. For this study, it is imperative to consider the standpoints and multiple social identities of my subjects of analysis, including the historical figures of the settlement neighbors, residents, and reformers, as well as the authors and characters found in the texts explored herein. My examination of these individual actors or groups of actors must acknowledge their individual standpoints in relation to *entities of power*. Entities of power include groups such as local police and immigration authorities as well as landlords, charity workers, and settlement workers. Standpoint theory, according to Patricia Collins, explains how “group location in hierarchical power relations produces shared challenges for individuals in those groups. These common challenges can foster similar angles of vision leading to a group knowledge or standpoint that in turn can influence the group’s political action” (205). For instance, poor, non-native, ethnically non-white people who lived in the Lower East Side of Manhattan had their own set of experiences with police officer(s) and charity worker(s). This situated knowledge garnered from a particular social and material experience, provides the bearer, Lower
East Siders in this case with generally “similar angles of vision” shared among the members of the community. These positioned identities accumulate situated knowledges that are crucial for a nuanced understanding of a discrete community. These situated identities may be self-defined or defined by external forces.

To illustrate, Collins observes that race and gender can define one with an *immutable* identity that is not voluntary. Even when the repercussions of that identity are disadvantageous, one cannot shed this immutable identity (207). So too, for many individuals, though certainly not all, disability, ethnicity, even poverty become identity markers that define and situate them in relation to others, especially in relationship to power. In fact, in Yezierska’s stories, “Soap and Water,” “Children of Loneliness,” and “Wings,” dirt and poor grooming is not only enough to stigmatize a person, but is enough to alienate a person from access to power. “Shenah Pessah sensed that . . . she was different . . . She had noticed [the public librarians] hands on the desk and she became aware that her own were calloused and rough. That is why she felt her dirty finger-nails curl in awkwardly to hide themselves as she held the pen to sign her name” (“Wings” 13). Shenah’s awareness that she is dressed and groomed differently than the librarian evokes a physical response of curling inward. Her response signals her recognition that she is separated by an invisible gulf from the uptown world of libraries and universities. She feels the stigma of the dirt, poverty, and ethnic identity. For most of Yezierska’s characters, the stigma associated with ethnic identity does not bind them to their neighbors, but instead it drives the characters to isolate themselves from their community in order to strive for a life that
both rejects middle class values and rises above and away from the slums of the Lower East Side.

For the real-life men and women who lived in the Nineteenth Ward of Chicago and the Lower East Side of New York, social settlement neighbor and resident alike, the group identity that shaped their relationship to power and to others was not a singular identity of Bohemian, East Sider, or settlement resident, but a multiple and intersectional identity. The women and men of the settlement neighborhoods are not just marked as immigrants or impoverished or disabled or women, they are a myriad of such identities and more. A careful exploration of the characters in the historical and fictional texts I have chosen must not ignore differences within groups, unique intersectional identities, and even the intersectionality of groups of individuals, because to ignore the multiplicity silences crucial portions of lived identities (Crenshaw 357).

For this research, a most important aspect of intersectionality theory is the way in which it is mutually constitutive. Not only do the members of a certain group of people recognize their shared identity, so do social and governmental institutions and individual wielders of power (charity workers for instance). However, as Patricia Collins points out, “[i]ndividuals can more readily see intersections of race, gender, class, and sexuality in how they construct their identities as individuals than in how social institutions rely on these same ideas in reproducing group identities” (209). Group membership and the regulation of membership limits become even more critical when the meting out goods and services occurs (Collins 208). A number of
social mechanisms perpetuate this policing of identities and group memberships, working to stigmatize certain identities while validating others.

For instance, stigmas such as disability or non-whiteness transformed individuals into objects of rehabilitation. The throngs of immigrants from Europe and beyond began arriving in the 1890s and filled the cheap tenements of the urban slums. Generally, they were not considered white, nor were their American-born children. Given that settlement literature is predominantly set in impoverished, immigrant communities, critical historical scholarship on the messy and discordant relationship between whiteness, ethnicity, and race, like that done by Matthew Frye Jacobson and David R. Roediger, is necessary for understanding the significance of whiteness to Progressive Era charitable relations. Such scholarship is also important to the debates about who belongs in the metaphorical American family portrait.

Recalling the historical context—industrialization and its attendant urbanization, and the increasing success, institutionalization, and valorization of science—we have set the stage for a variety of mechanisms of identity production. In “Nationalism and Deafness: The Nineteenth Century” Lennard Davis argues that with the rise of nationalism and imperialism the need for both a fit national body and a more finely honed theory of difference increased dramatically. He shows how disability and non-native born white racial or ethnic identities were othered by their figurative distance from able-bodied whiteness.

Nineteenth-century social and human science attempted to answer questions about race and ethnicity through developments in measurement, classification, and statistical analysis. Eugenic mechanisms of classification often conflated disability and
criminality with race (“race” used by Francis Galton is inclusive of identity markers which we would call “ethnicity” today). This conflation, with its aura of scientific truth, linked stigmatized identities and pathological behavior. Eugenics’ appearance of scientific validity reverberated in state-sanctioned and informal practices of exclusion, and tinged many human interactions with fear or hatred of those who were marked by seemingly pathological identities. The disciplinary apparatus of eugenics—as well as the management of immigration and distributions of charity—empowered entities to produce docile bodies “that may be subjected, used, transformed, and improved” (Foucault Discipline 136). These technologies, in the hands of agents of science, charity, or the state, measured individuals and declared which were fit to be citizens, worthy of charity, or suitable for parenthood.

In the quest for a fit national body, motherhood was a key location for eugenic gatekeeping. Physical and mental disability was the wolf menacing the gate from without. This was about creating subjects who were part of the whole nation, but also who were defined, isolated, and controlled. Charitable and reform institutions became additional locations for biological gatekeeping and control. People who administered these institutions had the power to rank, assimilate, conceal, and in some cases, confine. The bio-power created by these institutions, the “explicit calculations [that] made knowledge-power an agent of transformation” and management, offers a mechanism to maintain order in a capitalist state (Foucault Sexuality 140-41). The delineation of race and ethnicity through eugenic technology was an evolving mechanism of bio-power during the Progressive Era, in part motivated by the changing demographics of the American continent, and advances in science.
Since the scientific, or more aptly pseudoscientific, practices of race monitoring evolved over the fifty-year span that my research examines, it is necessary to consider the development of race theory historically. In the nineteenth century until the early decades of the twentieth century, anthropologists looked to biology to develop a theory of the races. From the meeting of the biological and social sciences arose “scientific” racism. Social reform and charitable institutions developed sometimes complicit, sometimes remediative, sometimes disinterested relationships with scientific racism.

In *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*, Michael Omi and Howard Winant suggest that the *biological* theory of race was edged out by *ethnicity* as a dominant model around 1920. Three paradigmatic measures of racial identity dominated from the 1920s and 30s onward: ethnicity, class, and nation (Omi and Winant). In the last fifty years, though, critical analyses of the implications of racial identity in the United States has witnessed the primacy of *ethnicity* challenged by *class* and *nation* as the key paradigms:

> These theoretical challenges originated with the black and other minority movements which rejected two central aspects of the ethnicity approach: the European immigrant analogy which suggested that racial minorities could be incorporated into American life in the same way that white ethnic groups had been, and the assumption of a fundamental, underlying American commitment to equality and social justice for racial minorities. (12)

Therefore, class-based differences or the membership requirements of political bodies partially construct and define race. Important distinctions exist between the experiences of racism and stigma endured by immigrants from Europe versus the experience endured by individuals who are Native American, African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Latino Omi and Winant argue. This observation is valid
and important, and certainly, a belief held by numerous writer-reformers, both white and black, affiliated with the settlement movement during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Progressive Era settlements were nexus of interaction across class, social, and ethnic difference; however, most large social settlements were racially segregated and black settlements served the black community exclusively. It is thus necessary to recognize the difference between settlements that served ethnic minorities and settlements that served racial minorities.

Many of the writers and activists associated with social settlements spoke out against the isolation of large impoverished African-American communities segregated from both middle-class and immigrant enclaves. A dearth of money, as well as a lack of manpower committed to social services for the black neighborhoods compounded this isolation and deprivation. The proliferation of settlements in white immigrant communities further exacerbated the gross inequality, already pervasive in American cities. However, settlements and “missions” run by and for the black community did exist in the U.S. Iris Carlton-LaNey describes how difficulties such as “intensified segregation, repression, and discrimination” faced by the black community caused “individuals to step forward and engage in the struggle to develop services and programs which would ensure a higher quality of life for people of African American ancestry” (“George” 29). From these efforts, leaders emerged who established cross community, cross-racial alliances.

The relationship between African American activist/writer Fannie Barrier Williams and Jane Addams is one such example. Williams decried the lack of black settlements and actively advocated in speeches and essays for the establishment of
settlements or similar institutions. “The Need of Social Settlement Work for the City Negro” (1904), “The Frederick Douglass Centre: A Question of Social Betterment and Not of Social Equality” (1904), and “Social Bonds in the ‘Black Belt’ of Chicago: Negro Organizations and the New Spirit Pervading Them” (1905) are three of her essays about the need for community-based institutions. These essays were published in the *Southern Workman*, *Voice of the Negro*, and *Charities* respectively. In “The Need of Social Settlement Work for the City Negro,” Williams writes about the “steady stream” of blacks “from the South, seeking freedom, liberty and opportunity, protection of the law, and education for their children” in northern cities, but these men and women were met instead with lack of opportunity, pervasive poverty, and ubiquitous danger (108). Thousands of recent arrivals to the city, she writes, could not adapt to the difficult living conditions and scarcity of jobs that they find in the northern city:

This failure of thousands of our people to adjust themselves to the higher economic and industrial conditions of city life has given rise to a growing need for some form of organized kindness or effort to check the evil consequences of their failure . . . A study of these conditions has led to a plan of relief that seems to reach the heart of all our social needs, and that plan is the social settlement . . . The number of activities and interests to be found in this ample enclosure [Hull House] create a feeling impossible to describe. There are reading rooms, a library, club rooms for girls and boys, club rooms for men and women . . . (108-9)

Since the middle-class black community and black churches were not able to completely fulfill the needs of the community, a more organized and better-funded solution was necessary that would capitalize on the experience and resources of black and white philanthropists and reformers to establish settlements. Williams notes in her essay that the work of Jane Addams and Hull House would be familiar to her Hampton
Institute audience. With Hull House and Addams as a shared example, she wonders if such cross-class collaboration of “capital and labor, the rich and the poor, the fortunate and unfortunate” can be harnessed to benefit black communities as it has in communities of European immigrants (108). Williams writes:

Such being the spirit and practical helpfulness of settlement work, can it be made to serve the needs of colored people in our large cities? As a general rule these settlement institutions are located in districts where the foreign element predominates. Russians, Italians, Greeks, Jews, Hungarians, Poles and other nationalities constitute the strange admixture of life that surrounds these settlements. It is these people of foreign tongue and foreign customs who are seeking to adjust themselves to the freer and more responsible life of democracy in America that have the helpful agencies of Hull House and the Chicago Commons. What this class of newly-made citizens needs in the way of protection, guidance, and sympathy is needed even in a greater degree by the throngs of native-born colored people who are swarming into our larger cities. (109, emphasis added)

Williams, a woman of substantial education with an upper-middle class upbringing, denounces the isolation and prejudice suffered by recent African American émigrés to the north. While the European immigrant communities also endured isolation and prejudice, she notes, they enjoyed significantly more support. Williams condemns the fact that “society . . . is doing everything that heart and brain can devise to save white young men and white young women, while practically nothing is being done for the colored young men and women, except to prosecute and punish them for crimes for which society itself is largely responsible” (110). The argument in this 1904 essay supports the observation that Omi and Winant make about how class and nation analyses trouble the ethnicity paradigm of race.

In “The Need of Social Settlement Work for the City Negro,” Williams condemns the twin fallacies of ethnically based race theory: the first fallacy is that European immigrants and individuals who are Native American, African American,
Asian/Pacific Islander and Latino share comparable equality of opportunity. The second fallacy is that racial inclusion and equality are truly valued in American culture and political institutions. Furthermore, Williams implies that dominant forces in society are purposely ignoring the African American community: “[for us] the way to crime, to demoralization and ruin is easy and unobstructed, almost, by a single great effort in our large cities” (110, emphasis added). Williams’s essay may not go so far as to say that the possibilities for social and economic mobility and equality available for European immigrants are impossible for African Americans, but she certainly recognizes that the obstacles facing the working poor and impoverished African American community are substantially greater. Equally important in this equation is that there is far less outside philanthropic or community-based support for individuals in Chicago’s Black Belt. Implicit in her carefully worded arguments are the notion that “a fundamental, underlying American commitment to equality and social justice for racial minorities” is a myth. Contemporary theories of race also argue that a commitment to racial equality is more myth than reality (Omi and Winant 12). Williams’s own activism pushed back against the belief that such inequality and injustice is inevitable.

For an institution that theoretically held justice and equality of opportunity as core values, it would seem that settlement literature should engage with the lack of equality of opportunity or justice for African American city dwellers. In the course of this exploration of motherhood, charity, and disability in literature set amid settlements, I present the work of black reformer-writers such as Fannie Barrier Williams and settlement workers and authors Alice Dunbar-Nelson and Sarah Collins
Fernandis. While the black settlement house movement did produce descriptive or prescriptive texts akin to Williams’s articles, there are a few examples of black settlement fiction available for analysis. In fact, Dunbar-Nelson’s settlement fiction tells the stories of immigrant and first-generation European American families in New York City. So, while my analysis focuses on narratives about impoverished European immigrants and native-born people as well as upper- and middle-class, native-born white women—because those are the texts that exist in this genre—I will also, where possible, present texts by African American settlement workers expand the discussion.16

Given the historical reality of rampant—if not equivalent—prejudice based upon race and ethnicity, my examination of race engages with critical race history that explores the experiences of European immigrants as racially distinct from native-born whites. In order to understand the history of race and ethnicity in the U.S. during this time, Roediger suggests “demystifying ‘white ethnic immigrant narratives’ requires distinguishing between the historical oppression of people of color and that of new immigrants. Language that arrays race against ethnicity is commonly used to make such a distinction” (31). However, Roediger insist that it is imperative to consider Progressive Era Southern, Central, Eastern European immigrants as racially different from native-born white Protestants because if the identities and experiences of these groups are conflated, we lose the complexity of racial and ethnic textual interactions. These moments in print include depictions in which ethnically diverse characters explore both becoming white and differentiating one from non-whites (33).

New immigrants . . . came into a society in which they and others were judged on the basis of race. From Henry James’s ‘look in’ on Italians,
Jews and others, to muckraking travelogues of immigrant
neighborhoods, to serving as guinea pigs in the development of
intelligence tests, . . . immigrants were repeatedly scrutinized, tried,
examined, and ranked against other races. (Roediger 58)

As Roediger implies in this selection, perceived racial variations between peoples are
not only used as criteria for distinguishing groups, these racial variations became
fodder for textual production: fiction, travelogues, and journalistic pieces. I will add to
that list photojournalistic projects like Jacob Riis’s 1889 *How the Other Half Lives*
and his subsequent lecture tour. Interest in racial and ethnic differences drew readers
to these texts and descriptive artifacts, but also a voyeuristic curiosity about witnessing
poverty and physical difference. People hoped to see lives lived outside the confines
of middle-class, Protestant social conventions. 17

Returning to the earlier discussion of the impoverished, industrial, multi-
ethnic, urban neighborhoods of the northern cities and the complex intersectional
identities embodied by their residents, we must also consider that disability was a
commonly embodied identity. This was not simply a result of statistics due to sheer
population density in the neighborhood but rather the result of inadequate medical
care, poverty, and the rise of industrial manufacturing. Disability was, and still can be,
a result of illnesses going untreated, accidents in poorly maintained domestic and
public environments, and perhaps most dramatically, industrial work-related injuries.

In “Nationalism and Deafness,” Lennard Davis states that during the
nineteenth century increased industrialization “re-created the category of work, and in
so doing recreated the category of worker . . . [C]itizenship came to be ideologically
associated with work and various kinds of inclusions and exclusions in the category of
nation were associated with work and work-related issues” (*Enforcing* 86). The able-
bodied worker becomes more valued by factory owners and capitalists, while at the same time industrial workplaces become ever more dangerous, thus causing a variety of impairments. … “[I]ndustrialism and capitalism redefined the body” while “( . . . ) the increasing mechanization of the body led to an increase of destructive acts in the form of factory-related mutilations. The machine . . . demanded human bodies and transformed them into disabled instruments of the factory process” (87). Investigative reports like Crystal Eastman’s *Work-Accidents and the Law* (1910), or Dr. Alice Hamilton’s U.S. Department of Labor Report *Lead Poisoning in the Smelting and Refining of Lead* (1914), *Women in the Lead Industries* (1919), and her autobiography *Exploring the Dangerous Trades* (1943) offer striking descriptions of the frequent and devastating dangers of industrial workplaces. Consequently, disability in this discussion of complex intersectional identities links race, ethnicity, and criminality through eugenic technologies that conflated such characteristics. Class links to disability in the construction of intersectional identities as well. Examples of this disability-class elision include: the poor and mentally ill who were housed together in the almshouses; wageworkers who labored in factories and were more likely to be injured in commercial accidents than those not working with industrial machinery (people of the professional class, for instance); and soldiers of the working and impoverished classes who filled the ranks of the army and often suffered war-related disabling injuries (Davis, *Enforcing*).

As discussed previously, science, statistics, and technologies of documentation and classification mobilized the categorization and regulation of difference within the body politic. Earlier in the nineteenth century, these developments led to the coinage
of “normal,” meaning standard or regular. The invention of “normal,” according to Lennard Davis, creates a sense of the abnormal, stigmatized, disabled body: “The human process of disabling arrived with industrialization and with the set of practices and discourses that are linked to late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century notions of nationality, race, gender, criminality, sexual orientation, and so on” (“Constructing” 3). The “practices and discourse” that framed disability evolved from an anxiety to understand “nationality, race, gender, criminality” and other aberrant qualities. “The problem for people with disabilities was that eugenicists tended to group together all allegedly ‘undesirable’ traits. So, for example, criminals, the poor, and people with disabilities might be mentioned in the same breath” (“Constructing” 6).

This sort of conflation is evident in settlement literature. For instance, in “Eleanore Culyer,” Richard Harding Davis’s short story, the climax comes upon the young settlement worker when she is working. Poverty, danger, and discomfort surround Eleanore in this scene. She sits in an uncomfortable room at the top of a squalid tenement, reading to an old, unpleasant, bedridden Mrs. Lockmuller. Downstairs, Eleanore can hear the shouts of the drunk, unpredictable, and frightening Corrigan. The setting is stifling, the person she is supposed to be helping is not only old, disabled, and probably an immigrant—Eleanore is sent out to read the Bible in German to an immigrant neighbor with failing eyesight earlier in the story—but Mrs. Lockmuller is also “cross” and “ungrateful” (126). The building feels unsafe because she is familiar with the peril that attends the Irish American man downstairs when he is drunk, apparently yet again, during the day. At this point Eleanore dreams of leaving her life in settlement work because the deformity of the situation is manifold
and overwhelming—disability, foreignness, lack of civility, socially unacceptable behaviors like public drunkenness, and loud, potentially violent outbursts, and degraded living conditions. In fact the situation has even given her a headache, and she wishes she could be released of her responsibility as a settlement worker “by being told that it didn’t matter, . . . she was not to blame if the world would be wicked and it’s people unrepentant and ungrateful” (126). Eleanore feels that the world is simply full of people who do not know how to behave properly. In this story, she cannot fulfill her benevolent maternalist fantasies, even though the setting and characters appear to be appropriately deficient and stigmatized.

This example shows stigmatized identities arising from a variety of recognizable deviations: disability, poverty, alcoholism, and foreignness. Such deviance undermines national or community cohesiveness and must be managed or disciplined by organized civic or informal social means. Foucault and others link the controlling mechanisms of bio-power, such as public health initiatives and population regulation, to the rise of the industrial, capitalist nation. Lennard Davis expands this link between the non-normative identity, nationalism, and industrialism:

[F]or the formation of the modern nation-state not simply language but bodies and bodily practices also had to be standardized, homogenized, and normalized. In this sense, a national physical type, and national ethical type and an antinational physical type had to be constructed. Here we see much work done in the nineteenth century on racial studies, studies of pathology, deviance, and so on—all with the aim of creating the bourgeois subject in opposition to all these abnormal occurrences. (Bending 106)

Individuals who deviated from model bourgeois citizens became the objects of focus for some progressive reform and charitable relations.
Not only reform and charity relations marked identities and behaviors for rehabilitation though. In order to interpret the significance of the deviant fully we must place the broad, amorphous category of the deviant against the less broad, more defined category of the normate. The normate, according to Rosemarie Garland-Thomson is the model, middle-class, and able-bodied citizen. The normate, she contends, “is the constructed identity of those who, by way of the bodily configurations and cultural capital they assume, can step into a position of authority and wield the power it grants them” (8). At the stripped core of the normate, identity “is a very narrowly defined profile that describes only a minority of actual people” (8).

Was creating normate subjects a primary purpose of the social settlement? The answer to that question is a resounding “sometimes.” However, many scholars have lined up behind far more definitive answers to this question. For instance, Shannon Jackson is sympathetic to Hull House as a transgressive, queer space that pushed back against repressive normative social forces. In her 2001 book, *Lines of Activity: Performance, Historiography, Hull-House Domesticity*, Jackson argues that Hull House offers a “complicated case study in social change—one that self-consciously contested the nature of society, identity, culture, and art and innovated methodologically in arenas of space, performance, public welfare, and practical politics” (9). She locates her critical theoretical approach to Hull House and its reformers in cultural studies and performance theory.

Jackson coins the term *reformance* to describe performative action, such as dance classes and dramatic presentations, which constitute progressive reform in action rather than theory. She analyzes Hull House’s achievements in the staging of
reform in deed and art. The neighbors enact reformance, instead of the middle-class residents reforming their neighbors (7-9). Her particular reading of Hull House as a site of performance and reform is conceptually original and her notion of reformance will become central to my work, especially when paired with Susan Schweik’s own disability situated riff on reformance: deformance (46-48, 90-91). Schweik, as compared to Jackson, is skeptical of Addams’s work and methods. Perhaps this skepticism makes sense since Schweik focuses on the rampant disabling and deforming forces that buffeted American cities during this period. Her work examines the history and impact of local ordinances that controlled the movements of disabled and impoverished individuals on the city streets. Different cities enacted a variety of such ordinances in different ways, but all sought to limit the freedom of movement and visibility of men and women who were visually unappealing and socially dangerous due to their non-normative identities. Schweik’s “deformance,” as opposed to Jackson’s “reformance,” is a performative act that becomes the doing of disabling and making of disability by reformers and forces of reform. Simultaneously, the deformed individual continues to be a subject for the reform initiatives that disabled them in the first place (Schweik 46-48, 90-91). Deformance is Schweik muses, the gift that keeps giving. The work of Jackson and Schweik provide critical paradigms for apprehending the reforming and disabling actions of settlement workers that I will use when I examine the deforming power exerted by social workers, settlement residents, and charitable visitors when applying their trade to the settlement neighbors.

Disability theorists have also suggested critical interventions that pose disability not just as a coexistent, yet separate identity like race or gender, but as
ethnicity. In the 1997 book *Extraordinary Bodies: Figuring Physical Disability in American Culture and Literature*, Rosemarie Garland-Thomson argues that disability should not only stand with race, gender, and ethnicity in the critical analysis of social relations, but that disability can be read as ethnicity. Garland-Thomson writes:

> Constructed as the embodiment of corporeal insufficiency and deviance, the physically disabled body becomes a repository for social anxieties about such troubling concerns as vulnerability, control, and identity. In other words, I want to move disability from the realm of medicine into that of political minorities, to recast it from a form of pathology to a form of ethnicity. (6)

“Disability” according to Garland-Thomson “is a reading of bodily particularities in the context of social power relations,” and overturns the more familiar understanding of disability as “an absolute, inferior state and a personal misfortune” (6).

Describing disability as ethnicity, which works toward supporting disability not only as an identity recognizable politically, also encourages an intersectional reading of disabled people as having racial, sexual, and gendered identities (Garland-Thomson 6; Davis, *Enforcing* 79). Robert McRuer and Tobin Siebers are pushing disability identity theory to even more nuanced levels. McRuer’s *crip theory* (2006) takes paradigms from Queer Theory to inflect Disability Theory. Sieber’s *complex embodiment theory* (*Disability* 2008) moves disability out of the realm of analogy with other identities to center stage with the on-the-ground reality of constantly morphing or contingent intersectional identities folded into the theoretical package. While their work will not be central to this current research, they underscores the complexity of intersectionality of bodies marked by race, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and disability.

Equally important to my analysis are the ways that the literary creation of disabled and non-disabled citizens can perpetuate or trouble cultural norms. The study
of disability in literature is also the study of disability as a device that reifies the hegemonic structures of cultural, political, and economic power predicated on individualism. More concretely, in benevolence or reform literature like settlement novels, marginalized disabled figures shore up the heroine or narrator as a paragon of humanitarian charity (Garland-Thomson 81-83). I examine how this beneficent female character employs maternal rhetoric in her interactions with disabled or stigmatized characters. This equation is not monolithic; many novels, stories, and non-fiction texts use disability to push back against normative prescriptions. “By contrasting and comparing the depiction of disability across cultures and histories, one realizes that disability provides an important barometer by which to assess shifting values and norms imposed upon the body” suggest David Mitchell and Sharon Snyder in “Narrative Prosthesis and the Materiality of Metaphor” (207). I argue that an exploration of depictions of disability in settlement literature—as well as depictions of stigma that arise from “blemishes of individual character” like unemployment or mental illness and differences of “race, nation, and religion” (Goffman 4) —reveal an array of normative paradigms placed simultaneously upon the body.

Let us return to the example above about the family who took money from Hull House when down on their luck and reinstated to their previously financial stable existence invited Addams to dinner. The act of regarding the family as in need of charity is an act of deformance, but in this example the family attempts to regain their pre-deformance status by performing their able-bodiedness at the dinner table, amid possessions that symbolize culture and civilization: a normate identity. Thus, the stigmatized identity of the family extends to their apartment, too. As a normate family,
their physical environment has returned to an orderly and clean state; there is no longer a stigma associated with their personal physical environment.

Tobin Siebers links physical stigma to the environment in “What Can Disability Studies Learn from the Culture Wars?” The interplay of porous boundaries and shared identities between people and place is central to my textual analysis. For instance, the shared and sometimes mutually constituting qualities of settlement workers, neighbors, the streets, settlement houses, and tenements creates a unique profile for the place and the people associated with it. Therefore, the stigmatized identities of the impoverished, foreign residents of the Lower East Side or Nineteenth Ward transmit a stigmatized reputation to the neighborhood and the stigmatized reputation of the neighborhood passes to the residents.

Human communities come into being and maintain their coherence by imagining their ideal forms on the basis of other bodies. It is no accident, then, that descriptions of communities in disarray summon images of the disabled body and that, conversely, the appearance of disabled bodies in public provokes fears that the community is itself under attack or coming apart. (“What Can Disability Studies” 198)

Siebers demonstrates how the physical landscape connects to the community body as the dilapidated cityscape to the disabled body. Settlements develop in neighborhoods that are already neglected and decaying, where the locals are already neglected and deformed.

Public aversion to disability may begin with individual human bodies, but it escalates rapidly to form a network of wider symbolism that includes nonhuman bodies, buildings, and many other structures in the built environment . . . The public imagines diseased and disabled bodies as a hazard—obviously—but its fear of disability also contaminates its vision of cityscapes, confusing bodies, building, and skylines according to the ratio of some mysterious human geography. (“What Can Disability Studies” 200)
A literary example of this that leaps to mind is Stephen Crane’s description of the home of Maggie Johnson in his 1893 novella *Maggie: A Girl of the Streets*. Her parents’ alcoholism and abusive natures have left the apartment filthy, with the furniture broken and upended. When Maggie attempts to impress her brother’s friend Pete, she cleans up, hangs curtains, and tries to add a modicum of homey decoration to the flat. The dysfunction within the family, especially by her bloated, savage, drunken mother, quickly destroy her efforts. As decay, disorder, and violence overtake the remaining members of the Johnson family, the spectacle draws the other tenants in the building, and they look on from the doorway. The reader watches as the Johnson’s neighbors gaze upon Maggie’s neglected, broken-down home. The neighbors’ simultaneous condemnation and sympathy indicates that the family has fallen too far outside the conventional standards held by the community.

Outside the fictive Johnson family’s tenement on the nineteenth century streets, “unsightly beggar ordinances” sought to control the visibility of the poor, deformed, or discernably non-normate. These “ugly laws,” Susan Schweik writes, existed to limit the visibility of beggars both with physical disabilities or simply of desperate appearance. The ugly laws are an example of how the physical environment, especially the middle-class environment must be kept free of disability and decay in order to shore up the health and normal status of the dominant community. In addition, the prevalence of institutionalization of people identified as penniless, enfeebled, or criminal points to mechanisms that kept the concrete surroundings of middle-class neighborhoods free of disabled or aberrant men and women.
Thus, we can understand the social settlement as not simply trying to address the needs and aspirations of the human community, but attempting to ameliorate the lived impairments and the stigma of the physical environment too. This is especially clear when considered in terms of the disproportionate population of disabled people, and individuals marked with stigmatized identities on the streets and in the neighborhood adjacent to social settlements.

Overview of Chapters

With this historical and theoretical foundation built, I turn to a close reading of texts in Chapters Two, Three, and Four. We will see that settlement literature can entertain, critique, and participate in deformance, advocacy, liberation, and protest. This examination begins with literature written by authors who lived outside of settlement neighborhoods and wrote engaging stories about the middle-class women who labored in the spirit of the settlement amid the tenements and their residents.

The literature that is the subject of the first chapter forwards a nationalistic or normative message about American citizenship. Settlement literature, currently an unrecognized category of reform literature, focuses on the lives of settlement workers, members of the local community, the impact of the settlement on both the resident-workers and the neighbors. Female characters in settlement literature like Kate Barrington in the novel *The Precipice* fulfill their eugenically enhanced maternal duty to the nation by laboring in settlements and caring for the multitudes of poor, potentially white children that emerge from the darkness of squalid urban tenements. In Chapter One, I explore how the metaphor of motherhood molds young women (the New Woman) into a program of disabling individuals with stigmatized identities.
Richard Harding Davis’s “Eleanore Cuyler” (1892) a tale from his collection *Van Bibber and Others* provides an example of motherhood, charity, and disability advocating for native, heteronormative, non-disabled whiteness. The urban settings and middle-class main characters reify this hegemonic message. Peattie and Davis, both middle-class novelists, also worked as journalists during their careers. The narratives of journalists writing fiction joined the tide of other true-to-life books that were filling the shelves during the Progressive Era. William Dean Howells’s realist novel *A Hazard of New Fortunes* offers critical depictions of charity and disability entangled in a national surge of enthusiasm for the unfettered expansion of industry, and both scientific and eugenic management practices. Other literature of the period, however, colluded with these industrial and institutional forces, forwarding a normative message.

Chapter One shows that some female reformers use their power to deform and then care for their subjects in order to justify living their own lives in the city apart from suburban or upper-class domesticity. Charitable institutions and settlements in deform their subjects, by naming them as *in need* and proceed to rate the subjects of their charity and services as worthy or unworthy. Disabled characters rarely appear in these texts, but when they do, they are stigmatized individuals who fall outside the bounds of middle class expectations of civilized behavior. Disabled or otherwise stigmatized characters in these texts help to construct benevolent, maternal identities for young, unarguably white, middle-class settlement and charity workers.

In Chapter Two, I examine texts written by authors who were settlement neighbors and authors who failed to, refuse to, exemplify the white, middle-class ideal
of a docile American woman. A public thirst for graphic urban stories like Howells’s coupled with an authorial identity beyond that of the native-born, middle-class writer was part of the sensation that made Anzia Yezierska’s stories a commercial success in the 1920s. Readers and reviewers of Yezierska’s stories about Polish Jewish families living amid the close streets of the Lower East Side of Manhattan valued her texts because they came from the actual lived experience of a Polish immigrant, not from the second-hand observations of journalist-activists. Yezierska’s Salome of the Tenements, as well as the stories of African American writer, teacher, settlement worker, and editor Alice Dunbar-Nelson allowed the middle-class, white reader a chance to be invited inside the tenement and be voyeurs into the lives and minds of the settlement neighbor.

This chapter follows the experience of the European immigrant and European American tenement-dweller through the autobiographical and semi-autobiographical texts written by settlement neighbors and settlement workers. The point of view in these books is through the eyes of working poor immigrant neighbors, not the settlement or charity worker who brings her gifts and abilities into tenement flats and settlement classrooms. This is an important distinction. The writers I examine in this section offer insightful critiques and sometimes scathing depictions of the work of the social settlement. The settlement residents in these stories are often woefully unaware of the realities of day-to-day life of their neighbors. Jane Addams echoes the criticisms that charity or social workers are ignorant of the lives and experiences of the women and men they seek to help.
Protagonists in these texts exert personal agency or resist deformation when interacting with representatives of charitable organizations. These instances however are predicated on individual, context-specific experiences with settlement houses and charitable organizations. The authors use maternal discourses and metaphors to bring the New Woman or the New Jewish Woman settlement worker into the process of disabling or producing a new generation of whitened U.S. citizens. Female reformers in these narratives engage in benevolent maternalism and as a result, they disable characters, while they create more model American citizens. At times, the social settlements are active participants in this deformance, though this is not a uniform participation. Lastly, there are very few disabled characters in these texts, though the disabled character in Dunbar-Nelson’s story “Miss Tillman’s Protégé” exposes the upper class philanthropist as classist and indifferent to the humanity of the people she claims to care about.

The semibiographical fiction of Anzia Yezierska offers a view of life for working poor immigrants from Eastern Europe lived in the shadow of Lower East Side social settlements, while Alice Dunbar-Nelson creates a fictional New York City neighborhood filled with Irish American families in her collection of short stories, “Annals of ’Steenth Street.” These stories attempt to bring complex human faces to the flat depictions of dirty, ignorant, pathetic, or menacing tenement-dwellers depicted in The Precipice and “Eleanore Cuyler” in the previous chapter.

The fact that these texts are simultaneously autobiographically informed and fictional resonates with Jane Addams’s own memoir/manifesto, Twenty Years at Hull-House. Autobiographies are fictions of one sort or another, and Addams’s memoir is
no exception. Similar to Addams’s work and realist fiction, these autobiographical or semi-autobiographical texts forward vehement judgments about the nature of charity and the stigmatized impoverished identity. The cultural, political, and economic historical context is essential to what these arguments mean, as well as how they function.

Chapter Three focuses on Jane Addams’s contribution to the historical and textual interplay of motherhood, charity, and disability in settlement literature. It shows that Addams recognized that social forces exerted disabling power in the lives of people that did not embody the ideal of liberal individualism. I also analyze texts that focus the problems of charity, and the treatment of disabled and impoverished people: “Charitable Effort” (1902), “The Home and the Special Child” (1908), *Twenty Years at Hull-House* (1910). Addams’s texts offer a point of view that straddles the settlement and tenement. She lived for more than 40 years with her neighbors in the Nineteenth Ward of Chicago. Through first hand experience and collaborative work with the women and men who lived alongside her she published many books and essays some of which offer yet another viewpoint on the processes of deformance that can arise from the mantle or motivation of American motherhood and charity.

Jane Addams identifies forces that disable and deform the Hull House neighbors. This chapter shows that charity workers can be useless or even detrimental to communities. Some deforming forces are exceedingly hard to avoid when faced with individuals with immediate need, but as Addams shows the nature of the social settlement as an institution that is a part of the community day in and day out allows neighbors to reverse deformance. Moreover, settlement residents like Addams and
Lathrop argue that living in the Nineteenth Ward creates an intimate understanding about the neighbors’ lives. Deforming forces, according to Addams, arise from valuing the labor of an individual more than their humanity. Deforming forces arise when charity workers enter the Nineteenth Ward and naively believe that church training or their college education have prepared them to help the locals. Deforming forces arise when poverty forces people to make choices that gamble one aspect of their families’ well being against another. Addams decries these deforming forces. Her texts expose injustices that undermine individual agency and push back against the more restricted and conservative views about proper human behavior. Her texts uncover the detrimental role of bio-power technologies in the evolution of the neighborhood—like institutionalization of the elderly and impoverished and the systematic ostracism of disabled people. Her writings counter deforming statements made by other settlement directors like Sarah Collins Fernandis of the Colored Social Settlement in Washington D.C. or Lillian Wald (1867-1940) founder of the Henry Street Settlement in New York City.

This dissertation establishes that settlement literature can function as technologies of eugenic ideology, classism, capitalism, racism, and ableism. These texts use maternal rhetoric, charity, and disability to do their work. Benevolent maternalism is at play in social settlement literature, but it is different from that which Rosemarie Garland-Thomson describes in the nineteenth century novel of reform because the benevolent maternalism is working in collusion with instruments of deformance in a more active fashion. Thus while the young settlement workers are defining themselves in relief against the disabled bodies of their participant-object
neighbors, they are also deforming the neighbors with their efforts to reform or aid. These books are not just literary renditions of deformance. This benevolence-deformance process becomes a cycle unless one of the actors, the settlement worker or the neighbor, intervenes and stops or reverses the deformance.

This dissertation, then, investigates how motherhood and charity are complicit producers of disabled figures in Progressive Era social settlement literature from non-fiction texts, reform fiction, and autobiographical stories. Motherhood, as maternal rhetoric and charity, as an idea and act, are pertinent to depictions of disability in settlement literature. Disabled figures are commonly portrayed as stricken, impoverished, and childlike entities in need of maternal care proffered by social settlements and settlement workers, or charitable institutions and charity workers. These dramatis personae, the settlement worker often depicted as a maternal benefactress and settlement house or relief agency, are endemic to the urban American cityscapes that provide the backdrop for these texts. Moreover, the maternal benefactress expects that the disabled characters in reform fiction reward her assistance and advocacy with gratitude. Yet, these central symbols of Progressive ideology, conventional ideas of motherhood and charity deform and construct the disabled characters in the first place.

On occasion, writers like Jane Addams contest the traditional tropes of motherhood and charity, thereby overturning literary expectations of disability in settlement literature. The result is empowered and independent characters with impairments or non-normative identities. Settlement literature in these cases can function to further equality and respect. These atypical textual representations avoid
and in turn reverse the deforming forces of charity and maternalist/paternalist rhetoric by performing *prenormalization*, an act that does not deform, but attempts to return the character and reader to a time before the hegemony of normalcy.
Chapter One

“Long live the Addams Breed!”: Authors Write Settlement Life

“I mean to be the mother to many, many children, Karl,” she said in a voice which thrilled with sorrow and pride and a strange joy. “To thousands and thousands of children. But for the Idea I represent and the work I meant to do they [the children] would be trampled in the dust of the world. Can’t you see that I am called to this as men are called to honorable services for their country? This is a woman’s form of patriotism. It’s a higher one than the soldier’s, I think. It’s come my way to be the banner-carrier, and I’m glad of it.”

- Spoken by Kate Barrington. Elia Wilkinson Peattie, *The Precipice* (1914)

Probably there is no relation in life which our democracy is changing more rapidly than the charitable relation—that relation which obtains between benefactor and beneficiary; at the same time there is no point of contact in our modern experience which reveals more clearly the lack of that equality which democracy implies. . . . Many of the difficulties in philanthropy come from an unconscious division of the world into the philanthropists and those to be helped. It is an assumption of two classes, and against this class assumption our democratic training revolts as soon as we begin to act upon it.


Atop a majestic mountain in Colorado, a beatific young reformer has refused an offer of marriage in order to devote her energies and body to mothering needy children. In the first passage above, Kate Barrington is sure that without her conviction and exertion the children will be “trampled.” Her maternal duty is patriotic, as important to the nation as military service. Her sacrifice and belief in her calling should lead other women toward honorable maternal service.

Selflessness is not the only motivation for Kate’s work. Kate’s motivations include an exciting life of independent work in urban neighborhoods and a meaningful
contribution to the nation. As literature often reflects history, Kate’s story is representative of the exodus of young middle-class women into university classrooms and city streets and away from lives as wives and mothers in their own homes and families. Elia Peattie’s 1914 novel, *The Precipice* is a paragon of New Woman’s reform fiction. It tells the story of the young University of Chicago alumnna Kate Barrington. After graduation, she returns to her parents’ home in rural Illinois. Kate, disillusioned by the repressive Victorian values of her small town, breaks with her family and moves back to Chicago. There she finds work as an agent of the Children’s Protection Agency at Hull House. As her career develops and her convictions evolve, she becomes more involved in the women’s rights movement and increasingly influential politically. Finally, Kate is rewarded with a presidential appointment as the head of the Children’s Bureau in Washington D.C.

**Settlement Workers in the Slums**

In the late nineteenth century, women like Vida Scudder, Jane Addams, and Lillian Wald conceived and launched reform and relief initiatives which in turn allowed more middle and upper class women to leave the confines of domestic life for vocations that they found fulfilling and exciting. However, these rapidly expanding social relationships—which often hinged on charity not collaboration—were not without problems. Jane Addams, in the epigraph to this chapter, warns of the impact charity workers have on the people they assist. Addams names interactions of charity as relationships of harsh clarity. Charitable relations make visible gross inequalities among people and classes in America. Not only can this disparity arise from economic
and racial difference, but also from non-native ethnicities, religion, or differences in physical and mental ableness.

Increasingly, tenacious young women, like Kate, chose a life of public service, reform, and social work. Many of these women chose to describe and justify their actions with maternal imagery: “I mean to be the mother to many, many children,” says Kate, who has no biological children and does not intend to have biological children (Peattie 235). By couching their vocational identities in maternal terms, they make themselves more legible as motherly women who have dedicated their lives, labor, and bodies to the American family writ large. Thus, these women avoid scrutiny as women who have turned their backs on their domestic obligations to biological families. Nevertheless, Addams’s passage suggests that there are negative outcomes to the care that the individuals receive from their benefactresses. In fact, the creation of beneficent and disadvantaged classes in the name of Christianity, Progress, Science, or America had disempowering and disabling consequences. These epigraphs uncover motherhood and charity as colluding forces and metaphors in the guise of goodness. This dissertation examines how the tropes of motherhood and charity are venerated, and sometimes disparaged, in depictions of disability and disabled characters within social settlement literature from the Progressive Era (1880-1930) metropolis.

Within this larger project, this chapter shows how these texts create culture and act as mechanisms of social control. Social settlement literature functions as a technological tool for social control. In the case of A Hazard of New Fortunes, the text is also a tool for social critique. The Precipice and “Eleanore Cuyler” provide examples of in deformance—deforming characters whose identities place them outside
the nativist, non-disabled paradigm of valorized American citizen. My examination of motherhood, charity, and disability in the social settlement literature is predicated on a belief that these texts, examples of literary realism, operate in conjunction with mechanisms of social control and capitalist motives. Realist literature may work as a mechanism of social control, which promotes liberal individualism as Amy Kaplan suggests, but *A Hazard of New Fortunes* also operate as mechanisms of social critique.

Stephanie Palmer’s article, "Realist Magic in the Fiction of William Dean Howells," examines chance meetings in Howells’s novels. These chance meetings offer opportunities for cross-class meetings, which might lead to social cohesion and change. However, these meetings fail to produce the desired transformations. These chance meetings are ephemeral replicas of the day-to-day interactions of the social settlement. Palmer calls these “dynamic accidents” like the moment when the carriage that Basil and Isabel are riding in takes a wrong turn into the Lower East Side and gives them a chance to see the teeming downtown streets and crowded tenements. Even though this moment gives rise to recognition of social difference, nothing comes of it. Basil and Isabel take no action. Palmer argues that Howells uses chance meetings, made possible by urban life, as occasions for “accidental entanglements” which might ideally lead to cross-class social cohesion (214). This is in contrast to the purposeful entanglements that happen in and around the social settlement.

For this chapter I examine two social settlement texts: Peattie’s *The Precipice* (1914) and Richard Harding Davis’s short story “Eleanore Cuyler” (1892). Additionally, I explore William Dean Howells’s *A Hazard of New Fortunes* (1890) as a comparative example of realist fiction that addresses the inequalities that exist in the
Progressive Era metropolis, and the violent and disabling forces of capitalism and economic injustice.

Literary realist authors like Howells mediated between the settings and situations with a middle-class protagonist, whereas the later naturalists depicted the poverty and urban conditions in a more direct fashion (Barrish). The middle to upper middle class author mediated the representation of the city and city dwellers. Class distance and the politics of the author skewed this mediated picture. The scholarly interpretation of American realism has shifted over time “from a progressive force exposing the conditions of industrial society, realism has turned into a conservative force whose very act of exposure reveals its complicity with structures of power” (Kaplan 1). I engage with the literary texts at the heart of this study both consistent with and against this interpretation. Fiction that centers on social settlement workers depicts maternal heteronormative female protagonists who are committed to a paradigm of charity that is consistent with benevolent maternalism and, where applicable, are proponents of eugenic thought and technologies. Disabled characters in these books are never central and are always the object of the attentions of the fit, American heroine.

These stories focus on the women (and men) who worked with the settlements and urban charities. Elia Wilkinson Peattie (1862-1935) was a journalist, newspaper editor, and novelist. She was politically active and socially engaged in her local communities, hosting salons as well as fighting for women’s rights. Like many of the most famous realist novelists, Peattie was a journalist who wrote fiction. She was often the family breadwinner and therefore had serious concerns about the
marketability of her fiction. Richard Harding Davis (1864-1916) was an adventurer and journalist who wrote, sometimes sensationalist prose. His book *Van Bibber, and others* is a collection of stories of a college educated, independently wealthy, socially connected, and well-liked member of a tony men’s club. Protagonist Van Bibber has a keen insight into the human condition and a penchant for pursuing truth and righteousness, especially when to do so preserves the safety and sanctity of the men and women of his station. Richard Harding Davis was the son of Rebecca Harding Davis who wrote *Life in the Iron Mills* (1861), which argues for social reform and uses the disabled bodies of young women to construct the argument for humanitarian change (Garland-Thomson 81-82). Thus, Richard Harding Davis’s use of the maternal benefactress and the needy cripple as a dramatic device is a continuation of the family business.

William Dean Howells (1837-1920), senior to both Davis and Peattie, was editor of *Atlantic Monthly* and on staff at *Harper’s Monthly* as a critic. He was a prolific writer, a leader in the literary culture of America and Europe. Howells used his realist literary novels to comment on social injustice and advance the cause of democracy and social justice. Addams published many essays in the *Atlantic Monthly*, including the essay “The Subtle Problems of Charity,” which is excerpted at the beginning of this chapter. Howells work is included in this examination of settlement literature as a central grounding link to canonical American fiction. While his book is not centered on settlement work, problems of capitalism, concern for workers, and charitable impulses are central issues in *A Hazard of New Fortunes*. 
In the stories by Peattie and Davis, women run from emotional turmoil and find themselves within the vocational confines of the social settlement. Davis’s wealthy dilettante Eleanore Cuyler is an early convert to settlement life arriving at the fictional College Settlement shortly after the actual College Settlement opened in 1889. In Davis’s cynical chapter on Eleanore’s foray into Lower East Side settlement work, the uptown do-gooder finds the work far less romantic and less fulfilling than she had hoped. Peattie’s young college graduate Kate Barrington, however, blossoms into her role as an officer of the Child Protection Bureau.

In contrast, William Dean Howells’s novel *A Hazard of New Fortunes* offers an expansive view of life in New York City amid Gilded Age accumulation of wealth, the swirl of southern relocation, and waves of European immigration. Characters in this novel wrestle with the causes and cures of poverty, the broad destruction wrought by the Civil War, and the discomfort of class inequalities. Educated, middle class protagonist Basil March experiences the shocking breadth of social, economic, and geographic disparities that existed in New York City at the end of the nineteenth century. The reader follows Basil on his evolution from cloistered Boston professional to a more sympathetic, though still not critically engaged, participant in the savage machinations of late nineteenth century life in Manhattan. Empathetic humanitarian sentiment drives the characters of Conrad Dryfoos the younger and wealthy socialite Margaret Vance. They dedicate their lives to helping the poor and stigmatized, as well as awaken the comfortable masses to the harsh disparities of life in the city. Howells’s richly tapestried narrative includes Lindau, an exceptionally educated German immigrant and physically disabled veteran, dedicates his energies to the fight for
justice and equality. Lindau resides in the Lower East Side sharing his life with the poorest citizens of the city. He refuses the identity of a deformed character due to his amputation, his poverty, his Socialism, or his status as an immigrant. Instead, Lindau fights the destructive forces of deformance, capitalism, and racism to his death.

I examine Howells’s novel alongside the settlement stories of Davis and Peattie not just for its depiction of the dire realities of the city, but also for the characters’ commitments to reform, benevolence work, and collaborative cross-class respect. *A Hazard of New Fortunes* depicts characters committed to benevolence work and shows deformance as the result of charity. Howells’s representation of the benevolence work of wealthy New Yorkers in a very broad context of industry and commerce provides a useful counter point to the social settlement literature that focuses on middle and upper middle class female workers. Texts that depict benevolence and reform work conducted by middle and upper middle class women (and the young Conrad Dryfoos) contrast the texts examined in Chapter Two which focus on how such work is perceived and judged by residents of the neighborhoods near the settlements, neighbors who embody the stigmatized and deformed bodies of the objects of charity or reform.

Davis’s and Howells’s texts from the 1890s present a world recovering from the devastation of war and a long financial depression, while Peattie’s 1914 novel creates a world where women bring science and strength to the development of a strong, eugenically-fit nation that is perched just outside the shadow of World War I in Europe. Richard Harding Davis’s *Van Bibber, and Others* features a story entitled “Eleanore Cuyler” about a wealthy socialite who commits to work in a social
settlement because she thinks it is romantically self-sacrificing. Eleanore is a high society woman in Manhattan who covets her freedom and refuses to marry any of her suitors, but once her rejected potential fiancé Wainwright leaves for work in London she is devastated and adrift. She throws herself into work with the College Settlement on the Lower East Side. Eleanore is an example of a naïve, ineffective, perhaps even destructive, settlement worker. This story illustrates the hazards of charity work as described in the epigraph from Addams’s speech. Eleanore never stops believing in and perpetuating class structure, which undermines the agency of the east sider.

The eponymous Van Bibber is a young, wealthy Harvard graduate. Van’s charm and good timing lead him into interesting encounters in which he shines a light upon the spotty moral quality of the citizens of New York. Van’s exploits become amusing stories for his fellow clubmen about the foibles of the city dwellers and the novel experiences that are possible in America’s first city. Eleanore and Van run in the same uptown circles. This story, like the others in this chapter, offer the reader a more developed sense of the uptown world as it is contrasted with that of the downtown world of the social settlement. Moreover, the characters in Van Bibber identify themselves as citizens of high society visiting grittier neighborhoods for the time being, whether for a matter of months or just an evening.

In “Eleanore Cuyler,” Van encounters Eleanore on the ominous dark streets of the Lower East Side while he is slumming. After a visit to a Bowery theater, he spots the poised Eleanore amid the typical throng of “Thieves’ Highway” and “with a feeling of noblesse oblige, and a hope of being of use to one of his own people” follows her down progressively darker, more desolate and dangerous streets (112).
Protecting her from a threatening ruffian, Van gamely initiates a fight with the stranger. Van fights the thug and his tough comrades who exemplify “the purest specimens of the tough of the East-Side water-front,” while the calm Eleanore calls a policeman, by rapping out the signal for “fire” with a walking stick on the curb (116-19). This meeting with Eleanore, his drubbing of the four thugs, followed by a condescending, yet chummy encounter with a stereotypically useless and uneducated policeman provides Van with a rousing tale to share at the club and ultimately alerts Eleanore’s rejected lover, Wainwright, that she needs to be rescued from settlement life. This chain of events places Van in a final wedding scene, where he is given credit for bringing the couple back together and returning Eleanore to her rightful place uptown as a new bride, and potential mother. Moreover, Van’s surprise encounter with Eleanore downtown allows him an opportunity to preserve the boundaries and perpetuation of New York upper-class society.

This story establishes that the female settlement house worker was already a character in the public mind in 1892. This curiosity about women working at the social settlements is borne out in the regularity of publication of newspaper articles that describe their work. Moreover, many serious articles about settlement workers describe not only the work undertaken, but also the philosophy behind it (Knight 248). Davis’s story though, offers a cynical view of social settlement work. Eleanore, a social work dilettante enjoys a few public moments of her good works, such as presenting legislation about kindergartens. As she gains experience in the settlement she is not only ashamed at how tiny her contribution feels to the work of the College Settlement, but also she is ashamed of the amount of excitement her presence
generates when she visits her society friends. “The good she did now, it was humiliating to acknowledge, was in no way proportionate to that which her influence had wrought among the people of her own class” (107). Her life on the east side is exciting and exotic to the men and women of her class in idea alone. The members of her social circle are interested in tantalizing stories, not the realities of inequality, or an understanding of larger social and economic forces that perpetuate those inequalities.

Davis’s depiction of the social settlement is not, however, wholly cynical and superficial. While Davis’s depiction of Eleanore presents a demeaning picture of a woman who works at a social settlement as an emotional escape, he depicts College Settlement women as serious, wise, and happy. The settlement house veterans have experience with dabblers. Newcomers must prove themselves before they get critical or sensitive work. Eleanore Cuyler wants to see herself as an agent of reformance, but she is not cut out for work of the College Settlement, therefore, she never really seizes any opportunity to engender reforming transformation. Certainly, Eleanore is not cut out for work that might respectfully collaborate with the neighbors. She successfully objectifies and deforms the individuals that she is assigned to help, and when her romantic visions of settlement work are unrealized she deems settlement house work unfulfilling and abandons it.

Initially, Eleanore imagines herself visiting prisoners and nursing the ill, but the women who run the settlement have seen many would-be social workers come and go. Therefore, Eleanore is relegated to less heroic tasks, like reading the Bible in German to an elderly woman who is bed-ridden. She grows weary of her work: “She
had grown sceptical as to working-girls and of the good she did them—or any one else. It was all terribly dreary and forlorn” (Davis 126). Eleanore believes that she fails to reform or save anyone, but her story offers ample opportunities for deformance. For instance, Davis describes the neighborhood and its denizens through Van’s eyes as he follows Eleanore along the streets: “From the light of the lamps he could see signs in Hebrew and the double eagle of Russia painted on the windows of the saloons . . . and on some of the stoops and fire-escapes of the tenements a few dwarfish specimens of the Polish Jew sat squabbling in their native tongue” (113-14). Here signs of ethnicity merge with the morally degrading community institution of the saloon—in contrast to the club of Van’s class. Angry, unintelligible “dwarfish specimens of the Polish Jew” perch upon the buildings, like freakish circus performers. To Van, the streets become “suddenly more silent and dirty and desolate-looking” as the situation becomes more foreign, deformed, and dangerous (116). In this description, world of the social settlement and its neighbors is disabled and decaying. The space and the people mutually constitute one another in deformance through the insertion of a settlement worker.

Eleanore finds the place and people degraded as well. In her final moments of settlement work she is trapped in a small, airless, hot tenement flat with an elderly, “bedridden” Mrs. Lockmuller whom she characterizes with no sympathy as “cross” and ungrateful (126). The room itself has given Eleanore a headache he and soured her mood. The tenement as a whole is distressing and frightening. Downstairs, a drunk Irishman is loud, and his erratic, possibly violent, behavior has the settlement worker on edge. She extends her mind’s eye out across the rooftops, perhaps imagining
crossing from building to building from above, instead of descending the dark stairs just to the ascend again a few buildings over. This too darkens her mood. Everything about her work and the environment is bleak, in fact she fantasizes: “putting her head on some broad shoulder” and being released of her duties. Eleanore knows, “she was not to blame if the world would be wicked and its people unrepentant and ungrateful” (126). Disability, drunken degradation, and environmental decay coalesce into a moment of deformance through the presence of the charitable woman who is on the cusp of marital union and, presumably, domestic and reproductive success. Eleanore is both an agent of deformance and an agent of reproduction of white, nativist, and upper-middle class culture. She believes she cannot fix a world so clearly depraved, but she can return to her place and recreate the status quo. In this moment of great personal resignation, bristling with fear of the drunken shouts of the downstairs neighbor, Eleanore’s true love rescues her with all appropriate romantic drama.

Wainwright tracks Eleanore to the dingy airless tenement room. He announces that he has a carriage waiting downstairs to take her away from all the squalor. Her wish has come true and they are married soon after.

Middle-class and privileged women, like Eleanore Cuyler who left their families and eschewed domesticity to work in settlement houses were described as “mothers to great motherless masses” in order to shift public opinion which judged working outside the home as selfish and hazardous to a prosperous, superior white America. In order to create a legion of patriotic “mothers” to nurture urban multitudes, reformers, journalists, and novelists propagated rhetoric that metaphorically orphaned people with parents and spotlighted families without mothers so that these great
American mothers could do their national duty. The discourses that critiqued working poor mothers asserted that women who labored long hours for pay could not raise children properly, and destitute or absent mothers would not foster healthy citizens. Moreover, some nativist reformers posited that, due to a lack of schooling or an adherence to ethnic practices, many women failed to nurture their families with up-to-date scientific methods. Thus, a generation of able-bodied, scientifically minded, college-trained women, like those who ran the College Settlement entered cities to care for people deemed needy, uneducated, exploited, and disabled. The individuals who became the objects of their care are bestowed with stigmatized identities; they were viewed as having diminished capacities thus they were worthy of maternal protection. Female characters, like Kate Barrington in Elia W. Peattie's novel *The Precipice* (1914), fulfill their maternal duty to the nation in a manner consistent with the mothering of disabled "children" by applying the paradigm of benevolent maternalism from Rosemarie Garland-Thomson.

Elia Peattie's *The Precipice* is not simply a novel, but a manifesto and a call to action. *The Precipice* actually begins with a haunting sound of trumpets:

A fanfare of trumpets is blowing to which women the world over are listening. They listen even against their wills, and not all of them answer, though all are disturbed. Shut their ears to it as they will, they cannot wholly keep out the clamor of those trumpets, but whether in thrall to love or to religion, to custom or to old ideals of self-obliterating duty, they are stirred. They move in their sleep, or spring to action, and they present to the world a new problem, a new force—or a new menace . . . . (5)

This epigraph alludes to a summons that is not “of this world” but higher. It is a signal that resonates around the world. The placement of this selection before the novel
begins implies that all women hear the call to arm and begin to move, like automatons. Peattie, better known for her journalistic and editorial work, must have been keenly aware of the images and messages about women's changing role that were circulating in the media, discussed in the churches, workplaces, and dining rooms of America, if not the world. The message that she alludes to in this epigraph is one that urges women to enter all areas of the workplace, government, and social reform. Peattie’s 1914 novel provides a description of what this sort of self-fulfilling vocation would look like. In contrast, she also offers examples of women who were not true to themselves or to their obligations as individuals, women, and vocational contributors. Peattie acknowledges that she is living in a moment in which women, who follow a multitude of paths, present a threat to social stasis.

_The Precipice_ tells the story of Kate Barrington, a college-educated woman from the insular, idyllic village of Silvertree, Illinois. The story opens at a key moment in Kate's life: college graduation. She is adrift. She has a degree in psychology, but no clear idea of where she belongs. This situation mirrors the social problem that afflicts women outlined in Addams’s “Filial Duties.” Young women with first-rate educations and social privilege find themselves anxious and chaffing under the expectations of returning home to assist their families with day-to-day domestic life. Then marriage and children replicates life with their natal family, and women’s educations or ambitions are misspent. Such situations can result in depression (Addams, “Filial Duties”).

Peattie sets Kate against a number of alternative models of post-college womanhood. First, college friends Lena Vroom and Honora (Daley) Fulham live in
the neighborhood of their alma mater, the University of Chicago. Lena Vroom has no family; the university fills her life with rigorous intellectual meaning. Honora Fulham is a scientist. She is married and committed to being her husband's helpmate in their university lab, eschewing vivacity, and familial warmth for the betterment of David Fulham's work. These two women with graduate educations push the boundaries of gender expectations in their quest for success. These ambitions lead to their descents into psycho-emotional disability.

Back in Silvertree, Kate's mother embodies Victorian motherhood. Mrs. Barrington is a self-sacrificing wife and mother, and prioritizes her family’s needs before her own. Yet, this upper-middle class woman is supported by a trio of individuals who manage all aspects of her life—a “husband to provide for her,” a “pastor to think for her,” and housekeeper Martha Underwood to run the house (8). As soon as Kate returns to Silvertree, she enters into power struggle with her domineering, pessimistic father. Kate has returned home both confident in her ability to take care of others and unwilling to bow to her father's repressive notions of behavior. Mrs. Barrington dies suddenly without an apparent physical cause. For Mrs. Barrington, the loss of identity coupled with the mounting father-daughter conflict appears to sap her life force. The story of Mrs. Barrington and her Victorian worldviews is one of Peattie's cautionary tales.

Like the young Jane Addams, Kate breaks with her family and travels to the city to seek a life worth living. There, she meets the great woman herself and takes a position at Hull House as an officer in the Children's Protective Association. In Chicago, Kate lives communally with Honora, David Fulham, and their twin
daughters—who seem like little more than props throughout the bulk of the book—and Honora's vivacious cousin, Mary Morrison. Kate is a natural for social work. She thrives on challenge. She rises through the ranks to head the Children’s Protection League and is invited to Washington DC to speak about the needs of mothers and children. Kate proposes establishing a federal Children’s Bureau. Once it is established, the president appoints her as director of the Children's Bureau. In this position, Kate will be mother to an entire nation of needy children.

In order for the biologically childless Kate to rise to national maternity, she decides she must reject marriage to her handsome, moneyed college suitor, Ray McCrae, only to later fall in love with the equally independent and driven Western businessman, Karl Wander. The tension between her vocational commitment and her love of Karl brings her to the precipice of heart-wrenching dilemma and to the precipice of a mountaintop. Despite pressure to settle into domestic life from friends and society at large, Kate must reject a life of embodied motherhood, in order to fulfill her greater maternal destiny. She urges other women to join her in national motherhood as well, though many of the women who are eager to follow her lead have raised their children to adulthood already. The country needs caretakers, “mothers of the state” to care not only for children, but men and women in need too (Peattie 222). This message needs more than a trumpet fanfare to be compelling. This message requires objects in need of care.

*The Precipice*, like other more canonical Progressive Era fiction such as *A Hazard of New Fortunes*, uses the bodies of marked individuals to forward their reform messages. Public health initiatives, for instance, are necessary to keep babies
born to poor families from wasting away or keep typhoid from spreading through dirty, crowded tenements. These marked bodies support the identity of the independent reform-minded characters. Social workers apply their ameliorative services to recipients stigmatized by poverty, disability, racial, or ethnic difference. The dirty children, poor immigrants, and enfeebled neighbors are marked not only by their difference, but also by the charity that they receive. It is a difficult trap for the object of charity to break out of, but Sonya Vrunsky in *Salome of the Tenements* dismantles in Chapter Two.

Disabled characters and maternal benefactresses work together in nineteenth-century novels to further a message of humanitarian reform (Garland-Thomson). The act of benevolence toward a needy other defines the benefactress, while disabling the object of the charity. Rosemarie Garland-Thomson explores this relationship in Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852) and Rebecca Harding Davis's *Life in the Iron Mills* (1861). This same dynamic is at play in Progressive Era novel *The Precipice* (1914).

For instance, when Kate is first installed in the Children’s Protective Agency at Hull House she encounters Mrs. Barsaloux the patroness, and Mrs. Barsaloux’s operatic prodigy Marna Carton while on-the-job. The three women run into each other in the middle of the city. Kate is carrying a baby and has “two miserable little children clinging to her skirts. Hunger and neglect had given these poor small derelicts that indescribable appearance of depletion and shame which, once seen, is never to be confused with anything else” (31). Mrs. Barsaloux is incredulous that this is what Kate is doing for work and exclaims that Kate must be frightened that she will become
“infected with some dreadful disease” from such “filthy little bags of misery” (32).

The upbeat Kate replies that their mother has been taken to Bridewell, part of the New York Penitentiary system—originally a workhouse and evolving into a prison—while the father is at the police station waiting to be tried (32). Kate will feed and wash the children. Kate explains her job and intentions: “‘I’m moving pawns here and there, trying to find the best places for them. It’s quite exhilarating.’ . . . ‘I’m on the side of the children first and last.’ . . . ‘You must n’t forget that I’m doing it for money,’ she said. ‘It’s my job. I hope I’ll do it well enough to win the reputation of being honest, but you must n’t think there’s anything saintly about me, because there is n’t’” (32).

Here Kate declares her devotion to the children, but claims her motivation is professional, not religious nor ideological. While The work itself is exciting even though she wants to be seen as professional and upright. She likens it to a game of chess in which the children are pawns in the game.

In this analogy, Kate objectifies the children as the tiniest pieces in a game of strategy. She is motivated, she claims, by a desire for a professional reputation and her own need for an independent income. In reality, she arrives at Hull House after running away from depression and a devastating break with her father. She must find a professional identity, a place to belong, and a meaningful life—both in her own eyes and in the eyes of others. She defines herself by way of the “good work” she does for the children and young women—desolate lives, filthy bodies, and empty stomachs of needy children give meaning to her identity as a young, educated woman working for the good of others in the city. This is a new version of the maternal benefactress; she does not dispense charity, but engages in social work.
“By way of emphasizing her devotion to work,” she stops replying to the letters of her college beau and ignores all the eligible men that cross her path. She throws herself into her work organizing other people’s families in order to push away her intense sadness about the dissolution of her own family. In the evenings, she entertains the Fulhams with stories, particularly “the amusing or the merely pathetic . . . refraining from telling them of the unspeakable, obscene tragedies which daily came to her notice” (34). She creates an identity for herself in the minds of her friends on the stigmatized bodies of the neighbors. In part, she develops her identity as a brave and caring social worker in the tenements and courthouse when she indulges others in vicarious slumming with her carefully chosen stories. She maintains her position as a woman who can participate in polite society by failing to disclose that the most heinous and vicious situations that she encounters do not affect her as she imagines they should. In fact, when Peattie reveals Kate’s comfort and competency in the darkest corners the city, Kate is rejected by her college suitor Ray because he is disgusted by the places she is confident to go into and the people she is capable of upbraiding or sheltering.

In Chapter XV, when Kate has “come of age” professionally and has begun to exert influence on the nation, Peattie offers an in depth meditation on just what makes Kate so good at her job. This exposition places fictional Kate alongside the very public and efficacious figures like Jane Addams and Julia Lathrop. First, Peattie describes Kate’s ability to tell compelling human stories that allowed her listeners to understand and sympathize with the local characters. This is a quality identified with Addams’s own writing. These stories are rhetorically important to Kate and Addams’s work
because they allow the middle class listener or reader to understand and have
compassion for the lives of anonymous settlement neighbors:

[Kate] talked in personalities—in personalities so full of meaning that,
concrete as they were, they took on general significance—they had the
effect of symbols. She furnished watchwords for her listeners and she
did it unconsciously. . . . What stories there were to tell! What stories of
bravery in defeat, of faith in the midst of disaster, of family devotion in
spite of squalor and subterfuges and all imaginable shiftlessness and
shiftiness.

Kate had got hold of the idea of the universality of life—the
universality of joy and pain and hope. (105)

Kate’s Midwestern small town upbringing, Peattie notes, is key to her ability to
convey the lives and needs of the women and men, girls and boys, under her charge to
the members of her own class. Peattie sounds like she is describing Addams when she
describes Kate’s narrative mode of argument and commitment to “the universality of
joy and pain and hope.” Peattie makes the conflation even more explicit: “Just how
large a part Jane Addams had played in the enlightenment of Kate’s mind and the
dissolution of her inherent exclusiveness, Kate could not say. Sometimes she gave the
whole credit to her” (105). Then, Kate’s identity and Addams’s identity become
difficult to untangle.

For here was a woman with a genius for inclusiveness. She was
the sister of all men. If a youth sinned, she asked herself if she could
have played any part in the prevention of that sin had she had more
awareness, more solicitude. It was she who had, more than others,—
though there was a great army of men and women of good will to
sustain her,—promulgated this idea of responsibility. A city, she
maintained, was a great home. She demanded, then, to know if the
house was made attractive, instructive, protective. Was it so conducted
that the wayward sons and daughters, as well as the obedient ones,
could find safety and happiness within it? Were the privileges only for
the rich, the effective, and the outreaching? . . . She believed they were
for all. She could not countenance disinheritance. (105-06)
Peattie allows Kate to eclipse Addams. She credit Kate as speaking the hard truth without holding back for the sake of social niceties:

Yes, always, in high places and low, among friends and enemies, this sad, kind, patient, quiet woman, Jane Addams, of Hull House, had preached the indissolubility of the civic family. Kate had listened and learned. Nay, more, she had added her own interpretations. She was young, strong, brave, untaught by rebuff, and she had the happy and beautiful insolence of those who have not known defeat. She said things Jane Addams would have hesitated to say. She lacked the fine courtesy of the elder woman; but she made, for that very reason, a more dramatic propaganda. (106)

Peattie’s language becomes vague, and the two women, their work, and their words merge. Yet, Kate’s youth and naïve passion allow her to surpass Addams. Kate may be shockingly bold, but she is effective. Throughout the book, Kate is never far from Hull House and Addams. Hull House is the originator of the Children’s Protective League. Kate’s job and her office are located within Hull House. Kate refuses an offer of full-time residence in Hull House. Instead, she chooses to remain living with the Fulhams and dining with them at Mrs. Dennison’s boarding house table. Kate may eschew living in the famous settlement, but she chooses to remain in a communal living and dining situation that still carries with it a whiff of turn-of-the-century utopianism. Peattie borrows liberally from contemporary events and people, so Kate moving into Hull House might push the fiction-reality boundary too far.

The use of actual contemporary figures and governmental institutions that reflect the national zeitgeist give The Precipice an air of authenticity America for the 1914 contemporary reader. This book is not faithful to the literary realism of the day. The novel fails to depict in detail the harsh truths of life that Kate saw on a daily basis, actual situations that would be at the center of a novelistic treatment of the subject in
the hands of Theodore Dreiser, Upton Sinclair, or William Dean Howells. Much of the
time, Peattie only describes the work of Kate in vague terms and only in the way that
such situations are part of her career as a whole. “Kate had known what it was to
tramp the streets in rain and wind; she had known what it was to face infection and
drunken rage; she had looked on sights both piteous and obscene; but she had now
begun—and much, much sooner than was usual with workers in her field—to reap
some of the rewards of toil” (106). The Precipice focuses more on Kate’s career and
personal relationships than the brutality of her work. Establishing Kate as
exceptionally successful, Peattie compares Kate to Addams.

Chapter XV describes Jane Addams’s influence on Kate quite directly and
attributes the establishment of the fictional Bureau of Children to the illusory Kate
Barrington of Silvertree, Illinois. President Taft established the real Children’s Bureau
in 1912. Taft named Julia Lathrop as the first director of the Children’s Bureau.
Lathrop was from Rockford, Illinois—Addams’s hometown as well. Lathrop was a
Hull House insider and close comrade of Addams. Like the historical Lathrop, Kate
goes to Washington, DC:

At Washington she had a signal triumph. The day of her speech found
the hall in which the convention was held crowded with a company
including many distinguished persons—among them, the President of
the United States . . . She talked . . . of the ignorance of mothers, the
waste of children, the vast economic blunder which for one reason and
another even the most progressive of States had been so slow to
perceive. She said that if the commercial and agricultural interests of
the country were fostered and protected, why should not the most
valuable product of all interests, human creatures, be given at least an
equal amount of consideration. In her own way, . . . she drew a picture
of the potentialities of the child considered merely from an economic
point of view, and in impulsive words, she made plain the need for a
bureau, which she suggested should be virtually a part of the
governmental structure, in which should be vested authority for the care of children,—the Bureau of Children, she denominated it,—a scientific extension of motherhood. (107)

Thus, the care and rehabilitation of the American citizenry is a government problem and for the economic good of the nation, scientific measures need to be implemented. *The Precipice* never deviates or questions this plan. Kate is the central figure of the book because she acts to make this plan manifest.

Talk of Kate and her accomplishments grows. People who know Kate or know of her characterize Kate as an emerging type: “. . . the Addams breed of citizens,’ . . . ‘Here’s a new one with the trick—whatever it is—of making us think and care and listen. She’s getting at the roots of our disease, and its partly because she’s a woman. She sees that it has to be right with the children if it is to be right with the family. Long live the Addams breed!” (108). In this selection, the speaker notes that work that Kate and “the Addams breed” does identifies and cures “disease.” Moreover, her ability to recognize deformity results from her sex. This cure, the public argues, begins with the children. This role for the “Addams breed,” casts Kate in a maternal role, one that she has already embraced. Peattie has already ascribed to Addams/Kate that the city is a great home that must be a caring and protective shelter for its sons and daughters. Thus, Addams/Kate and “the Addams breed of citizens” stand in as mothers of this family unfortunately struggling with disease and deformity.

This book is entertaining, yet it also functions to kindle a social consciousness in women readers. Peattie, a journalist and women’s rights supporter, as well as a novelist whose writing supported her family, mixes the actual—nineteen-teens Chicago, Colorado miners’ strikes, and the establishment of the Children’s Bureau in
Washington, DC—with all the elements of a popular novel for women. Peattie includes relational drama that develops when Honora’s husband David and cousin Mary Morrison’s have an affair and abandon the family. Kate has an on-again, off-again relationship with her wealthy and handsome college suitor Ray McCrea; she is also the focus of the amorous attentions of boarding house resident Dr. von Schierbrand. However, true romance of the novel arrives with a passionate meeting of equals between Kate and Colorado businessman Karl Wander. Their relationship develops in letters they exchange. When Kate travels to Colorado to help Karl care for the emotionally incapacitated Honora Fulham, they are finally united. Their fiery attraction, coupled with intense professional ambitions, pushes them to the precipice of the mountain and the precipice of a seemingly unresolvable question: How can two people who love each other and their respective vocations so much be together and yet remain true to their larger commitments? Peattie has already established the difficulty of this conundrum in the narrative: women must choose a professional career or love and family. Honora sacrifices her family for her professional devotion to David’s groundbreaking research at the University of Chicago. As a result, Honora loses everything but her daughters. Honora’s contribution to David’s Norden (Nobel) Prize-winning scientific breakthrough goes unrecognized.

Karl and Kate’s love versus vocation conflict is resolved at the romantic and feminist apex on the final pages. Those pages of the book read like a romance and not a didactic or realist treatise. The resolution allows Kate and Karl to love one another while maintaining their individual careers. They will commit to a long distance relationship, both serving their personal ambitions and obligations to nation and
mankind. They will take their conjugal moments when and where they can find them. Kate will continue to be mother to the nation’s needy children, and Karl must honor her maternal obligation by allowing her freedom to work and remaining childless himself.

In *The Precipice*, the Addams breed of woman fights for her personal ambitions and obligations to nation and mankind. This includes suffrage and women’s rights in general. She debates the right to choose between a life of professional ambition or motherhood and domesticity. The Addams breed of woman argues for the power of women to control their own bodies: breastfeeding vs. formula and bottle-feeding; the physical, mental, and economical oppression of uncontrolled reproduction; and the very real likelihood of dying from childbirth and leaving your family destitute. Yet, science, eugenics, classism, and able-bodiedness are bound to this fight for a better life for women and families. In *The Precipice*, this fight is for white women and children, or those who could become white.

Scientific training and material advancement are central to the struggle for a higher standard of living. Kate finds opportunities to strengthen America’s children and improve motherhood everywhere. For example, Kate and boardinghouse owner Mrs. Dennison visit their friend Marna, who has given up opera for marriage to Mrs. Dennison’s nephew. At Marna’s small flat, the visitors encounter Marna’s neighbor, Mrs. Finn, and her weak, malnourished infant. Kate and Mrs. Dennison advocate for the use of formula and bottles for the exhausted and drained young Irish mother whose family has grown out of control. Mrs. Finn, a mother of five young children none of older than eight, feels trapped; she feels compelled to bear children, one after another,
due to cultural, familial, and religious pressures, even if it will kill her. The practical Mrs. Dennison explains that if a family is going to survive “a mother has no business to die; it’s the part of intelligence to live. So you just have a set-to with your old-fashioned mother-in-law” (134). Mrs. Finn is horrified at the idea of bottle-feeding her youngest child in order to regain her own strength. Kate observes that, as scandalous as it seems to the young mother, “the new generation always has to fight the old in the interests of progress” (134). The concerns of Mrs. Finn are nothing more or less than “women’s rights” (134).

After securing bottles and formula for Marna’s neighbor, Kate and Mrs. Dennison walk home reflecting on the events of the evening. Mrs. Dennison encourages Kate to consider marrying one of her boarders, Dr. von Schierbrand, or Ray in order to establish a domestic life with children. Kate refuses the personal maternal destiny that Mrs. Dennison wishes for her. She muses that a life of marriage and children would seem “stale” to her and provides her own interpretation of her future:

[S]uppose I get this Bureau for Children through. Suppose it becomes a fact. Let us play that I am asked to become the head of it, or, if not that, at least to assist in carrying on its work. Then, suppose that as a result of my work, the unprotected children have protection; the education of all the children in the country is assured—even of the half-witted, and the blind and the deaf and the vicious. Suppose that the care and development of children becomes a great and generally comprehended science, like sanitation, so that the men and women of future generations are more fitted to live than those we now see about us. Don’t you think that will be better worth while than my individual happiness? They think a woman heroic when she sacrifices herself for her children, but shouldn’t I be much more heroic if I worked all my life for other people’s children? For children yet to be born? (136)
Kate is concerned about the fate of children yet to be born. Her Children’s Bureau would protect the unprotected children and bring education to all, even “half-witted, and the blind and the deaf and the vicious” (136). The meaning of her life is predicated on the deformity of masses of American children. Kate is exceptionally successful at constructing her life of meaning.

Her shining moment arrives when she joins two thousand of the Addams breed for the Federation of Women’s Club’s convention in Los Angeles “in the name . . . of culture, of literature, of sisterhood, of benevolence, of music, art, town beautification, the abolition of child-labor, the abolition of sweat-shops, the extension of peace and opportunity” (218). Kate has the keynote speech. Her talk is appealing beyond all others because she rallies the crowd with the “idea of an extension of motherhood, an organized, scientific supervision of children . . . the concrete and essentially womanly idea of the care of children” (220). Kate has no illusions about the general quality of parents in fact “real mothers” are uncommon. The bulk of American mothers, she explains, are breeding, lactating “mammalia.” The Bureau of Children must elevate the common “mammalia up into the high estate of motherhood” and the Addams breed of women she is addressing will become “the mothers of the communities—the mothers of the state” (222).

These national mothers will seek to eliminate disability and nurture smart, superior children. These women, according to Kate, would benefit from a federal agency to help them succeed at such a grand project.

Is the child blind, deaf, lame, tubercular, or possessed of any sorry inheritance? The Bureau of Children will devise some method of easing its way; some plan to save it from further degeneration. Is the child
talented, and in need of special training? Has it genius, and should it, for the glory of the commonwealth and the enrichment of life be given the right of way? Then the Bureau of Children will see to it that such provision is made. It will not be the idea merely to aid the deficient and protect the vicious. (220-21)

Kate identifies the disabled and the criminal as a part of a single class of children. Their rehabilitation is paramount, but not to the exclusion of America’s most gifted progeny. The new religion of eugenic science inspires these national mothers. Kate argues that the Addams breed of women has lost faith in theistic religion, but has gained a sense of the efficacy of their own efforts and the power of science:

As the Bureau of Agriculture labors to propagate the best species of trees, fruit, and flowers, so we would labor to propagate the best examples of humanity—the finest, most sturdily reared, best intelligenced boys and girls. . . . It is an economic measure of the loftiest type. It will provide against the waste of bodies and souls; it is a device for the conservation and scientific development of human beings. It is . . . the new, practical religion—a new prayer. (220-21)

Kate’s national maternal project will be a financial boon to the nation, as well as a project that harnesses and improves the natural resources of the US—like the development of scientific agriculture. America will become a mighty nation by making eugenically informed mothers and applying scientific management principles to the elimination of disability and the development of genius. She has “set in motion a movement which may have a more lasting effect upon my country than any victory ever gained by it on the field of battle . . ..” (225). Pride and the satisfaction of her own ambitions flare up inside her when she thinks of Karl—“she did not so much wish to succeed for him as in despite of him” (220). She fears that the pleasure she feels with him is but mere selfishness in the face of the duty she has to the nation with
or without Karl. She will be the banner carrier for American motherhood that deforms and cures, stigmatizes and redeems.

*A Hazard of Fortune: Capitalism Impoverishes, Deforms, and Kills!*

The maternalism, charity, deformance dynamic is not just found in social settlement novels about the women who work in urban centers, but in this case it is evident in a novel about New York City and men and women who cross social and economic boundary lines. *A Hazard of New Fortunes* is a realist novel that may perpetuate mechanisms of social control, promoting liberal individualism, but I argue that it offers a critique of social practices, as well as a critique of capitalism as a deforming force.

Central to my analysis of *A Hazard of New Fortunes* is Howells’s dichotomous depiction of the city as picturesque and lively, as well as abominable and in need of redemption. This complex presentation of the city resonates with the city depicted in social settlement novels. Basil March’s relationship with the city and its inhabitants evolves over the course of the story. I will argue that through the transformation Basil learns to see that social divisions defined by stigma and wealth are arbitrary and easily subject to change. While there are no settlement workers in this text, three characters engage directly with the east siders. Conrad Dryfoos, Margaret Vance, and Berthold Lindau all have personal commitments to alleviate the injustices associated with urban poverty. Young, idealistic Conrad is the son of a recently wealthy natural gas tycoon; Margaret is a socialite-turned-charity worker and nun; and Lindau is a German
intellectual who lives his Socialist principles. This trio of characters troubles the hegemonic values of liberal individualism and class prejudice in the story.

Following protagonist Basil through the city, the reader acquires a solid image of late nineteenth century New York City. The March’s search for a suitable apartment dominates the first quarter of novel. This quest takes them to flats and neighborhoods well above their means, and down city streets that they never would have traveled on their own. This quest is an excursion of excess that stands in sharp distinction to the depiction of the city in the texts of Chapter Two that take the tenements of the Lower East Side or Chicago’s Nineteenth Ward as its center, not the brownstones and apartment buildings Washington Square or Gramercy as its primary setting. The Marches, a middle-class, bourgeois couple, have relocated to New York, but they do not have the luxury of unlimited funds to make their way in Manhattan. As a result, they struggle to find their place, but then they have it is a tad more gritty and simple than Boston. Thus, Howells offers an outsiders’ view of the city to the reader. Amy Kaplan, Palmer argues, shows that the realist novel, “contrasts a middle class domestic ‘foreground’ to the ‘unreal’ city composed of the working classes and capitalist elite. [Kaplan] identifies the middle-class . . . Basil and Isabel March, as vehicles for representing the middle-class response to the new, unsettling anonymity of city life. For Kaplan the Marches are mobile, realist characters ‘preoccupied with the problem of in inhabiting and representing rented space” (Palmer 219; as quoted in Palmer; Kaplan 12). I argue that the social settlement as Addams portrays it undermines this anonymity of city life, while the fictional texts examined herein also foreground the middle class and push the working class and capitalist elite to the ‘unreal’ city.
The Marches middle-class outsider status is pertinent since the other settlement texts present New York and Chicago from the point of view of characters who are at home in the city. The reader follows the Marches as they try to understand the strange new city. For instance, during their house hunting, the Marches encounter a “decent-looking man with the hard hands and broken nails of a workman” searching for scraps of food in the piles of garbage that line the streets (70). Isabel has become a sheltered middle-aged wife and mother. She is scandalized by desperate man who picks up “a dirty bit of cracker from the pavement and cram it into his mouth and eat it down as if he were famished” (70). They realize that the world has always been just as dirty and dire, but in days gone past when they traveled outside their comfort zone, they were younger and simply did not pay attention. In their youth they were not yet so bourgeois Basil reflects. There is so much that is has been invisible to them now that they are ensconced in their upper-middle class existence: “. . . you don’t starve in parlor cars and first-class hotels; but if you step out of them you run your chance of seeing those who do . . . If it’s the unhappy who see unhappiness, think what misery must be revealed to people who pass their lives in the really squalid tenement-house streets” (72).

The encounter with the man eating a forgotten cracker from the street resonates with the creation of public ordinances that intended to control begging and other such unsightly behavior from the city streets for the sake of middle-class city-dwellers like Basil and Isabel. Susan Schweik’s 2009 publication, The Ugly Laws, catalogues and analyzes the legislation and policing of begging, disability, non-normative gender performances like cross dressing, and other civil disruptions in Progressive Era cities.
The “unsightly beggar ordinances” were enacted to penalize begging and grotesque public spectacles. The man’s actions and physical being discomfits the Marches and their gaze deforms him and registers him as threatening to the couple. The starving, dirty man the Marches’ encounter takes money from the couple and undermines their belief that America is the land of plenty. Such images testify to the fact that “[m]anifest deformity posed a supposed threat . . . to notions of American national integrity . . . A tensely conjoined mixture of ableism, biologized racism, and nativism emerged in American culture” (Schweik 165). The inclusion of the hungry man to whom Basil gives money provides a literary example of the distance between the world of the Marches and other middle class citizens of the city and the world of the disenfranchised and hounded non-normate subject of ugly laws. These “unsightly beggar ordinance[s]” increased in frequency concurrent with anti-immigration measures (Schweik 167). Thus, social settlement fiction texts drew inspiration from the realities of the socio-cultural moment, and locations, as well as the institutions that disciplined, reconditioned, or concealed poverty, disability, and unconventional gender behavior.

Howells’s characters repeatedly describe New York as “picturesque.” For the Marches, giving money to the starving man is another novel experience, though not one that they relish. Howells is emphasizing the visually stimulating and complex construction of the setting. Stigmatized identities abound and Basil and Isabel wrestle with how they feel about the encounter. They would like to see themselves as liberal, but their emotional reactions in the face of poverty and difference calls into question their true attitudes about the other. For instance, in Chapter XI, Basil rides the Third
Avenue elevated train down to the East Side to find Lindau. He marvels at the “picturesque admixture” of humanity (182). “March never entered a car without encountering some interesting shape of shabby adversity, which was almost always adversity of foreign birth,” though he realizes that the poorest workers cannot afford train fare and thus elude his gaze (182-3). In this selection, the fellow occupants of the train give the scene its striking quality. Howells describes a group people on the train that represent Goffmen’s categories of stigma. The contrast between their stigmatized identities and Basil’s normate identity make riding the train seem “picturesque” to Basil.

The elevated train is hurtling along the tracks above the city, which itself has a character. The East Side trains speeds southward “into the gay ugliness—the shapeless, graceless, reckless picturesqueness of the Bowery” (183). This is the same Bowery that Richard Harding Davis’s Van Bibber and his friends frequent to get their kicks—thwarting Thieves Row, able to misbehave with little fear of censure from members of their own society. Thus the “gay ugliness—the shapeless, graceless, reckless [picturesque]” Bowery is a space of criminal or licentious behavior, poverty, danger, ethnic difference, and it is down the Bowery side streets that the College Settlement and the Henry Street Settlement would be found. It is in this neighborhood that the fictional Eleanore Cuyler works.

Bodies that fail to measure up fill this space, the train, and the streets of the neighborhood. The people are treated and housed like beasts, not humans. The space is lawless and degraded. Basil finds the black crepe of mourning on the door of Lindau’s tenement. Death and deformity are ubiquitous here. The deformity is manifest by the
myriad bodies and by the space itself. Calling to mind Tobin Sieber’s observations about the connection between space and bodies:

Human communities come into being and maintain their coherence by imagining their ideal forms on the basis of other bodies. It is no accident, then, that descriptions of communities in disarray summon images of the disabled body and that, conversely, the appearance of disabled bodies in public provokes fears that the community is itself under attack or coming apart. (“What Can Disability”198)

The space and the people constitute one another as Siebers suggests. Siebers uses this formulation to explain the existence of ugly laws that control the visibility of the disabled, impoverished, non-normative body. However, for the Lower East Side this is not an anomalous sight that can be easily policed away. This scene with its ugliness and recklessness is just business as usual.

In Chapter XI, Howells describes Basil’s entire journey to the Lower East Side in great, colorful detail. The reader experiences the trip through the eyes of Basil, a man who has become keenly aware of fitting and not fitting into different neighborhoods as a result of his jarring relocation to New York City. He ogles the “picturesque admixture” of people from different places, occupying different classes, but he is on the train with the commercial motive to find Lindau and invite him to work for the journal Every Other Week. To do this, Basil must locate Lindau in his Lower East Side tenement.

Basil’s entire trip downtown telescopes to Lindau’s disabled body at the center of his cold dirty bedroom. The scene is unsettling for Basil. Lindau is at home—in his room in a shared tenement apartment reading in bed—his cap pulled down over his bald head. Basil asks if he is sick, but Lindau explains that he is not sick; it is simply
cheaper to stay warm in bed than keep a fire going all day. This interaction provides a
counter example to the middle-class work ethic that requires honorable and healthy
individuals to work for money not lie in bed reading, spending their days in seemingly
unproductive activities. Basil finds Lindau in a dirty, disheveled, shared tenement,
amidst a foreign and chaotic landscape, though he is a character of exceptional
education, high principle, and has Basil’s sincere respect

Basil deems Lindau’s way of life unnecessarily harsh and distasteful. However, Lindau explains that he chooses to live there in order to maintain a
familiarity with the realities of urban poverty. When he lived in Greenwich Village,
Lindau says, he began to lose his sense of the poverty that exists in the city. “... you
much zee it all the dtime—zee it, hear it, smell it, dtaste it—or you forget it. That is
what I gome here for” (190).

Lindau’s decision to live in the Lower East Side offers a compelling argument
for why the social settlement workers choose to live in the neighborhoods that they do.
This may explain why women like Dr. Alice Hamilton, who worked outside of the
Nineteenth Ward researching industrial workplace safety, choose to live at Hull
House. Hamilton, for instance, had the chance to see the men and women who worked
in the “dangerous trades” in their daily lives even when she was not in the factories
gathering data for her reports on health risks in manufacturing plants.

Sadly, the wisdom of the city streets eludes Basil. For instance, Basil and his
teenage son Tom are walking downtown in late winter when they enter a street where
great piles of frozen garbage are beginning to thaw. Such scenes of fetid piles of
rubbish and decomposing material, like the one the March men observe, are similar to
descriptions of the Nineteenth Ward by Jane Addams. Garbage collection in the poorest neighborhoods was spotty at best, the result of corruption and indifference on the part of municipal government. The setting spurs Basil and Tom to discuss the state of affairs both on the city streets and in the economy of man in a larger sense. They explore their views of the inevitability of human suffering and inequality in contrast to Lindau’s personal belief in a world of equanimity and plenty. Basil comments about the squalor, “It’s curious, isn’t it, how fond the poor people are of these unpleasant thoroughfares? You always find them living in the worst streets.” It is the poor who endure “the burden of the wrong in the world,” Tom replies to his father (300). Tom is repeating what he has learned from Lindau: “Every sort of fraud and swindling hurts them the worst. The city wastes the money it’s paid to clean the streets with, and the poor have to suffer, for they can’t afford to pay twice, like the rich” (300). Lindau has convinced young Tom of the degradation of the poor by the capitalist system. The abandoned garbage on the streets stands in for the quality of life for the poor and stigmatized citizens in the city as a whole.

_A Hazard of New Fortunes_ is not a social settlement novel, yet it reinforces some of the central dynamics that are at play in settlement fiction. The middle-class able-bodied settlement workers leave their own worlds to enter the neighborhoods that need them. Thereupon, it is figuratively the neighborhood that is lacking and in need of rehabilitation. The young worker in texts like _The Precipice_ and “Eleanore Cuyler” do not enter the East Side neighborhood and deem the way of things “business as usual.” The settlement worker looks about and sees that the streets are dirty, thus
legitimizing the need for her to be there. Their normative presence on the street and in the buildings deforms individual people and the neighborhood as an entity.

As discussed in the Introduction, Shenah Pessah, from Yezierska’s story “Wings” does not recognize her hands as dirty and calloused until she leaves downtown and enters a public library. She only recognizes her lack in contrast. Lindau already understands about the vast contrast that exists between uptown and downtown and he chooses to live downtown in a shared tenement flat in order to remember that urban poverty and everything that goes along with it is, in fact, business as usual. Lindau believes, as Jane Addams does, that the power of the capitalist system to exploit and abuse workers in need is the source of much impairment and injustice. He knows that is how society works—hungry men “pick up a dirty bit of cracker from the pavement and … eat it down,”—and he is committed to fighting to make society more just and less harsh (Howells 70).

While there are no settlement workers in this text, the young Conrad Dryfoos, Margaret Vance, and Berthold Lindau forward reform, charity, and resistance, respectively. Conrad joins Every Other Week and wants the periodical do some good. “If you can make the comfortable people understand how the uncomfortable live, it will be a very good thing, Mr. March. Sometimes it seems to me that the only trouble is that we don’t know one another well enough; and that the first this is to do this.” (147). Conrad echoes the language and sentiments of reformers like Addams when he argues that exposure and direct experience will allow members of the privileged classes to understand and empathize with those of the less privileged classes. One might argue that this is a show of paternalism on Dryfoos’s part, but I argue that
Howells describes Conrad in a manner that makes his statement seem womanly, perhaps maternal, from Basil’s point of view. When Conrad describes what the journal might be able to do, Basil views him as a weak, unmanly individual: “Whenever he laughed his face looked weak, even silly” (147). Basil perceives Conrad as idealistic and emasculated. He travels into the most impoverished neighborhoods like the female settlement workers. He enters the tenements and impoverished places to bring his assistance and fulfill his calling. His work and his body resemble those of a maternal charity or social worker. The devout Conrad remarks that work gives him an understanding of injustice and poverty, “. . . I think that the city itself is preaching the best sermon all the time” (158). He has turned from the lessons of capitalism that his father would have him learn to that of the city. Conrad seeks to give himself over to reform and alleviating injustice, whereas Margaret Vance’s mission seems to be to give herself wholly to the city and its people.

During the course of the novel, Margaret spends increasing amounts of time with the very poor and becomes involved in a labor strike by women of the needle trades (471; 397). In stages, she removes herself from the world of uptown society. She regards herself and her class responsible for the injustices and terrible living conditions endured by workers. While the drivers strike turns violent in the city, Margaret encounters Conrad and urges him to help the strikers. “It’s we—people like me, of my class—who make the poor betray one another,” she says about the desperation of striker and scab alike (420).

Conrad idolizes Margaret; there is nothing maternal about the depiction of Margaret. She is saintly. She is the embodiment of charity. While Lindau declines
toward death in the hospital, Margaret sits and holds his hand. “‘There is no comfort for us in ourselves,’ . . . ‘It’s hard to get outside; but there’s only despair within.
When we think we have done something for others, by some effort, we find it’s all for our own vanity’” (471). After Lindau dies, Margaret releases herself to the “outside,” renounces all, and becomes a nun, mute and radiating peace (495). She vanishes into the Lower East side cityscape unlike Eleanore Cuyler, who holds firmly to her distinct class identity. Margaret Vance knows it is class identity is at the root of processes of alienation and deformance. She seeks to ameliorate the problem the only way she knows how—to give herself completely to the people who have suffered because of her and those of her class.

Like the settlement workers, Conrad, Margaret, and Lindau all regard the city as an environment of education. The community, the city, and the nation offer ample evidence of the brutal inequality that exists. Strikers take to the streets for a living wage; black men and women come north to the city for work, but find segregation and poverty instead; hungry men eat dirty crackers from the street. Howells juxtaposes this city to the one the contributors and benefactors of the journal *Every Other Week* enjoy. The Marches, Dryfooses, and Mr. Fulkerson share their good fortune, good food, and the prospect of a profitable future.

Basil tries to portray Lindau as a cosmopolitan intellectual who could be an asset to the bourgeois circle that the Marches and Dryfooses inhabit. Basil would like to draw Lindau into this world of plenty, but Lindau’s principles keep him at a distance. Basil suggests that many Americans would look at Lindau’s stump and wish they could give their own hands to Lindau to replace the one he nobly lost for the
nation (192). He sets Basil straight on this point: “They owe me nothing. Do you think I knowingly gave my hand to save this oligarchy of traders and tricksters, this aristocracy of railroad wreckers and stock gamblers and mine-slave drivers and mill-serf owners? No; I gave it to the slave; the slave—ha! Ha! Ha!—whom I helped to unshackle to the common liberty of hunger and cold” (193). Lindau explains that he gave his hand in the Civil War for a bittersweet tale of equality.

In the epigraphs that open this chapter, Kate expresses that she represents an ideal of scientific reform. Her intentions cast thousands and thousands of children as helpless orphans. These children need her because they are deficient in any number of ways. “Disability, then, is the attribution of corporeal deviance—not so much a property of bodies as a product of cultural rules about what bodies should be or do” (Garland-Thomson 6). Kate presents her remediation as a national duty, thus suggesting that the deformity of the nation’s needy children is a threat to the state. Her patriotic service is “a higher one than the soldier’s” (235).

Addams is committed to the ideal of equality and equality of opportunity. Philanthropy divides the world into two classes that are inherently unequal. Charity and equality are incompatible—where there is charity there is deformation, and the young women who are portrayed in these stories as settlement and social workers are cast as care-giving mothers to needy children or even adults who are regarded as dwarfish, vicious, or desperate. Addams credits the social worker or philanthropist with a democratic, egalitarian commitment that revolts against the “division of the world into . . . . two classes,” but that is not evident in The Precipice or “Eleanore Cuyler” (“Subtle Problems of Charity”). Neither Kate nor Eleanore have commitments
to respect all people, including those they serve, as citizens of a truly democratic nation. “Eleanore Cuyler” and *The Precipice* simultaneously depict and reify social inequity. The middle-class reader is free to identify with the characters.

Margaret and Conrad do not overturn any of the expectations of charity or reform workers, but Lindau offers a counter critique to both unbridled capitalist forces and the deforming forces endured by the East Siders. He embodies a universal regard for humanity, not based up class, ethnic, or able-bodied identity. Lindau makes visible the “unconscious division of the world” and fights against it—this shifting gaze allows the reader to see behind the disabling forces. *A Hazard of New Fortunes* undermines the status quo and spur critical assessments of social and economic relations. “[Realist novels] do not produce morally pleasing endings or radically changed societies; instead they remind readers of the need for, and the difficulty of, maintaining cognitive and emotional connections in a heterogeneous society” argues Stephanie Palmer (215). The reminder that realist novels offer may be a path to reverse deforming forces. Thus, if the reader identifies with the middle-class protagonist Basil—an outsider socially and geographically—they may find themselves reminded of the challenge to equality and justice that exists in a world as diverse as the one in the book and perhaps the world outside the book. The texts in Chapter Two *The Annals of 'Steenth Street* and *The Precipice* will also challenge the reader to ponder the complications of relations of power in a world of gross material inequality. The reader follows the settlement neighbors from the tenements, to the streets, and into the gaze of the settlement worker, agent of charity, or philanthropist.
Chapter Two

**Opposition at the Intersection: Neighbors Critique Settlement Life**

The previous chapter focused on how Kate and Eleanore, both settlement workers, functioned within the community and how their interactions with the objects of their work lead to deformance. In Chapter Two, however, the point of view in the stories moves from the settlement or social worker to that of the object of reform or charity. Alice Dunbar-Nelson's collection of short stories *The Annals of 'Steenth Street* (1900-1910) and Anzia Yezierska's novel *Salome of the Tenements* (1923) present the working poor neighbor-characters’ point of view, not the settlement or charity worker who brings her middle-class values, scientific training, and relief into the tenement flats and settlement classrooms. Many of their characters are immigrants and first generation Americans.

These stories depict settlement workers and the philanthropists who fund the settlements. Both are frequent visitors to the crowded communities that are home to settlements and the missions—missions can be a variant of the social settlement. It is important to note that the settlement worker and the philanthropist are two discrete character classes. Their motives, interaction with the local community and treatment by the authors are distinct from one another. Criticisms of charitable relations as related to both classes of actor are central to the narratives in this chapter. These texts are about resistance.

These stories depict settlement neighbors who fail to, refuse to, exemplify the white, middle-class ideal of docile American. They illustrate settlement neighbors who resist deformance and stigmatized identities. These books allow the readers, especially
the middle-class, white readers who reside far from the Lower East Side a look inside the tenement. The readers peer into the lives and minds of fictional settlement neighbors. Access to illustrations of the internal workings of the neighborhood allow for potential insight by the reader about local lives. “The Annals of ‘Steenth Street” and Salome of the Tenements resist reading settlement neighbors as disabled or stigmatized, while The Precipice and “Eleanore Cuyler” portray flat depictions of dirty, ignorant, pathetic, or menacing tenement-dwellers. “The Annals of ‘Steenth Street” and Salome of the Tenements show the complex human faces of the tenement-dwellers. Often the philanthropists, charitable visitors, and social workers in these texts are ignorant of the lives and experiences of the women and men they seek to help.

As we will see in my final chapter, Jane Addams echoes Dunbar-Nelson and Yezierska raise criticisms that charity or social workers are frequently—and destructively—ignorant of the lives and experiences of the women and men they seek to help. “Neighbors” in this chapter means the fictional characters, not the authors. Both Yezierska and Dunbar-Nelson spent the bulk of their writing careers living far from the bustling, polyglot neighborhoods about which they write. It is important to note that both Dunbar-Nelson and Yezierska spent time during their childhoods and young adult lives living in communities similar to those about which they wrote. During her young adulthood in the late nineteenth century, Dunbar-Nelson (then Alice Ruth Moore) moved to New York and helped build the White Rose Mission with Victoria Earle Matthews. The White Rose Mission was a social settlement that served New York City's burgeoning black population. Missions and settlements were often
similar in their structure and work, though missions were predominately found in black communities and often had church affiliations (Luker).

Dunbar-Nelson and Matthews, both mixed-race African American women, saw the profound need for institutions that supported the black community. Nurturing New York’s black youth was the special mission of the White Rose Mission. Lessons in black history and literature were included in the curriculum of the White Rose Mission. Matthews and Dunbar-Nelson’s work address many of the needs that Fannie Barrier Williams describes in her essays published in the Southern Workman and Charities as discussed in the Introduction. Dunbar-Nelson and Yezierska’s texts perform very different functions than Williams’s essay though. Their fiction illustrate that working poor protagonists can exert personal agency or resist deformation when interacting with representatives of charitable organizations or philanthropists.

The authors bring settlement workers into the process of disabling or producing a new generation of whitened U.S. citizens, but the characters refuse this project. These texts highlight the role of the philanthropist in the process of disabling. Female reformers and philanthropists in particular, employ benevolent paternalism to deform. The members of the community are sometimes overtly critical of the power of the social workers, though sometimes the objects of reforms just refuse domination. Social settlement workers in Yezierska’s stories uniformly participate in deformation, but workers in Dunbar-Nelson’s have more complicated relationships with the local community. However, both authors harshly critique philanthropists and their actions. Yezierska’s stories are full of characters burdened with stigmatized identities based on poverty, and cultural and ethnic difference, but she does not describe any characters
with physical or cognitive impairments. Dunbar-Nelson however fills her stories with characters with physical impairments, characters deformed by the prejudice of middle class expectations, and characters stigmatized by the hypocritical application of Christian values. Charity is clearly a prime deformer in all the stories in Chapter Two. In Yezierska’s novel, one finds motherhood only in acts of benevolent maternalism, but in Dunbar-Nelson the relationship between motherhood and deformance is rich and nuanced.

Dunbar-Nelson belongs in this chapter because her writing reflects her own complex relationship to class and race—in this, her writing is more akin to Yezierska, than Williams or Fernandis. Young Alice Moore was of mixed racial heritage and grew up with privilege in New Orleans. Kevin Gaines describes Dunbar-Nelson’s lifelong struggle with alienation and subtle class-based aggression. With fair skin and red curls, she would pass for white in order to attend cultural events that excluded black patrons (Hull xxix). She moved North in 1896 and studied literature at a number of elite East Coast universities (Gaines 210). In 1897, she began working with Victoria Earle Matthews at the White Rose Mission in uptown Manhattan. The young Alice Moore, like many settlement workers, had to work full-time to support herself. She volunteered at the settlement and taught school in Brooklyn (Kramer 250).

A decade or two separate the composition of “The Annals of ‘Steenth Street” from *Salome of the Tenements*. Alice Dunbar-Nelson began her public writing career much earlier than Yezierska. She began her writing career when she was just twenty, and thus entered the world of late Nineteenth Century black literary production,
fraught with the limitations of a racist publishing industry and reading public.

Dunbar-Nelson is perhaps most famous for her stories about life in Louisiana Creole country. Her second book, a collection of short fiction, *The Goodness of St. Rocque* includes local color stories about mixed-race characters. Published in 1899, it was her last full-length printed manuscript during her lifetime. Dunbar-Nelson avoided the stereotypical characters expected in black fiction by writing about mixed race or “aracial” characters (Hull xxxii). Critics regarded Dunbar-Nelson’s writings about Louisiana and Creole culture as being the work of a native, just as they regarded Yezierska’s writings about the Lower East Side and the world of the Jewish immigrant as the work of a native-informant. Dunbar-Nelson’s later works abandon the colorful stories of Creole and “aracial” characters to engage with racism directly, explains editor Gloria T. Hull. Hull edited the three volumes of Dunbar-Nelson’s writing, published in 1988 in *The Schomburg Library of Nineteenth-Century Black Women Writers* collection. “The Annals of ‘Steenth Street’” were never published altogether during Dunbar-Nelson’s lifetime.

While “The Annals of ‘Steenth Street’” aren’t about Louisiana and the world of the mixed-race Creole community in which she grew up, she is writing about a place and situation familiar to her through her work with the White Rose Mission in Manhattan from 1897-1898. Dunbar-Nelson allows the reader inside the experience and life of the neighbor and the settlement resident, offering insights about their evolving relations and their shared difficulties with the wealthy philanthropic outsider. Hull suggests that the “modern feminist realism” that is nascent in earlier stories becomes “urban naturalism” in these stories. These stories share much with
Stephen Crane’s *Maggie: A Girl of the Street* and other short stories about the Lower East Side. The ‘Steenth Streeters live very hard lives, fraught with poverty, hunger, violence, and rampant alcoholism. The focus on racial difference, that Hull notes was central to many Dunbar-Nelson’s work, becomes class difference in these stories. The locals are a mix of poor and working poor European American ethnicities.

Dunbar-Nelson presents a complex picture of the neighbors’ lives; they do not live lives oriented toward some middle-class ideal, like the middle-class goals Fannie Barrier Williams and Sarah Collins Fernandis’s essays promoted for urban black populations. Alice Dunbar-Nelson was also an activist and reformer, but her writing is not polemic, openly calling for change, in the manner of Williams or Addams. Nor do her narratives present a settlement administrator’s point of view like the narratives of Sarah Collins Fernandis, a career settlement administrator. *The Annals of ‘Steenth Street* tells the stories of the ‘Steenth Street locals from their own perspectives. However, her stories describe the experiences of both the community members and Pure in Heart Mission administrator Mrs. Morton. The neighbors’ relationships to the settlement in *The Annals of ‘Steenth Street* reflect an intricate balance. Sometimes the neighbors avail themselves of the settlement services, and sometimes they resent and resist the services of the settlement.

In the world that Dunbar-Nelson describes the locals are skeptical, if not overtly hostile to the philanthropists who support the settlements. The settlement founders and workers are in a complicated relationship with philanthropists, since they rely on monetary gifts keep the doors open and the services flowing. This delicate and fraught relationship is evident in Dunbar-Nelson’s story “Miss Tillman’s
Protégé.” Dunbar-Nelson depicts the discomfort the settlement director has with Miss Tillman and her assumptions. The author presents the philanthropist as a self-congratulating, prejudiced deformer. Such a presentation is consistent with Yezierska’s fiction but would be an impossible character for a story by a settlement administrator who wanted to continue receiving funds. Lastly, fiction writers can show the neighbors resisting and criticizing the deforming acts and misconceptions of the philanthropist in a manner that would be out of the question for a settlement director or reformer.

“Miss Tillman’s Protégé” is a story of a girl and her family that reject the deforming benevolent maternalism of a philanthropist. The self-righteous philanthropist must make a great effort to maintain her identity as selfless in the face of the community’s hostility. In the end Miss Tillman prevails and maintains her illusions about herself and her prejudices about “the poor.” Both the neighbors and the settlement administrator must continually push back against the deforming force of benevolent maternalism.

The story opens with philanthropist Miss Tillman’s exclamation, “Oh, poor little thing” when she sees young Hattie Gurton working on a sewing card at the Pure in Heart settlement (101). It is an outpouring of emotion, “oh, . . .” followed by “poor” bears both the meaning of impoverished materially and worthy of sympathy. Miss Tillman believes Hattie lives in abject poverty, with cruel parents who deny their daughter any pleasures or freedoms. Hattie has a deformed leg and vision impairment. However, Hattie is especially clever and aware of how her impairments can work for her, unencumbered by any fetters of socially constructed attitudes of
disability. Miss Tillman’s use of “little” implies that Hattie is vulnerable, in need of care, and diminished in ability—though Hattie’s words or actions show the very opposite. Lastly, Miss Tillman refers to Hattie as a “thing.” This resonates with the title, which places Hattie as an entity only in her relationship with Miss Tillman, without any indication of gender, age, or a name of her own. “Thing” dehumanizes Hattie and suggests that she is an item to be collected or observed from a distance with objectivity, not a person with her own relationships, abilities, and preferences. Miss Tillman’s “charitable soul” and her distance from people like Hattie define the do-gooder in her own mind. Dunbar-Nelson writes:

[Miss Tillman] was beautiful; she was fairly wealthy. She sang in the choir of her favorite church; not because of any emolument it might bring, but because she loved to sing and she did not think it right to deprive the world of the pleasure of hearing her voice. She went in for charity as she went in for music. It gratified her artistic spirit to note the supposed contrast between herself, and those ‘dear people’ as she was wont to call them. (102-03)

Classism, narcissism, and benevolent paternalism keep Miss Tillman busy, and deforming.

Dunbar-Nelson describes Hattie directly too, with as much detail as she gives to Miss Tillman. “Hattie was deformed. Her eyes were dim and near-sighted, and one of her legs was twisted painfully. But she did not like to be pitied or petted, and she was happiest when it was taken for granted that she was like other children. She had her brother John, . . . and her kitten, and she was happy” (103). Mr. Gurton works. The family is poor, but they have enough to eat, and Hattie has toys and a warm and pretty coat. Her parents “were singularly gentle with her” (103). She attends school, though she uses her impairments as an excuse to stay home, play, and go to the
settlement. “[W]hen it suited her fancy, she took Johnny by the hand and trotted over to the kindergarten at the Pure in Heart” (103). It is at the settlement that Miss Tillman first encounters and then decides she must adopt Hattie.

Mrs. Morton, the settlement director, suggests that any adoption would go through Hattie’s family. Mrs. Morton’s reflects upon the troublesome Miss Tillman as someone who “spent freely and gave money whenever and wherever she was asked, but she did not understand many things. Indeed, it was doubtful is she ever could” (103). Miss Tillman lacks the insight that Hattie’s parents cherish her as much as wealthy parents cherish their children: “surely these poor people up here would be awfully glad to be relieved of their cares. I am in love with that child . . . She’d look lovely in a dear white apron with her hair smoothed sitting at my feet in my study” (101). Hattie, in her imagination is like a pet or a fount of unending gratitude. Hattie rejects Miss Tillman’s enticements, preferring, she says, to stay with her mother.

On a mission to adopt Hattie, Miss Tillman takes Hattie’s address and rushes out “on her errand of mercy” (104). The Gurtons’ building meets all her expectations; she is perversely delighted. “She felt a delicious thrill of horror because the stairs were dark and the halls ill smelling, and she found herself unconsciously planning out a letter which she would write to a friend in the country” (104). Miss Tillman is a woman who enjoys slumming with her friends in hopes that they will encounter some “dear people” who have benefitted from her charity and will express their gratitude in front of an audience. She anticipates writing a letter to a friend about the dreadful living conditions her new ward lived in, and how wonderful it is that she did such good work in rescuing Hattie. Miss Tillman’s internal monologue deforms the
neighborhood and by extension young Hattie. The philanthropist’s image of Hattie’s degraded domestic situation cracks when she enters the Gurton residence and finds it clean and decorated with care. She has interrupted Hattie, alone at play with her dollhouse, dolls, and art supplies that she has just put down to answer the door. These environmental factors undermine Miss Tillman’s effort to deform Hattie. Miss Tillman’s irritation abates when she reinterprets the situation—Hattie’s parents must conduct illicit business in order to furnish a house like this. She cannot imagine what the home of a workingman might look like.

Using her power as an adult, Miss Tillman inveigles Hattie to go out “for a walk.” Instead, the two shop in fancy stores and eat lunch in a posh restaurant during the afternoon. Hattie, Dunbar-Nelson tells the reader, enjoys her day out. The two return by limousine only to find that the ‘Steenth Street neighborhood in an uproar. A policeman tries to calm Mrs. Gurton. Clusters of people talk and cast nervous glances around the area. Mr. Gurton is miserable, because “[h]e had searched, and reported and had telephone advertisements to every newspaper in the city, and there was nothing else to do” (106). Someone had abducted his daughter.

When the limousine drives up, Hattie’s mother “pushes Miss Tillman roughly aside,” lavishing joyous affection on her daughter. A crowd gathers and Miss Tillman tries to explain that she thought she would return Hattie for a while “before I took her to my house” (106). Mrs. Gurton is incredulous. She realizes that Miss Tillman assumptions about the family are innately deforming and announces that the Gurton family is in fact very able. “Adopt her? Adopt my child? What do you want with my child? To make a servant or a monkey out of her? She don’t want no ‘adoptin’ of
yours. She’s got a home an’ plenty of clothes an’ plenty of victuals. She ain’t no beggar; she don’t need your ‘doptin’” (107). Mrs. Gurton exerts her rights as a citizen and threatens to have Miss Tillman arrested for kidnapping and trespassing.

The petulant Miss Tillman rides away while the neighbors jeer and Mrs. Gurton does an insulting imitation of the high-class manner of Miss Tillman. This time it is the neighbors’ turn to belittle the philanthropist. In the limousine, her confusion about the events of the day soon transform into pride at the “martyrdom she had endured in the cause of charity, and she shuddered at the memory of the thoughtless ingratitude of the poor” (108). Her delusions allow her to create an explanation that supports her own identity as a maternal benefactress. She is incapable of seeing the “dear people” as full agents in their own lives, with rights and abilities beyond need and gratitude (or an insulting lack of gratitude if the case may be). This story is satirical and Miss Tillman is the butt of the joke.

Usually, disability and other stigmatized behaviors or differences are so threatening to the norm it is necessary to render disabled or stigmatized characters powerless in fiction or ignore them altogether. “[D]isabled people are rarely depicted . . . in fiction as being in control of their own lives—in charge or actively seeking out and obtaining what they want and need (Linton 168-69). Accordingly, literature and other modes of entertainment incorporate disabled characters as stereotypes. Disabled characters are often in positions of pathetic impotence. This is not the case in Dunbar-Nelson’s fiction though. Miss Tillman’s attempt to dehumanize and deform Hattie not only fails, Hattie is a child with agency. She succumbs to Miss Tillman’s entreaty to go for a walk, but she also refuses to abandon her mother when Miss Tillman suggests
that Hattie come live with her. Hattie goes to school when she wants to, has an active playtime life, and gets around the neighborhood without much trouble.

“The Downfall of Abe Powers,” another of “The Annals of ‘Steenth Street” stories, highlights the neighbors’ ambivalence toward the settlement. Young Abe Powers fears that accepting settlement benefits will leave him vulnerable, enfeebled—open to attack by the other boys in the neighborhood. His comrades respect him for being a tough leader, but his bravado is merely a defensive protection. The new social settlement causes a sense of split loyalties because Abe and some of the other boys want to enjoy the settlement Christmas party, but do not wish other boys and members of other gangs to view them as “reformed.” Abe “dared not hope. Deep within his soul, he longed for a sight of the great tree; for a gift from its branches. He had never seen a real ‘for true’ tree” (131).

After he hears the news about the mission’s upcoming Christmas celebration “the spirit of the season had gotten into his heart.” Abe wanders the streets bestowing smiles upon the local mothers and invisible mercies upon other boys. Abe comes upon a crowd of “hootings” youths, and at the center of crowd is Abe’s drunken mother. The outrageous behavior of his mother amid a crowd of young men on the street humiliates him; the text suggests that she is flaunting her sexuality before the crowd. Abe is angry and embarrassed. He quickly, and roughly, ends his mother’s sordid display. Followed by shouts of “shame!” for his gruff treatment of her as well as laughter inspired by the obscene and humiliating encounter, he takes her back to their room in a ‘Steenth Street tenement. Secluded away from the public scene of the streets, “Abe drew a deep breath of relief” and sits “down beside the bed on which his
mother had thrown herself and listened to her drunken snores with fast rising anger. A
gloom of hopelessness and misery was settling upon his spirit . . .” (133-34). He is
contemplating why his mother spends ninety percent of her time inebriated, when
there is a knock at the door. Rev. Mr. Collier enters their “one disordered room”
uninvited. The minister lectures Abe on the evils of drink alluding to the desolate
presence of his unconscious mother passed out on the bed: “You see before you the
evil influence of drink. Let it be a lesson to you as long as you live . . . You see what
it has brought your poor mother to” (135). Put in a terrible dilemma of accepting the
degrading treatment of the local pastor or defending his family, Abe remains loyal to
his alcoholic mother. He denies Rev. Mr. Collier’s right to preach to him, throws him
out of the flat, slams the door, and turns the lock. Abe, still just a boy, cries that all his
good behavior is for naught. The local pastor is disparaging, stigmatizing, and
judgmental and Abe links the minister to the activities of the mission. He fears that
his rejection of the minister will make him no longer welcome at the settlement
Christmas celebration.

The community at large also links the settlement to the neighborhood’s
sanctimonious preacher, even though they are not connected. Mrs. Morton, director of
the Pure in Heart mission, finds that the sporadic efforts of the Rev. Mr. Collier
undermine her relationships with the neighbors. “Now and then the vague idea of
doing good would stir him, and he would go to and fro over the territory of the Pure
in Heart, and with tactlessness and platitudes, wreak untold havoc which Mrs. Morton
would have to spend months repairing” (134). This example suggests that there is a
tension between relationships of trust that Mrs. Morton tries to develop with the
neighbors and work of the local minister which alienates and deforms the denizens of ‘Steenth Street.

After the fight with the pastor, Abe sends a note of explanation to Mrs. Morton the settlement director because he fears exclusion from the Christmas celebration. She protects Abe’s honor by keeping the note a secret. She even puts a special present for him on the tree—unlike the Rev. Collier who is overly familiar with Abe and is righteous and moralistic toward the mother’s behavior. Rev. Collier fails to understand the difficult position that Abe is in, neglected and humiliated, but too young and unsupported to be able do more than subsist. The pastor’s admonition and gaze deform Abe. The domestic scene resonates with the moment when the tenement neighbors apprehend Maggie Johnson’s family and flat in Maggie: A Girl of the Streets. The Johnsons, like Abe and his mother, exist beyond the boundary of acceptable domestic conditions. His mother’s pathetic behavior and the squalid manner in which she raises him has already stigmatized him, but the pastor actively highlights the deficiencies of his family life and Abe fights the deformance.

In this situation, Mrs. Morton’s position is complex. She recognizes the damage that the minister brings upon the community and does her best to distance herself from his sanctimonious interference. Yet, she acts as gatekeeper to the Christmas party, suggests that children who are good will be allowed to attend. This gate keeping is another example of representatives of charity discerning between the worthy and unworthy poor. Clearly, Abe understands that Mrs. Morton controls distribution of the mission’s benefits because he worries that his act of resistance against the pastor’s attempt at reform will deem him unworthy of charity. While
Dunbar-Nelson depicts Mrs. Morton as respectful and kind, the community harbors ambivalence toward the settlement and the director because she controls resources they need or want.

The settlement was a very destabilizing force to the community, when it opened. At first, the settlement is at odds with the other major community center—the saloon. Locals fear that the settlement will criticize and undermine the power exerted by the saloon. The author describes the saloon as a bastion of male power and privilege. Men reap the benefits of the saloon; women and children are alienated and impoverished by the husbands and fathers’ commitment to the saloon, its activities, and the community that grows up around it. In these stories, the saloon does more harm to women and children than it supports the community at large. The social settlement threatens the power of the saloon, by supporting the women of the community. The social settlement becomes a vehicle for the empowerment of women in the community, the way that the saloon is a vehicle for empowerment of the men in the community.

However, the Pure in Heart Mission is tiny and has few resources of its own. Mrs. Morton, the director of this small settlement must fight back against the destructive and deforming forces of religion and philanthropy because they undermine the community and her relationship with the community. Simultaneously, Mrs. Morton still has to cultivate support within circles that will furnish the settlement with the means for its work. Dunbar-Nelson’s depiction of the woman who runs the Pure in Heart mission is more nuanced and sympathetic than the depiction of settlement workers in Yezierska’s work. Dunbar-Nelson’s own stint working with
Victoria Earle Matthews in the establishment of the White Rose Mission may account for the complex rendering of Mrs. Morton. Dunbar-Nelson has experienced the difficulties and the conflicting allegiances that come with running a settlement. Yezierska however is unrelenting in her critique of the destruction that follows upon settlement efforts and the philanthropy that funds it.

Anzia Yezierska was a Jewish woman who immigrated to the U.S. in her youth (c. 1890) from a Russian Polish village in the Pale. During her young life, she lived in the Lower East Side of New York, worked various jobs, and earned a degree from Columbia University's Teachers College. Yezierska captured the attention of some of the wealthy supporters of the Clara de Hirsch Home for Working Girls and garnered patrons who sent her to Columbia. At Teachers College, she was only allowed to study Home Economics, which disappointed her (Henriksen 17). She graduated, but was never interested in being a cooking teacher, and therefore had a rather abysmal and intermittent career as a teacher.

In July of 1911 Yezierska married Arnold Levitas in a religious ceremony. They lived in a middle class Jewish section of the Bronx. The next spring in May 1912, when Yezierska was about 30-years old she gave birth to her only child, Louise Levitas. After Louise was born, Yezierska spent a great deal of time with her sister Annie commiserating about the drudgery of domestic life and the inequality endured by married women. Annie lived downtown on the Lower East Side in a crowded apartment with her husband and six children—six children at that time, more children were on the way. Annie was active in grassroots reform projects and local organizing. Yezierska drew on Annie’s domestic life when she created her stories. For instance,
an experience Annie had with a social welfare agency was the original inspiration for Yezierska's first published story "The Free Vacation House" in 1915.

In December 1917, Yezierska left her relationship with Levitas and her maternal duties. Casting about for fulfilling work, Yezierska marched into the office of Columbia University Professor John Dewey with the intention of getting him to help her find a job in the public school system. Dewey had recently given a speech in which he decried the unjust firing of three Jewish teachers and she challenged him to put his words into action. She disliked being cooking teacher and did not really want another position teaching Home Economics, but she did not want the other jobs she could get either. Dewey realized that Yezierska’s passion was not for teaching, but writing. He gave her a typewriter, created a job for her on his Philadelphia research project, and became the great love of her life. Their relationship lasted less than a year, but it was pivotal to her life and work. When the relationship ended, she threw herself into four years of virtual isolation living in tiny rented apartments and rooms around Manhattan, but not in the Lower East Side. During this time, she wrote and saw one story after another in print.

During 1918, Anzia Yezierska lived and worked in Philadelphia with four Columbia graduate students (who would all eventually become academic powerhouses in their own right) and Albert C. Barnes, a wealthy and eccentric businessman who bankrolled the disorganized research project to test John Dewey's ideas about democracy and education. Dewey's graduate students lacked training to do field research, so the project(s) went poorly and yielded little toward their intended aims. Yezierska joined the venture at the beginning in an advisory role, as a
translator, and as a researcher into the lives of women and families (Martin 285). In a review of *Salome of the Tenements* that was published in the February 1923 issue of the *Literary Digest International Book Review*, James Harvey Robinson, a former Columbia University History professor, Dewey colleague, and the founder of the New School for Social Research, observed that Yezierska in her fiction had succeeded where the research of social scientists had failed.

Yezierska's stories and novels are her contribution to the study and translation of immigrant communities. Yezierska’s fiction is often autobiographical and her autobiography is often fictional. Her stories were valued because they came from the actual lived experience of a Polish immigrant, not from the second-hand observations of journalist-activists. At this point Yezierska was no longer a “supported woman” of the kind that she railed against in her essays on marriage, but a working artist who made her own living, paid her own rent, and was free. Life for Yezierska was never easy however, even during her most successful years in the 1920s. She was an intense, intemperate, albeit charismatic woman driven to work and create at the expense of those around her. The semibiographical fiction of Anzia Yezierska offers a view of life for working poor immigrants from Eastern Europe who lived in the shadow of Lower East Side social settlements. The media seized the opportunity to portray Yezierska as the “sweatshop Cinderella,” who finds success after a life of sweatshop drudgery. Yezierska used this colorful caricature to her own advantage, though the life she lead did not match up with the biography that was written for her and that she embraced.
Yezierska's female main characters generally undergo transformations impossible for women of previous generations. Thanks to cross-class experiences and access to education, these characters recognize that they have more choices personally and professionally. Sonya Vrunsky in *Salome of the Tenements* is an exemplar of the Yezierska protagonist. She is a Jewish woman with connections to the immigrant community of the Lower East Side, but her desires, talents, and ambition take her outside of that community. She has no intention of remaining connected to anyone in the old East Side, nor does she wish to join middle class society.

Through her work at a Jewish newspaper, Sonya meets John Manning, a Manhattan old money philanthropist. She decides she will marry John, but she realizes that to do so she must make her appearance more appealing to a man of his station. By the use of her wiles and charms, she procures three necessary elements for her seduction. First, Sonya has the famous uptown designer, Jacques Hollins, design a stunning yet simple dove gray dress for her. Then, she manipulates her landlord into repairing and repainting her tenement front hall and her apartment by threatening to lodge a sexual assault complaint against him. Lastly, she convinces the local pawnbroker, Honest Abe, to loan her $100 to redecorate her room based on the strength of her conviction that she will marry her millionaire and will repay the loan with hefty interest.

Her plan is successful, in no small part due to Sonya's natural beauty and her “chutzpah.” Moreover, her sense of taste is far more chic Fifth Avenue than flashy Mott Street. Sonya arrives at the designer’s studio and demands that he make an understated, elegant gown for her. (27) In fact, the notion that she never has to be
polite or thank him is evidence that she has a truly regal spirit. "Ach! Ghetto princess! You have proven to me your thoroughbred soul because you are not grateful," Hollins states. “You have given me something more profound than gratitude--more than the humble thanks of servile souls" (29). The uptown designer “Jacques Hollins” she beguiles is a kindred spirit. “Jacques” began as “Jaky Soloman” an Eastsider like Sonya Vrunsky.

Jacques presents Sonya with a one-of-kind, high-end gown. When she enters the dressing room to try on the dress, she finds all the appropriate undergarments and accessories too. “Suddenly, she saw undergarments and every little detail of the toilette laid out on the dresser—obviously for her—even shoes and silk stockings. The understanding, the delicacy of this big-hearted giving marked Hollins as being above the oppressive charity she had known as a child” (27). She does not even have to acknowledge that he provided them for her because they are in the dressing room and out of sight of their face-to-face interactions. Jacques’ relationship to her is not deforming; her agency and dignity are preserved. Jacques does not patronize her or seek satisfaction from her gratitude. In fact, Sonya offers him none. Jacques appreciates her tastes and finds pleasure in the beautiful confluence of his clothes on a beautiful woman. “(T)his is the first time that I clothed the living frame of a soul. You are the most radiant being—“ (29). During her fitting, she acknowledges his gifts to her as “democratic,” wearing these clothes makes her equal to the Astors and Vanderbilts.

In this interaction Yezierska makes clear that charity work makes those given aid “servile souls” who must express their gratefulness to those who are giving: ““Jaky
Solomon!’ [Sonya] bantered mischievously. ‘Even if you'd be as rich as Jacob Schiff, you'd never know how to be a philanthropist. You couldn't be like those kind rich ladies who felt they saved my soul when they handed me down an old pair of shoes or cast-off corsets—and expected me to gush my gratitude to the end of my days’” (29). Jacques and Sonya have contempt for the philanthropists because they believe the rich have ever been dirty with work and thus lack insight into the lives of those they purport to help. Sonya, who is enamored with John Manning, tells Jacques that John is an exception. Jacques remarks: “‘he is one of those philanthropists who come with a gilded cane to tap ash-cans and garbage heaps? I suppose,’ . . . ‘playing with poverty is more exciting than knocking golf balls”’ (30). Jacques criticizes the philanthropists, as engaging in good works as if it was a hobby. She defends John saying that he does not “play with poverty,” but instead he dedicates himself to figuring out how to rid himself of his millions. This is, however, not true and Jacques realizes it: “‘the stupid fraud! The self-deceiver! It's his wealth that has made him spiritual enough to want to get rid of his wealth”’ (30). When the rich philanthropists are done playing, they have another life uptown, but the objects of their charity live in the squalor and poverty of the East Side day in and day out.

Sonya is single-minded in her pursuit of John Manning. Ensconced in her refined gown and tastefully appointed room, Sonya begins her seduction of philanthropist and settlement founder. She secures a clerical job working with him in his settlement and her plan to snag a millionaire husband comes to fruition. They marry, take a long honeymoon at the Manning family country estate, and then she is installed as the domestic head a large uptown home. Sonya, a vibrant and engaged
woman, quickly becomes restless with the life of leisure. Sonya returns to work at the settlement as Mrs. Manning and takes her first tour of the settlement. Yezierska’s description of the settlement through Sonya’s eyes has a cinematic quality. The reader follows along from one room to another while she observes the work of the settlement, like a fly on the wall, unseen but hearing everything. Her first stop is a cooking classroom. The social worker in this class is showing a room of women how to bake a very cheap eggless, milk-less, flourless cake. Sonya overhears a student question the teacher about why they would want to make such a culinary monstrosity. The teacher becomes defensive: “‘you can't afford plum pudding. Wouldn't you rather have a cheap dessert than none at all?’” (135). Sonya already knows it is demeaning for poor to always settle for the cheapest, second-rate, second-hand items. To Sonya perhaps it is better to go without, than to be trained to settle for low quality items. Thus, an institution like the settlement house trains impoverished people to settle for the most menial jobs and the lowest quality food.

Sonya then finds a room full of charity workers, arrayed in their somber artless clothes, discussing how to discern the “worthy poor” from the “imposters.” The “imposters” claim indigence in order to received a ration of cornmeal, rice, or macaroni while secretly they have a chicken or eggs to cook for their family hidden in the flat. Throughout this process from discussion to doorway to domicile, the social workers’ judgment deforms the neighbors. According to the settlement workers, either the neighbors are desperately impoverished and humble enough to deserve charity, thus stigmatizing them as deficient, or the objects of their charitable efforts are
morally deficient and greedy because they refuse to remain satisfied with subsistence living.

Sonya is disgusted by the “social experts” Manning calls the heart of his settlement. He explains that it is reason not emotion that dictates the work of his institution; that they are using scientific surveys and social experts to determine the best course of action (134). This scientific approach cuts out the voices of the neighbors from the community in the design of the social settlement work. Sonya critiques the philanthropist—he preaches brotherhood and democracy, but does not respect her community or their input in his work (149). Sonya must acknowledge that Jacques was correct about her philanthropist. Her discovery of the troublesome inner workings of the Manning Settlement House rocks the Manning marriage.

Sonya and John argue about the work of the settlement and the problematic nature of philanthropy. Across classes, Sonya argues there is no democratic understanding. John tries to convince Sonya that the gulf's between social classes can “‘be bridged with human love and democratic understanding’” (120). Sonya knows better—there is no “‘democratic understanding between those who are free to walk into steerage and the steerage people who are not allowed to give one step up to the upper deck’” (120).7 In response to Sonya’s criticism that democratic understanding is impossible in a world rife with class difference and injustice, John replies: “‘I am giving up my life to prove my belief in the brotherhood of man’” (120). A life truly dedicated to such a cause would not be given up—such an assertion belies his commitment altogether. Manning declares that ending class difference is his “religion” and that her relentless “harping” on the topic is undermining his commitment to the
cause. This is interesting because it suggests his commitment is actually rather tenuous and definitely not up for refinement or discussion. Throughout the novel, they do not learn anything from one another about their communities. They fail to come together about how to make the settlement house any more effective or just. He does not give credence to her observations or knowledge. She does not respect him—in the beginning she worships him as a god, but after marriage, with his true work and world laid bare she sees him as having feet of clay.

Yezierska's stories show that the settlement house and progressive reform fail to improve the lives of the community members materially or emotionally. Moreover, these reform projects reinforce the same hierarchies that are plaguing society. The immigrants in her stories are not only fighting the injustices of the world, but also the deforming forces of the reform initiatives. The answer for Sonya is to separate herself from her community of origin, the world of the gentile philanthropist, and the work of reformers. “Sonya can thrive only when she remains within the close quarters of her people (Jewish immigrants) and her enclave (Lower East Side),” claims Natalie Friedman in her 2005 article, “Marriage and the Immigrant Narrative” (178). I disagree. Sonya can only survive if she allies herself with men and women like Jaky Soloman. She finds community with people who leave the ghetto and reject middle-class Protestant values. Her sort are the fiercely independent, often first-generation Eastern European Jews who turn away from the traditions of their parents or Old World culture. In order to land her millionaire husband she alienates her colleagues at the Ghetto News. After the marriage fails, Sonya chooses to be alone rather than compromise her principles. In the end, separated from John, very alone and poor, she
takes a demeaning job as a waitress. The very nature of the physically repulsive, 
degrading job causes her to reflect and become resolute about her intentions: “[S]he 
must prove to herself her ability to stand on her own feet. She had left Manning and 
the ghetto had shut her out. So she must stick tight to whatever work is available . . .
until she found some way to learn the art of designing” (165). Sonya manages to get 
everything she dreams of wanting, but she gives it up because she feels that life with 
John is a lie. She cannot be authentic with him, and he seems like “a shadow, an echo 
of a human being . . . no fire from within” (183). His sheltered life and high ideals 
have never been tested and keep him from a deep understanding of humanity. His 
isolation and lack of insight leave him incapable of seeing what is wrong with his 
settlement.

Sonya, who is always hunting for something better, finds work in a downtown 
clothing manufacturing business. She creates a tasteful, exquisite dress that gets the 
city talking. Her success arises from her own abilities and the unique quality of her 
work draws Jacques to her. Together again they design and revel in beauty for the sake 
of beauty alone. Jacques, her devoted supporter suggests that they will open a small 
shop down on Grand Street where she can create “beauty for those who live it, beauty 
that is not for profit” (178). Sonya, flush with triumph, “Ach, that’s understanding! I 
ever burned so for something in my life like I burn for this. In the midst of the ready-
mades of Grand Street, a shop of the beautiful—that’s to be my settlement!” (178). 
She will make dresses, cut like the most elegant gowns sold in the department stores, 
but she will sell them to the young women of the Lower East Side. Her “settlement” is
one that will not deform, because it does not judge worthy or unworthy. She will offer her gift of beauty to those who long for it.

Sonya believes the distance between uptown and downtown is inviolate. In the last moment of the novel, John comes to her, mad with desire for her. He cannot stand losing her. In this moment, Sonya realizes that the distance between uptown and downtown is not so great. “‘At the bottom we’re all alike, Anglo-Saxons or Jews, gentlemen or plain immigrant,’ her thoughts went on. ‘When we’re hungry, we’re hungry—even a gentlemen when starved long enough can become a savage East Sider’” (183). She believes that he now possesses the fire of being human. He has experienced the longing and hunger of deprivation. “She thought of him going through the years making speeches in educated language, using handed down words in high sounding phrases that were as empty, as meaningless as the scientific goodness of his settlement work” (183). While, Yezierska’s novel explores the destructive collusion of philanthropy, charity, and social work, the reader can hope for redemption for John Manning and the Manning Settlement. Perhaps now Manning, through his understanding of loss and powerlessness, will be able to discern the forces of deformance that guide the workers at his settlement.

Alice Dunbar-Nelson and Anzia Yezierska’s texts make vehement, critical judgments about the nature of charity and the stigmatized impoverished identities of those who live in the shadow of settlements. Kristina Brooks argues that Dunbar-Nelson’s stories create a world in which “the omnipresent poverty of ‘Steenth Street [or the Lower East Side] is never characterized as exotic, and the sharp edges of violence and alcoholism which protrude in these stories are constant with the
narrator’s more aggressive stance toward the reader” (17). The same is true of Yezierska’s stories. Middle-class readers are not welcomed into the world of the story. Dunbar-Nelson’s ‘Steenth Street collection was not published during her lifetime, but Yezierska’s stories about the Lower East Side were. In fact, perhaps one of the reasons that *Salome of the Tenements* met with such harsh reviews is because it implicates the middle-class reader in the patronizing attitudes of the philanthropists and social workers. Yezierska’s vehement criticisms of charity, social work, and the maternal benevolence of philanthropists and settlement residents made her stories distasteful to some quarters of society. Yet, some individuals recognized the validity and usefulness of her fiction to the work of progressive reform and sociology. In a 1923 review of *Salome of the Tenements*, James Harvey Robinson, observes that Yezierska succeeds where social science research failed.

There is a great gulf fixt between the so-called sciences of human relations and the overwhelming facts. I wish that every sociologist and social psychologist and miscellaneous moralizer might read 'Salome of the Tenements’—might not only read it, but put it in his pipe and smoke it, until its wild fumes so beclouded his facile, pompous generalizations and academic abstractions that he would never again suspect them of answering any degree to the actual heartburnings of the creatures which he pretends to explain. (qtd. in Henriksen 181)

Robinson recognizes that social science research cannot substitute for an intimate understanding of life lived on the East Side. This criticism, that may disquiet the middle class reader, is what separates these texts from the ones in Chapter One. Those books invite identification by a middle-class reader with the social world and values of the book, whereas the books in Chapter Two may discomfort that same reader. The reader is pushed to look critically on the social structure of the narrative, and perhaps
the world. The result is a critique of relationship between the interloper—philanthropist, social worker, voyeur-reader—and the locals. As noted in Chapter One, the interaction between the interloper Basil March, and the locals from both ends of the socio-economic spectrum also bubbles up throughout *A Hazard of New Fortunes*. While the reader is offered middle-class Basil March as a touchstone, he is buffeted by the harshness of the worlds he must enter at both ends of the socio-economic spectrum. When Basil March watches the police attach Conrad and Lindau, the three worlds represented by each of the men collide. Jane Addams, in the next chapter will make the reader at home in the Nineteenth Ward, while simultaneously conducting a set of scathing critiques about the middle-class interloper’s—charity worker, factory owner, middle-class single woman—potential involvement with that world.
Chapter Three

Resistance from the Center: Jane Addams Fights for Agency

We have learned to say that the good must be extended to all of society before it can be held secure by any one person or any one class; but we have not yet learned to add to that statement, that unless all men and all classes contribute to a good, we cannot even be sure that it is worth having. In spite of many attempts we do not really act upon either statement.


‘It is regrettable that the United States government is more interested in good, healthy hogs than in good, healthy children,’ said Dr. [Harry J.] Haiselden in the afternoon at a meeting of the Brooklyn Civic Club. ‘The present tendency is for us to become a nation of weaklings. Years ago Europe decided the same problem admirably. She loaded the unfits on boats and sent them to poor ole Uncle Samuel. It might be a good plan for us to put them on some of these ammunition boats and send them back.’


Poverty and stigma are twin stakes that pierce the heart of the disabled and their families.


Defective! The Battle for the Baby

On November 12, 1915, a national scandal erupted in Chicago. In the German-American Hospital, at 4 a.m. Mrs. Allen Bollinger gave birth to a baby boy. Baby Bollinger was born with numerous impairments including only one ear, structural abnormalities in his shoulder and chest, and an unperforated anus that could be corrected with surgery, but would kill him otherwise (Pernick 3-4; Robertson 2025). Dr. Harry J. Haiselden, the surgeon called to attend Mrs. Bollinger’s baby after birth declared that the boy was “mentally defective” as well.¹ The doctor counseled that they should let the boy
die by withholding the surgery. The parents consented and five days later, after a kidnapping attempt and amid a national media firestorm, baby Bollinger died. Anna, the mother of three healthy older daughters, never saw her son.

Dr. Harry J. Haiselden’s withholding of life-saving surgery in the name of eugenics spawned discussion about motherhood and disability. It also spawned discussions about who should grow up to become an American citizen. This story brings forth questions about the real needs that mothers have in order to care for their children, both in infancy and throughout their lives. The media fury that arose around this issue wrestled with whether mothers or physicians should be the eugenic gatekeepers of the nation. We will see how poverty and a lack of social support caused families to fear the reality that disabled children could impoverish and stigmatize their entire family and the nation, a nation on the brink of the First World War. This public debate about the Bollingers’ son further inflamed public discourse around other ancillary social concerns like birth control, euthanasia, and the fear of the other (in this case, human beings that were viewed as “monsters,” defective, and sometimes menacing potential criminals). Dr. Haiselden’s actions brought into public and professional debate the exact nature of the physician’s duty to prolong life or eliminate suffering, as well as questions about the limits of their power when fulfilling their duty. This issue renewed discussions about what to do about eugenically unfit mothers and whether there was a need for compulsory sterilization of the genetically compromised: the feeble-minded, the children of drug and alcohol addicted parents, the physically disabled, etc. Judge Benjamin Lindsey asserts in the pages of The Washington Post, “this case should give an impulse to the national movement for birth control and prevention of defectives” (“Noted Men and Women”).
Lastly, the Bollinger cause célèbre preyed upon some citizens’ fears about America’s preparedness to enter the war. A country awash in disabled and deformed members (who may be reproducing) and diverting resources to their care was not likely to prevail on the battlefield. In this controversy about what to do with disabled babies and disabled adults, the stakes were very real.

The case of baby Bollinger follows on the heels of Elia Peattie and Alice Dunbar-Nelson’s own texts about how to care for the nation’s children. The images and references to disabled children in their texts reflect real people in the streets; the Bollinger case and the proliferation of ugly laws are historical examples from the streets and papers. Jane Addams wrote about her experiences in and around Hull House; she wrote more philosophical works about the problems that troubled the American cities and how motherhood, charity, and disability are realities. These are ideas that run through much of Addams’s work. Titillating and picturesque, the fictional depictions of settlement life are romantic renditions of the world in Addams’s *Twenty Years at Hull-House* (Raftery 38). There was no shortage of descriptions of Addams and the work of Hull House during her lifetime. Descriptive and persuasive articles about Hull House and the settlement movement, many by Addams herself, ran in newspapers. Some of Addams’s newspaper essays evolved into chapters of *Twenty Years at Hull-House*. Moreover, Addams was a member of literary and women’s clubs with Elia Peattie, Fannie Barrier Williams, and other authors and reformers. The work of Hull House would have been a part of the teatime conversation at the literary society that met in Chicago’s Fine Arts Building (Raftery 40).
Many progressives who believed in the objectivity and power of science to advance civilization supported Haiselden (Pernick 15). This is certainly something that was evident in the Peattie’s The Precipice as Kate wishes to improve American children through eugenics, while Yezierska criticizes the inefficient and useless “scientific” methods of the Manning Settlement social workers. Addams, I will show, also appeals to science, but she does so in order to show that evolutionary biology supports a notion of mutual aid. This mutual aid belies the unequal relations of charity. Dr. Haiselden’s determination that baby Bollinger is unfit for life and should be left to die constitutes deformance beyond anything depicted in the settlement novels. As a leading voice in American social and public hygiene practices, Addams had to address the Bollinger baby controversy.

Haiselden’s subsequent film project The Black Stork (1916) constitutes yet another abhorrent production of deformance, one that was enacted time and again as it played in theaters into the 1920s (Pernick). The public solicitation and publication of comments about the Bollinger case by Addams and other settlement directors, workers, and Hull House intimates brings the public discussion into the realm of settlement writing, especially as these texts are directly related to motherhood, charitable efforts, and disability. Pervasive images from articles and The Black Stork of the powerlessness or potential danger of the disabled individual, coupled with depictions of a miserable life, fostered a public fear of an unnatural threat from disabled people. However, Jane Addams had little sympathy for social forces that regarded the sick and disabled as the weak limb of the national body requiring rehabilitation or amputation. In this chapter, I
will analyze Addams’s own contribution to the contested tug of war over motherhood, the application of charity, and the powers of deformance.

**Jane Addams: American Icon**

One figure eclipses the rest American in the social settlement movement, world of women reformers, and social settlement literature: Jane Addams. Addams was a prolific writer, powerful reformer, and a key figure in the network of relationships that influenced politics and social change in the nation. She may be the best-documented and well-researched woman of the Progressive Era. At twenty-nine, Jane Addams abandoned her upper-middle class life, and moved into a neglected mansion set in an impoverished, squalid Chicago neighborhood. On September 18, 1889 on Halsted Street in Chicago’s Nineteenth Ward, Addams and a college friend Ellen Gates Starr, and house-keeper-cum-settlement worker Mary Keyser opened the doors of Hull House, one of the nation’s first settlements. For the next forty years she worked with immigrant laborers and captains of industry alike, becoming one of the nation’s most influential progressive activists and writers. Addams was America’s first female Nobel Peace Prize winner and the FBI identified her as one of the most dangerous women in America. In her work, she influenced far-flung fields including philosophy, sociology, labor reform, and social policy.

For the sake of this project, which examines literature of reform with a particular focus on motherhood, charity, and disability, a close reading of Jane Addams’s work, both in word and deed, is essential since she was so visible and well known in her day. In fact, several settlement novels include Jane Addams or Hull House as a character or part
of the setting, as in *The Precipice*. Perhaps the authors of reform novels did not study Addams’s texts, but her influence would have been hard to miss. Women like Elia Wilkinson Peattie and Clara Laughlin who authored reform-themed books such as *The Precipice* and *Just Folks*, were not only writers, but also members of educated and politically engaged circles, circles in which Addams would have been a familiar presence. In studying her essays closely, I isolate examples of her thought for analysis and comparison with the novels of Chapter One and Two. These specific examples are consistent with Addams’s overarching philosophy.

While Jane Addams is a cultural icon that embodies the work of the Progressive Era settlement house and settlement house workers, it is important to remember that she was an individual with her own beliefs, and she did not direct Hull House with a heavy hand. Residents who came to work there had to determine their own vision and project; Addams did not micromanage or dictate what individual people should do. She did make her viewpoints known though, and it is probable that women and men who lived at Hull House were familiar with her writings and her thoughts on various subjects as well, since spirited dinner table debates were a common occurrence. It is important to remember that Addams’s own personal positions on issues or her own commitments does not equate with the work of Hull House. Moreover, Addams, like other members of the inner core of Hull House, such as Alice Hamilton, make an effort in their texts, especially those written in mid-life to note that they started their careers with enthusiasm but were naïve and with time, through much failure, became wiser and more humble about their own knowledge. Their commitments changed as they learned from the neighborhood what were the most pressing needs for the residents. It is crucial to read broadly across the textual lifespan of
women like Addams in order to have an accurate understanding of their views and their personal development. Over the course of twenty, forty, or fifty years, Addams developed more nuanced and deeper understandings of issues at the local, national, and international level.

In this chapter I contest that Addams recognized that social forces exerted disabling power in the lives of people who did not embody the ideal of liberal individualism, and thus failed to contribute to the national health of America in the form of able-bodied, native-born, white, middle-class producers. For this I analyze texts that focus on the problems of charity, and the treatment of disabled people: “Charitable Effort” (1902), “The Home and the Special Child” (1908), “The Problems of Poverty” from Twenty Years at Hull-House (1910), in addition to her protestations around the death of baby Bollinger. Addams’s texts and reform activity must be placed into the context of the broad collection of Progressive Era reform-minded texts, both fictional and non-fiction. We will see that Addams texts and those of some of her peers were in fact forwarding a radically divergent message than the normative, often racist messages of other settlement leaders and progressive reformers. Addams’s message argued for personal agency, autonomy, prenormalization of identity, as well as the equitable treatment of the neighbors, disabled people, and others who embodied the stigmatized identities of working and lower class women and men. “Jane Addams,” James Salazar writes, “forged a distinctively new role for women’s charity work and for social reform more broadly” (275). He views the role of the settlement worker as, “an opportunity to realize the radically democratic potentials of cross-cultural exchange” (Salazar 275). This chapter allows for a broader comparative look at the breadth of political and social
messages embedded in social settlements. For Addams the topics and stakes were very real, not wholly fictional, or even thinly veiled fiction. She was speaking and publishing about people and situations that she knew first hand and existed within her sphere of influence.

Addams was not alone in her assessments of the industrial, social, and medical conditions that disabled Americans. Her statements about the dangerous connection between unregulated manufacturing practices, debilitating injury, and the physical risks taken by impoverished workers are similar to observations in Work Accidents and the Law (1910) by investigative journalist and socialist activist Crystal Eastman, as well as the many volumes about the dangers of the industrial workplace researched and written by Hull House resident Dr. Alice Hamilton. Moreover, Addams’s advocacy for the autonomy of disabled people resonates with Clifford W. Beers’s, A Mind that Found Itself (1908) and his subsequent work with the Mental Hygiene Movement. Additionally, Addams’s arguments push back against the statements of settlement founders like Sarah Collins Fernandis or Lillian Wald who presented more restricted and conservative views about proper human behavior and the role of bio-power.

Pragmatist Roots of the Social Settlement or How Not to Be a Charitable Organization

While the social settlement is thought of as a typical Progressive Era entity, it is important to look at the relationship between pragmatism and praxis in Addams’s own life to understand what makes her work and texts particularly interesting for this study and how her notion of the social settlement is different from that depicted in fiction.
Addams’s pragmatism may be the most obvious explanation for the difference between her and the other authors of social settlement literature. This resonates with her praxis in which experience and sympathetic knowledge are central (Hamington 2004). Only three years after establishing Hull House, Jane Addams describes the obligation of the settlement and its residents as:

[A]n experimental effort to aid in the solution of the social and industrial problems which are engendered by the modern conditions of life in a great city. It insists that these problems are not confined to any one portion of a city. It is an attempt to relieve, at the same time, the overaccumulation at one end of society and the destitution at the other; but it assumes that this overaccumulation and destitution is most sorely felt in the things that pertain to social and education privileges. . . . The one thing to be dreaded in the Settlement is that it lose its flexibility, its power of quick adaptation, its readiness to change its methods as its environment may demand. It must be open to conviction and must have a deep and abiding sense of tolerance. It must be hospitable and ready for experiment. . . . It must be grounded in a philosophy whose foundation is on the solidarity of the human race, a philosophy which will not waver when the race happens to be represented by a drunken woman or an idiot boy. Its residents must be emptied of all conceit of opinion and all self-assertion, and ready to arouse and interpret the public opinion of their neighborhood. They must be content to live quietly side by side with their neighbors, until they grow into a sense of relationship and mutual interests. (“Subjective Necessity,” Twenty Years, 83-85. Emphasis added)²

This sort of plastic and practical approach allowed Addams to eschew the traditional approaches taken by the charity worker. Her statement argues for more than poverty relief and “cross-cultural exchange.” Addams identifies the economic—and power—imbalance at the heart of American society is the root cause of so many problems. To truly rectify many social problems requires a redistribution of wealth. The fictional settlement workers explored thus far are incapable of such egalitarianism, and they never identify the unequal distribution of capital and resources as a key force creating the host of problems that the settlement seeks to ameliorate. A belief in equality—or the lack thereof—and the recognition of capitalism’s destructive power are at the heart of the
deforming forces that permeate Addams textual depictions of settlement work and the historical record of her work. Addams’s declaration of the work of the settlement in “Subjective Necessity” is far more reflective and insightful than anything stated or enacted by Eleanore Cuyler or Kate Barrington.

Addams writes in “Charitable Efforts,” that for the young charity visitor, the training, and moral upbringing she brings to her first days in the tenements are poorly suited for the reality of the situation. The neighbors may have contempt for the charity worker if she fails to be willing to shed her own rigid training about how one should live. “The young charity visitor who goes from a family living upon a most precarious industrial level to her own home in a prosperous part of the city, if she is sensitive at all, is never free from perplexities which our growing democracy forces upon her” Addams writes (31). This sort of “perplexity” arises from careful and thoughtful observation. The young do-gooder must realize that she came to this work “incorrigibly bourgeois” and that “she cannot insist so strenuously upon the conventions of her own class . . . .” (21). A “charitable visitor” who insists upon forwarding a set of values that are unsuited, even patronizing, to the family turns her visit “from a vehicle of poverty relief into an instrument of impoverishment” (Salazar 273). The visit becomes deformance.

“Charitable Efforts” is hardly a simple anti-classist treatise. Addams provides many examples of the difficulties that face a settlement worker in their day-to-day interactions with neighbors. Treading the line between deforming and respectful understanding is difficult. As Addams describes it, the charity visitor comes to her work with her own sense of cultural or scientific superiority. Perhaps she foresees a career as the maternal benefactor, bringing succor to those in need and silently basking in the
appreciation of the poor and distressed. This may only truly exist in fiction or in relationships where one party is willing to play a fictional role. Reality, especially for the astute, holds very different lessons. In "Charitable Efforts" Addams writes about the learning curve that a charity worker might enjoy if she is especially sensitive. First she enters the family home believing she has the answers to how the family can live a better life and that she has a firm grip on right and wrong. Yet, she is an outsider and her mere presence elicits unnatural behavior from the family she encounters. There may be mutual suspicion, both sides questioning the motives of the other. Within the community of the family the charity visitor witnesses acts of humbling generosity between neighbors and emotional endurance. She also sees good people acting in ways she knows are immoral. Thus, she finds herself at odds with her training. She may realize that she doesn't know so much about the world that she has entered and that morality is not as clear cut as she was lead to believe in church or college. Saloons may not just be a place where the family breadwinner spends all his pay on liquor, but may in fact be a place where a man can get treated to a meal when he is broke or find social support after a devastating personal loss. Community and social support is not always found at church, but sometimes in dark hallways, on the stoop, and on the street corner.

Addams uses science to make her argument. The charity worker brings her own scientific training to the friendly visit, and her cautious systematic approach makes her hosts suspicious. Evolutionary psychology presents an explanation for the misapprehension that objects of charity may hold upon meeting the young charitable visitor explains Addams:

The evolutionists tell us that the instinct to pity, the impulse to aid his fellows, served man at a very early period, as a rude rule of right and wrong. There is no
doubt that this rude rule still holds among people with whom charitable agencies are brought in contact, and that their ideas of right and wrong are quite honestly outraged by the methods of these agencies. When they see the delay and caution with which relief is given, it does not appear to them a conscientious scruple, but as the cold and calculating action of a selfish man. (14-15)

Addams is regarded as a skillful rhetorician, so whether she believes that charitable relations are really evolutionarily grounded or not is uncertain, but she has identified a central problem with charitable giving—it seems calculated and measured in a way that makes the recipient feel like the giving was done without generosity or a sense of equality between agents. By attributing this disconnect to a hardwired biological response, Addams alleviates the sting felt by those who may read her essay and see their own folly.

Addams ends her essay with the somber suggestion that this work is not easy, but instead yields “the pangs and throes to which the poor human understanding is subjected whenever it attempts to comprehend the meaning of life” (34). This is a high price for tough work. Eleanore Cuyler is not willing to give up her “incorrigibly bourgeois” values and thus leaves the settlement disgusted, perhaps moving into the future with stories to tell about the ungrateful and despicable denizens of the East Side. Kate Barrington never questions her motivations or values. She is an educated, modern woman. Why should she question what she learned at the University of Chicago? Kate exists on a plane far removed from the realities of her charges. She sees the lives people lead and she tries to make them better, but only better as she deems them.

At times, the work of a settlement may be inherently deforming. Returning to the family described in “Problems of Poverty,” it is clear that monetary assistance from Hull House deformed them. Taking charity is a public deformity. However, Addams offers
that the settlement, unlike the charity, allows the object of charity to reclaim a non-disabled identity by ongoing interaction with the settlement workers. Recognizing the “pangs and throes to which the poor human understanding is subjected whenever it attempts to comprehend the meaning of life” can allow the members of the community to establish mutual respect and understanding, even if it cannot be a constant state of existence (34). In order for one to know what members of the community feel they need for their own growth, one must listen and find chances to work side by side. “For Addams, the boundary between individual morality and social morality blurs as personal stories aggregate into communal concerns. Care can be seen as an important aspect of the integrated involvement of the community that facilitates individual freedom and growth” (Hamington, Embodied 95). Pragmatism, particularly the feminist pragmatism that Addams helped to define, seeks to find ways to create a society that recognizes and makes accommodation for interdependency and the collective care of individuals when they need supplemental care. This is the antithesis of hierarchical relations of charity.

As Hamington puts it, “it was Addams who pushed American pragmatism out of the universities and onto the streets” (98). She had “no question in her mind of ‘seeing how the other half lives’ but of jointly learning how to live together; learning especially that democracy is a way of life, the truly moral and human way of life, not a political institutional device” writes Jane Dewey, daughter of John Dewey (29). Jane Dewey’s observation underscores the difference between a settlement and a charity. The settlement was not about quiet listening. Addams and Starr believed that the social settlement could become an important liberatory space in the lives of young educated, middle-class women too.
Addams worked to make her neighbors legible to other segments of American society and vice versa. Thus *Twenty Years at Hull-House*, as well as many of her other works, recount stories of neighbors as they offer aid to one another, make hard choices about work, flourish in their surroundings, suffer devastating losses, and teach the settlement residents about the importance of understanding different cultural norms. For Addams, Hamington notes, “the personal is political, despite overwhelming forces that attempt to disconnect them” (*Embodied* 92). While she respected and supported cultural difference, she was also willing to help or support recent immigrants in their quest to acquire education and skills necessary to take advantage of economic and social opportunities. Because, as she states in the “Subjective Necessity of the Social Settlement” one purpose of the settlement is to try to balance, in whatever way it can, the great imbalance in wealth and poverty, as well as equality of opportunity (25-26).

Many men and women of the Nineteenth Ward wanted the skills that would allow them access to better jobs and allow their children to advance in school and into professions. This aspect of the settlement, education and training, has been described as part an Americanizing project and perhaps that indictment is warranted, but it was also a way for the people with the least money to accumulate the cultural capital necessary to gain access to professional, vocational, and educational advancement. For Addams this is not an issue of charity only but of securing equal access to opportunity and creating a system that distributes resources more justly. One way to redistribute the overabundance at one end of society is to relocate young women with personal or family wealth and/or cultural capital into the poorest neighborhoods. These women are a redistribution of wealth—though the success of such a strategy is varied. Clearly, Eleanore Cuyler and the
women at John Manning’s settlement were stingy with their wealth. Lindau, in *A Hazard of New Fortunes* appears willing to share his rich cultural capital of education and knowledge with his neighbors. Gifts from donors and money from Mary Rozet Smith, Addams’ partner, and the Smith family supported Addams for decades after she invested most of her own money in Hull House projects. The acts of these women (and men) enact both the deforming powers of charity and less problematic relations of cooperation and mutual respect.

For some of these women, like Kate Barrington, maternal rhetoric is central to her movement into an impoverished neighborhood in Chicago and ascent to power over a nation of needy and disabled children. I, like Heather Ostman, believe that Addams applies maternal imagery to forward her own work and gain acceptance for her unusual life choices. Addams describes herself as “mother” to the needy neighbors, a common rhetorical strategy and literary trope used with unmarried, childless reformers and social workers in Progressive Era America. However, she *does not* use maternal imagery in her speeches and essays that sought to liberate progressively minded young women from their cloistered family lives and domestic destinies. Addams does not use maternal rhetoric when advocating for young women to join the social settlements because she astutely understands that middle-class parents would not accept scenarios in which their daughters become mothers to impoverished, foreign, or disabled citizens of the Nineteenth Ward. Kate Barrington can become the mother to multitudes because she has no family to protest at such an identity. However, in the flesh and blood world, daughters claiming “maternal relations” with stigmatized and deformed settlement neighbors would horrify many middle-class parents.
“Hull House School of Race Relations”

Addams’s relations to the African American community of Chicago is a topic that deserves its own book, but it is important to note that there was regular collaboration between a whole host of reformers, black and white, native and foreign. Locally Fannie Barrier Williams and Ida B. Wells—whose husbands were partners in a Chicago law firm—worked with Addams and other members of Hull House. Mary Jo Deegan, who coined the term “Hull House School of Race Relations” in her work on the history of sociology, cites Williams as another feminist pragmatist and an early sociologist of the Chicago School. Her work shares the same notions as Addams: all women, black and white, need to join and pool their situated knowledge. “Jane Addams,” Williams writes, “has taught the world a new conception of the divine element in humanity, which neither rags, dirt, nor immorality can entirely obscure” (“Need of Social Settlement” 106). Such a statement contraindicates the deforming nature of some settlement work.

Williams’s work was not without detractors though—in fact, during the organization of the Columbia Exposition in 1892 she and Ida B. Wells became estranged. In *The New Woman of Color: The Collected Writings of Fannie Barrier Williams, 1893-1918*, Deegan defends Williams against critiques that identify her as a member of the black elite who forwards an overtly classist argument about the troubles of the black community, particularly those who fall “into the easy path of immoral living” (“Need of Social Settlement” 108). Williams also describes young women as “the handmaids of shame” who will “fall easy victim to the flattering inducements of a well-dressed idleness” when they fail to find work that meets their standards (“Need of Social
Settlement” 108). Such descriptions of the most destitute among Chicago’s African American communities are common in her essays and do not fit with Addams’s depictions of poverty and young women.

William’s writings on the settlement describe the settlement establishment as a largely a white endeavor in Chicago. She is critical of this fact, but rhetorically careful not to alienate the sympathetic white members of her audience. Williams writes about the particular need for black settlements, as examined in the introduction, but ultimately she helps establish the Frederick Douglass Center in a predominantly African American neighborhood to act as a common ground between the black and white reform communities. “The Frederick Douglass Center is not a ‘negro settlement’ but a place where the best of both worlds can work together,” explains Williams.

‘By raising up the black man and black woman we can move beyond race concerns and begin to engage on the ‘higher plane of human brotherhood’” (Deegan 112). Williams does not describe life within black settlements, though the articles and speeches collected in Deegan’s collection describe the needs and achievements of black Americans, and address institutional needs.

As stated in the Introduction few works of fiction or poetry exist that depict black settlement life. Black settlement administrator and social worker, Sarah Collins Fernandis wrote poetry on a number of themes and prose descriptions of life in and around black settlements. Fernandis was an educator and social worker, and was instrumental in establishing a number of settlements in cities along the Eastern seaboard that served black communities.7 Describing the role of the black settlement in city life, Fernandis creates a set of vignettes in “A Social Settlement in South Washington.”8 “A Social
“Settlement in South Washington” is a complicated text, which forwards a rather pessimistic view of the neighbors and the scope of problems facing the settlement. Fernandis concludes to the reader “... you have incomplete outline of the small effort at settlement work which we are attempting ... a few pulse throbs of the life that is lacking, and some of the helpful influences we are seeking to inject into it ... this line of work has its peculiar values as a corrective for delinquent conditions in city districts where Negroes, ignorant and poor, form a segregated mass, is our firm belief” (66). This essay’s subtext is a plea for funds, so perhaps the dire tone of the essay is both reflective of some of the worst conditions in the neighborhood and is meant to inspire a generous spirit in the reader.

Her essay begins by introducing the reader to a few of the locals. First, there is a tipsy dockworker, just paid and heading to “Dick Ryan’s” to “git whooping drunk.” (64) Such a scene might make one “[away] in disgust,” but he reminds Fernandis of neglected Baby Ben, who she encountered on her “rounds of neighborhood visiting” (64). His mother is a teenager who “drifted from a life of extreme poverty in the country,” to Washington D.C. where she now lives with Ben “utterly unprepared to earn a decent living, eking out a useless, worthless existence” (64). Ben, “a sorry picture of neglected babyhood,” sits in “filthy discomfort with eruptive sores over his head and face” sucking on his fingers in hunger. A neighbor implores the writer to “git after his mother an’ make her pay some ‘count to him” (64). With the deformed exposition fully developed, settlement worker Fernandis can begin rehabilitating the young mother and Ben. The mother now has a job “of a menial sort” thanks to the help of “the agent of the Board of Children’s Guardians, and Baby Ben spends his days at the settlement nursery” with
“comforting baths, a soothing salve applied to his eruptions, clean clothing . . . and a plentiful supply of milk” the reader is told how “little Ben slept and grew and thrived, and in his waking hours filled the house with the music of his merry crowing” (64). Clearly, the reader is meant to assume that without this intervention neglected Baby Ben will grow up and become the worker, staggering to the saloon to spend his pay. This description shares far more with Peattie and Davis’s descriptions of the work done by Kate and Eleanore, than Dunbar-Nelson or Addams’s more nuanced depictions of worker-neighbor interactions.

Fernandis’s essay is particularly interested in the environment as an indicator of the stigmatized state of the inhabitants. “A Social Settlement in South Washington” describes a visit by the “Colored Conference Class of the Associated Charities” during which they tour the neighborhood to do a study of housing conditions. They visit “a miserable frame hovel” inhabited by “a drunken old crone . . . We got sight within, . . . of the smoke-blackened walls, the water-soaked floor, the filth and squalor, and of Marie clinging to her grandmother’s skirts . . .” (66) Sad, silent Marie the author tells the reader is a regular at the settlement, and the grandmother had been convinced to send Marie to the local school. Despite Marie’s attendance at school and her time at the settlement, Fernandis reflects, “I sometimes found myself wondering if some future friendly visitor would find Marie old and rum-soaked, a tenant of that miserable shack which was one of an unsightly row which had stood there since the 60’s and for which an agent harrowed from the shiftless occupants a monthly rental of three or four dollars” (66). Herein, the author links young Marie’s destiny with the “unsightly” homes, and pervasive dirt and drunkenness of the environment.
Fernandis offers the reader a glimpse into the future of the deformed, unsightly shack and the deformed, unsightly Marie through the gaze of another “friendly visitor.” Such an image exemplifies the disabling power of the “friendly visit.” Though in this essay, which seeks to inspire generosity in the reader, the settlement can rehabilitate the environment and by doing so rehabilitate the locals. Before the settlement moved into the neighborhood, the yards were “unsightly” but thanks to the example of the settlement, the neighbors’ yards turn into “neat gardens with beds bordered with clam shells where flowers and vegetables grew in pleasing profusion” (65). The repetition of “unsightly” is striking. “Unsightliness” was a common term used to define beggars, disabled people, gender non-conforming individuals, and other “improper persons” that the ugly laws controlled (Schweik). Being unsightly was punishable by local ordinances intended to clean up the city streets. Schweik’s book *The Ugly Laws* is subtitled *Disability in Public* and I contend that the tour that Fernandis and the Colored Conference Class of the Associated Charities took was not just a tour of housing conditions, but a tour of disability in public.

We see that the cultural space of charity or “friendly visiting” becomes one that highlights inequalities and deforms the recipient. Sharon L. Snyder and David T. Mitchell explore the “cultural spaces” that have been established for the scrutiny of disabled people broadly such as “nineteenth-century charity systems; institutions for the feebleminded during the eugenics period,” and so on (3). In my work, I examine the cultural space of the neighborhood and local homes depicted in settlement fiction. As I have argued already, the social settlement was sometimes very different from charity institutions, and sometimes they were indistinguishable.
Let us return to the counterexample of charity, or perhaps it is better described as “charity plus,” discussed in the Introduction. In “Problems of Poverty” Addams explains how the work of the settlement is different from a charity, though the family took charity from the settlement. The family, normally self-supporting, takes assistance from Hull House when unemployment has rendered them destitute and without anything to sell. The wife and mother of the family, feels that she has been deformed by poverty. According to the woman, taking charity in their case is akin to a non-disabled person appearing “misshapen with rheumatism or with a face distorted by neuralgic pain” (110). Thus, the woman invites Addams over to dinner in order to see their home and family life returned to a renormalized state of living, able-bodied once again and unmarred by the deforming power of charity. The inhabitant and the stigmatized environment have a mutually constitutive relationship.

[W]henever sickness, dirt, political disagreement, social chaos, or economic depression appears, society responds by generating images of the disabled or diseased body. . . . the study of cultural representations of the disabled body must be extended to its symbolization by other bodies and the vast array of cultural forms, such as objects or art, buildings, environments, and consumer products. (Siebers, “What Can Disability Studies” 208-11)

The wife intends that Addams see that there is art on the walls and new furniture in the apartment and expects that she partake of a good, nourishing meal to understand the health of the family. The power of Addams’s gaze restores the identity of the family.

In Twenty Years at Hull House, Addams offers examples of disability and death that come as the result of economic and living conditions that leave children either unattended or placed in dangerous circumstances due to the exigencies accompanying their mothers' need to work.
The first crippled children we encountered in the neighborhood had all been injured while their mothers were at work: one had fallen out of a third-story window, another had been burned, and the third had a curved spine due to the fact that for three years he had been tied all day long to the leg of the kitchen table, only released at noon by his older brother who hastily ran in from a neighboring factory to share his lunch with him.

This description of the disabling of children is included in the chapter “Problems of Poverty,” because Addams argues that poverty and workplace exploitation is at the root of many of the neighborhood’s problems. Mothers must work to support their families. Though underpaid for their labor, they cannot afford to feed, cloth, and house their children, and pay for childcare simultaneously.

Dunbar-Nelson’s *The Annals of Steenth Street* depicts this culture of women caring for their children alone. The children run wild around the neighborhood because of the obligations of running a household and supporting a family. At best, a neighbor may casually look out for the most neglected of children, like the woman who happens to be watching Baby Ben while she does the laundry in Fernandis’s description of the neighborhood. Likewise, Abe from “The Downfall of Abe Powers” appears to be fatherless and his mother is an inveterate alcoholic, so his neighbor Mrs. McMahon sometimes feeds and disciplines him (Dunbar-Nelson). In the story, “A Witness for the Defense” Dunbar-Nelson describes how the settlement transforms the lives of women in the community, by offering support when there was none before. This lack of support, as described in the stories, comes from the quasi-abandonment by the adult men in the family in favor of the sympathetic support found at the saloon.

Because the Hull House residents recognized the danger resulting from children who were unsupervised while their mothers work, they established a nursery. Addams writes "Our early day nursery brought us into natural relations with the poorest women of
the neighborhood, many of whom were bearing the burden of dissolute and incompetent husbands in addition to the support of their children" (Twenty 113). This judgment of the uselessness or desertion by the husbands reflects the community organization in The Annals of ‘Steenth Street and in Maggie: A Girl of the Street. When Addams realizes that the capacity to earn a wage may not be the principle good that the men bring to the family she expands her assessment of fathers. “. . . I could but wonder in which particular we are most stupid—to judge a man's worth so solely by his wage-earning capacity that a good wife feels justified in leaving him, or in holding fast to that wretched delusion that a woman can both support and nurture her children [alone and in poverty]” (115). Addams does not blame the mothers in these examples of children disabled by accidents or abusive conditions. Instead, she recognizes that these women are between a rock and a hard place: starvation and homelessness, and unsupervised children in a world of dangers.

In “The Home and the Special Child,” Addams describes cognitively disabled and multiply disabled children and their families and the role that special education can have in their lives. Addams first delivered this essay as a speech to the American Educational Association in 1908. She is speaking to a room of professional educators, and we can deduce from the way she begins her speech that she followed a male speaker, Mr. Barnes, who expounded upon how hard it is for professional educators to do their work when parents interfere. Addams acknowledges the difficulties that her predecessor describes, but then speaks of “parental affection” and their “power of devotion” that is “necessary to carry out the regimen when the trained mind [of the educator] has laid down” (224). She recognizes the abiding, nurturing love of parents as integral to the education and rehabilitation of children with disabilities. This approach means that she is not suggesting
institutionalization, but a collaborative approach between a team of experts and the parent. In the midst of the ascendance of institutionalization for the care of the disabled, this is not common rhetoric.

However, much of her speech praises the impact of education on the family of disabled children and the possibility that disabled children, with the right support, can grow into self-supporting adults. She opens the substantive portion of her speech: “when deficient children are discovered in their homes, are taken-care of by trained teachers, after they have been diagnosed by child-study departments, and when all the apparatus of public education is turned on, the parent is convinced that his child is not an exception” (“Home and the Special Child” 224). Only then can the mother be “freed from her sense of isolation” (225). Addams’s essay implies that the existence of a severely disabled child isolates the family from the community.

First, Addams’s implication presupposes that the community in which this family lives is not openly welcoming to the parents or the parents never allow the community a chance to know their child. Secondly, the manner in which she situates this family also presupposes that it is her audience's common assumption that families with disabled children are socially isolated. In both Addams’s “Problems of Poverty” and Dunbar-Nelson’s “Miss Tillman’s Protégé” disabled characters are integrated into the community and are generally do not need adjustment. Hattie, in “Miss Tillman’s Protégé” is not isolated or exceedingly limited. She does use her impairments to stay home from school when she wishes, but that is an example of a mischievous girl using her disabilities to her advantage, not a limitation.
Addams’s depiction of disability in “Home and the Special Child” is different than it is in her other essays. She is speaking to a room of professional educators who likely believe they have the best methods for treating the nation’s disabled children and clear definitions about disability. After offering the educators in the audience a description of the wonderful results of their work, she turns her attention to the state of institutions for disabled children and the current state of research and education in Chicago. Again Addams acknowledges the speech Mr. Barnes’s made about the education of disabled children, “We have a school for crippled children—very much such an one as Mr. Barnes has described, and some believe that from these points of special education Chicago may secure the best suggestions for educational advance” (226). From the context, the schools that Mr. Barnes describes are institutions that are not educationally sophisticated. Addams suggests that they consider the work of the educator Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1764-1827) instead for a more appropriate educational model. Pestalozzi created a learning environment in which the children were participants, not just objects. “Perhaps in time” Addams concludes, “educators who are assisted by devoted parents may come to realize these children as possible contributors toward the solution of the public-school problems. Educators may face them [their students] simply and fairly in a change of attitude to which the parents have brought them [their children]” (226).

While Addams’s speech begins by creating a sense of familiarity and superiority in the audience—yes, we all know the families are isolated, ignorant, and ashamed, but with your professional help they can be lifted up to a “surprising degree of hopefulness and normality” (225). She then suggests that the current treatment of disabled students is
insufficient and not consistent with the innovative research and practice in the Chicago program with which she is affiliated. Thus, the educators need to reassess how they regard their students and the parents. Moreover, she cautions that the goal isn’t to educate or train these children just to set them loose in the world unsupported, but that the model should be an environment that is simultaneously least restrictive, and supportive of the student’s optimal performance. Addams slyly acknowledges that it “may take half of the seventy years of which Mr. Barnes spoke to recognize the capacity of the defective child,” but that the positive result of a commitment to special education are many and are worthwhile, if perhaps a little slow. “To bring the home and the school into closer connection thru these special children affords a glorious educational opportunity, and the results may react upon the schools in a way we can, as yet, scarcely estimate” (227).

Addams is advocating for trained professionals to engage with community in a spirit of cooperation, not treating the parents and the community with hostility. If the educators work with the family, then the mothers will understand that their family is one of many in the nation with a disabled child. If these educators can be convinced to work with parents instead of against them, then the mothers will understand that medical science and special education are working for “the best methods of dealing with children such as hers, and that she may be of great help to them as well as to her child” (228 emphasis added).

Cooperation is imperative, Addams argues, not just to make the mother tractable in the rehabilitation and education of her child, but also to show the professionals that mothers will realize their value to the process. Implicit in this is the claim that the professionals should also recognize the value mothers can bring to their work. Moreover, Addams claims that educational research and practices in general will benefit from a commitment
to special education. Special education is worth pursuing because it will benefit not just
“the special child,” but all children. “The special child” will benefit enormously from
being included in the latest educational advancements too. Lastly, Addams reassures the
educators that they do not have to dispense with everything familiar, but they should
bring educational best practices into the special education classrooms and institutions for
disabled children.

Addams also disrupts the disabling notion that people with disabilities are incapable. However, she simultaneously recognizes the struggles that face disabled
people in turn-of-the-century American society. For instance in Twenty Years at Hull-
House, she links the ease with which bosses can exchange disabled workers for non-
disabled ones to high rates of disabling events in the workplace. The very real need for
food and shelter makes desperate people willing to take jobs in dangerous professions.
Thus, there is a process based on poverty and capitalism that creates disabled bodies at an
alarming rate. “The Marxist or class-based argument bemoaned disability as a stripping
of capacity from the body by excessive labor demands; rising levels of worker disability
thus provided a reliable indicator of the corruption of capital” (Snyder and Mitchell 15).
Disabilities caused by industrial accidents diminish a worker’s value, but if workers are
plentiful then it is easier to replace the worker than it is to fix the manufacturing process.

“Problems of Poverty” ends with a strong statement that those who society
identifies as stigmatized or disabled often do not hold that identity themselves. Addams
tells the story of three women who are artists or connoisseurs of artistic culture is the
section that describes "visionaries and enthusiasts, unsuccessful artists, writers, and
reformers" who are not motivated by material gain but by their artistic or social engagement. Disability is central to the stories of these refined and creative women.

For many years at Hull-House we knew a well-bred German woman who was completely absorbed in the experiment of expressing musical phrases and melodies by means of colors. Because she was small and deformed, she stowed herself into her trunk every night, where she slept on a canvas stretched hammock-wise from the four corners and her food was of the meagerest: nevertheless if a visitor left an offering upon her table, it was largely spent for apparatus or delicately colored silk floss, with which to pursue the fascinating experiment. (116)

This woman uses her size as an advantage. She chooses to direct her resources to her art and can do so because she spends her money on materials, not on a conventional residence. This “well-bred German woman” has the cultural capital of a European upbringing and her artistic creations are “fascinating” and experimental. Addams, in her corpus, has a special respect for the abilities of mature women. The second of her three exemplars is disabled and poor, but was a well-traveled, skilled manuscript illuminator. “Another sadly crippled old woman, the widow of a sea captain, although living almost exclusively upon malted milk tablets as affording a cheap form of prepared food, was always eager to talk of the beautiful illuminated manuscripts she had sought out in her travels and to show specimens of her work as an illuminator” (116). Artistic expertise and cultural knowledge are at the heart of her description of this woman, not physical impairment or poverty. They have unusual cultural capital, from long since lost class advantage, artistic training, and broad experience of the world. This implicit observation cannot go unnoticed.

However, these women still undermine the flat simplistic descriptions of the neighbors as impoverished or without any means to live fulfilling lives. Moreover, the women’s disability and poverty are depicted as aspects of their lives that give an
advantage to pursue their art or experiments. The final woman is an inventor from Britain.

Still another of these impressive old women was an inveterate inventor. Although she had seen prosperous days in England, when we knew her, she subsisted largely upon the samples given away at the demonstration counters of the department stores, and on bits of food which she cooked on a coal shovel in the furnace of the apartment house whose basement back room she occupied. Although her inventions were not practicable, various experts to whom they were submitted always pronounced them suggestive and ingenious. . . . (117)

In these examples, the women are not people to be pitied or helped. “These indomitable souls are but three out of many whom I might instance to prove that those who are handicapped in the race for life's goods sometimes play a magnificent trick upon the jade, life herself, by ceasing to know whether or not they possess any of her tawdry goods and chattels” (117). She writes of them with admiration for their commitment to art and invention. They are driven by their love of art or knowledge and desire time and materials to pursue their passion without regard for ease of life. These women are the agents of their own lives, living autonomous existences on their own terms, and resisting deforming social forces.

Usually, disability and other stigmatized behaviors or differences are so threatening to the norm it is necessary to render them powerless in fiction or ignore them altogether. “[D]isabled people are rarely depicted ( . . .) in fiction as being in control of their own lives—in charge or actively seeking out and obtaining what they want and need (Linton 168-69). Accordingly, literature and other modes of entertainment incorporate disabled characters and create stereotypes consistently and place the disabled characters in positions of pathetic impotence. “Language that conveys passivity and victimization” Simi Linton writes, “reinforces certain stereotypes when applied to disabled people.
Some of the stereotypes that are particularly entrenched are that people with disabilities are more dependent, childlike, passive, sensitive, and miserable and are less competent than people who do not have disabilities” (168-169). Interestingly, the women described by Addams are not just not dependent, childlike, passive or miserable, but the German artist’s dwarfism actually affords her the opportunity to sleep in her trunk and spend her money not on board but silk thread. This scenario may strike the reader as a wretched way to live and that this poor woman should be helped, but that would diminish her right to chose how to prioritize her life. Addams does not respond with pity for her and her choice to sacrifice for her art, but regards her with respect.

Theses anecdotes from “Problems of Poverty” fly in the face of the expected literary tradition. The literary expectation is that disabled characters are invisible or incapable and it is evident in Davis and Peattie’s texts. “[A]diversity” for disabled characters in fiction, “is not depicted as lack of opportunity, discrimination, institutionalization, and ostracism; it is the personal burden of their own body or means of functioning” (Linton 168-69). Instead, these women are the heroes of the chapter. The problems of poverty are many, and they are real with real consequences, but Addams proclaims, amid this poverty and disability are women like the ones she describes who are inspired, self-sufficient, old, disabled, and admirable.

Jane Addams on Bollinger Baby Case

In a November 21, 1915, article in the New York Sun, "Dr. Baruch Praised Doctor who let Doomed Baby Die" Dr. Baruch asserts that "a monstrosity, or obvious defective,” like the Bollinger’s baby, “It [baby Bollinger] will never be anything but the semblance
of a human being." Thus, the Bollinger baby is one who bears only a faint similarity to a human being. Dr. Baruch states, with some disappointment, that the Spartan law of executing deformed babies just after birth will probably never become rule in this country and therefore good families—presumably society too—suffer the consequences of letting such babies live. He cites in an article that ran in another city paper, “Love for Defective Child Has Ruined This Family--Father Made a Bankrupt and Mother Sacrifices He is Now in An Institution.” From this headline the reader is left to deduce that ill-advised parental devotion leads to results that will destroy the family and bring the child to no better end than a lifetime confined in an institution, an institution paid for by the public's dime.

Addams makes clear that the laws of the land protect him. The Washington Post, quotes Addams: “... [baby Bollinger] as well as every other child should be kept alive as long as possible. It is not for me to decide whether a child should be put to death. If it is a defective it should be treated as such, and be taught all it can learn. The law states that only a judge has the power to decide who shall die, and then only in case of crime.” First, Addams is making the case for the child's life, regardless of its disability. Second, she is arguing that this child, broadly described as “a monstrosity” in the media, should be educated to the fullest of his ability, which resonates with the current standards of education and therapeutic rehabilitation in the least restrictive environment. Addams refers to baby Bollinger as “a defective,” which is a dehumanizing objectification. She condenses his identity to an entity that is less than normal. Moreover, she states that he should be “treated as such.” This part of the sentence is complicated because while she is limiting the baby's identity to “a defective,” she is also recognizing that there is a
developed set of educational, rehabilitative, and medical practices in place that strive to offer children with a array of disabilities the best possible chances for an engaged existence. The primary thrust of Addams’s statement is that he is a child, not a monster or menace. He is a citizen who deserves an education and the protection of the law. Death sentences are for criminals and only the courts make that judgment. This child has committed no crime, though plenty of “experts” in the papers are ready to declare him a public menace and danger. Moreover, she argues that no doctor nor public opinion have the authority to issue a life sentence to this child.

Lillian Wald, a trained nurse and the founder of the Henry Street Settlement and the Visiting Nurse Service offers qualified support for Haiselden:

However, the inevitable conclusion that, I think, almost everybody has come to is that the right to decide upon life or death cannot be left to fallible human judgment; every doctor must, at some time in his practice, ponder upon the responsibility in this. The most conscientious may at times decide from high ethical reasoning that extraordinary measures are not justified in prolonging life in a being who is destined to misery and suffering and who may be a positive menace to society. (The Independent 25)

In this statement, the heartfelt convictions of a scientifically trained, maternal, American settlement director brings patriotism and motherhood together for the betterment of the nation. America was on the cusp of entering the First World War. Perhaps a nationalistic concern for the safety and fitness of the American citizenry influenced individual decisions about this case. Clearly, the threat of America at war permeates The Precipice. The patriotic mothering of strong children is a national service, and this threat only fueled the eugenics movement already marching across the country. “Disability was gradually transformed from a private family/community affair where bodies broke down, took sick, evidenced human vulnerability and the interdependency of human lives, into a national
scourge that must be sequestered and ultimately ousted from a shared hereditary pool called the ‘national stock’” (Snyder and Mitchell 24). This historical moment clearly illustrates the approach that countless eugenicists and numerous progressive reformers took toward disabled individuals—institutionalization or extermination were bio-power technologies that refined the quality and power of the nation. The disabling and stigmatizing structure of power is keenly evident in the case of baby Bollinger.

Representatives of the settlement movement, like Addams, are called to speak about this disabled child because it is believed that they have special knowledge about life outside the comfortable confines of middle class America. Perhaps such leaders also have privileged knowledge about social injustices. It is not hard to imagine a scene in The Precipice in which Kate offers her expert opinion on a similar case, as Julia Lathrop, Director of the real Children’s Bureau did. According to Lathrop, “It seems almost unspeakable that a mother should desire the death of a child even it is [sic] be helplessly defective” (Chicago Daily Tribune). Given the settlement literature rhetoric about motherhood, the mother that Lathrop references may be biological or any woman invested in the welfare of children.

Addams's commitment to keeping children in the home, including the mother in developing educational programs, and supporting the family with outpatient and/or public educational, rehabilitation and therapeutic services is impressive. Her texts, “Charitable Efforts” (1902), “The Home and the Special Child” (1908), and Twenty Years at Hull-House (1910) disrupt the accepted narratives about the charities’ and eugenicists’ treatment of disability and disabled people. Addams proclaims that poverty and stigma are truly central impediments to the lives of those with disabilities, as Kittay does in the
epigraph. Whereas, some charitable institutions and eugenicists viewed disabled individuals as menacing, pathetic, in need of incarceration or eradication. Addams's commitment to keeping children in the home and supporting the family with outpatient and/or public educational, rehabilitation, and therapeutic services is different from those who advocated for the elimination of children like baby Bollinger. Her statement in 1915 about the Bollinger baby case is consistent with her position about supporting families and treating disabled individuals justly in “The Home and the Special Child.” This flies in the face of the common position of eugenicists and philanthropists. Moreover, Addams took positions about the rights and needs of disabled children and their families. The child and family must be viewed within the larger social context. One must recognize how society causes and compounds problems for the individual and the family as a whole.

Her texts offer an alternative to those who depict the work of charities and reformers alike as “repressive benevolence” (David Wagner). However far-reaching and complex the work of Addams and Hull House was, it was not without its problems though. There was a learning curve to their work, coupled with an experimental mindset and pragmatic compromises. While they made mistakes and deformed their neighbors, they also sought to fight the deformance and stigmatization of those neighbors too. Such an endeavor as a social settlement and large-scale social, educational, and political reform is messy business. It is striking, though, that Addams was at odds about disability with Lillian Wald, a fellow settlement director and reformer, while Addams shared common commitments with feminist, socialist journalist Crystal Eastman, and physician and industrial health advocate Alice Hamilton. An analysis of the social and economic forces
that undermined the dignity and power of disabled Americans drives Addams’ positions. Moreover, by her commitment to inclusive democratic participation informs her approach to disability. Thus, Addams’s work pushed back against the hegemonic discourse of Progressive Era eugenicists and in the 21st century continues to engage with contemporary rhetoric of disability. Addams’s texts, I contend, forward the argument that society causes or compounds the poverty, stigma, and isolation that often accompany disability. She pushes for the recognition of interdependency and equality as preeminent requirements for social justice. She proposes that these socially rooted difficulties could be remediated by making visible, publicly recognizing, and materially supporting disabled individuals and when applicable, their families. Moreover, Addams’s work on disability engages with contemporary notions about the social construction of disability, the way that individuals perceive and encode meaning upon non-normate bodies and disability resulting from a social environment that refuses to accommodate corporeal difference.
Conclusion

Jane Addams’s writing shows that her location and experience leads to epistemic perspectives akin to the settlement neighbors and the upper middle and middle class philanthropists, reformers, and others who lived far from the Nineteenth Ward. If location plus experience yields situated knowledge, then settlement residents can obtain situated knowledge of the lives of their neighbors. Addams’s anecdotes about the neighbors show a complex understanding of both the Nineteenth Ward and the problems of poverty. Hull House resident Alice Hamilton claims, “in settlement life it is impossible not to see how She argues that an intimate knowledge of life in the Nineteenth Ward and the gross inequality of American society are unavoidable for those who live in settlement communities. Some feminist standpoint theorists argue that location, both socially and materially, results in a gulf between the possible knowledge that different groups can possess (Nelson; Walby). Thus, white women from the middle class suburbs of Chicago and Russian émigré women from the Nineteenth Ward of Chicago hold perspectives so disparate that they may share little common knowledge. Perhaps shared understanding is sometimes impossible. Surely Addams and Hamilton will not experience social and material oppression in the same manner as their settlement neighbors, but that does not mean they cannot acquire a situated knowledge about the oppressive forces at work in the lives of their neighbors.

Addams’s perspectival understanding(s) can then be conveyed to philanthropists at the Chicago Women’s Club as well as local needle trade workers who are organizing a labor union. The situated knowledge can be shared though an intermediary, perhaps a person, or a text. The informant or informing text naturally has a stake in interpretation of
their knowledge. For instance, Jacob Riis’s book of photographs and eyewitness
description *How the Other Half Lives* (1889) and accompanying lectures brought his own
knowledge of the East Side to church congregations, and reform and philanthropy groups.
Riis actively sought to acquire and convey knowledge far from the experience of middle
class New Yorkers. When he shared his images and observations of the East Side, he
inflected them with middle class, nativist, Christian values. Anzia Yezierska also wrote
her semi-autobiographical depictions of the Lower East Side from the 1920s for an
audience distant from the East Side socially and materially. Yezierska’s texts display
contempt for traditional Old World Jewish culture, and contempt for middle-class
American society, both gentile and Jewish. Thus, *How the Other Half Lives* and *Salome
of the Tenements* require a healthy skepticism. Their depictions are mediated by their
values.

The novels and autobiographically informed narratives examined herein are
particularly well suited to the examination of how motherhood and charity deform
characters in depictions of social settlements, the standpoint of the authors as
intermediary requires scrutiny. In this examination the most useful texts and authors for
criticizing the maternal rhetoric-charity-deformance paradigm, offer the most
complicated depictions of the deforming power of maternalist rhetoric and charity. Alice
Dunbar-Nelson and Jane Addams’s texts are the most nuanced in this regard. Whereas,
the texts of Elia Peattie, Richard Harding Davis, Anzia Yezierska, and Sarah Collins
Fernandis present more simplistic pictures of the deforming power of maternalist rhetoric
and charity. Yet, these authors occupy an array of standpoints in relation to the social
settlement, women, and charity. For instance, the settlement fiction in Chapter One by
Peattie and Davis depict and perpetuate the process of deformance without any reflection on the negative outcomes. The young women who enter the settlements and their picturesque neighborhoods are at the center of the story and their adventures in good works and social reform occur without any understanding of the objects of their service. The deformance of the human objects of charity and social work in *The Precipice* and “Eleanore Cuyler” by the protagonists’ use of maternal metaphors or charitable relations is not acknowledged or critically interrogated.

William Dean Howells’s realist novel *A Hazard of New Fortunes* depicts a diversely picturesque Lower East Side, but fails to create any locals who are active characters in the story. Lindau lives downtown amid the throngs of working poor, immigrant, and impoverished settlement neighbors, but the cultural capital of his extensive education places him on a par, if not above, the wealthiest characters. Conrad Dryfoos and Margaret Vance are the young idealists most akin to the settlement workers of the other books. They share a desire to dedicate their lives to charitable efforts, but their sacrifices result in their textual invisibility. Conrad dies and Margaret disappears into a line of other women of her order. Thus, *A Hazard of New Fortune* helps to show how settlement literature could be situated within the realist literary tradition. The entire narrative is mediated by the middle-class Basil March though and it lacks the critique of the Lower East Side locals found in *Salome of the Tenements*. Howells’s commitment to realism as a mechanism for spreading democracy and social reform is evident in his critique of capitalism, but not in his depiction of charitable relations.

Yezierska’s novel *Salome of the Tenements* examined in Chapter Two critiques the benevolence-deformance cycle, but fails to interrogate the relationships between
settlement neighbors, social workers, and philanthropists in a nuanced manner. She excoriates social work and charity as a deforming force, yet she does not offer a complex depiction of the relationships. The social workers are never allowed to be anything but caricatures. The men and women above deck and the men and women in steerage are never able to have any sort of real relationship, nor are the social workers ever presented as questioning their own work or the nature of power relations in the settlement or neighborhood. Resisting or reversing the cycle of deformance may be important to Yezierska’s protagonists, but they do not seek the same liberation for anyone else. Sonya single-mindedly pursues her own empowerment, without concern for anyone else. Yezierska presents a useful critique of the deforming power of the settlement, but it only presents a portion of the picture.

In contrast to Yezierska, settlement administrator Sarah Collins Fernandis presents the local neighbors as needing the settlement to remedy personal and environmental lack. Fernandis’s narratives transfer her own local knowledge to potential charitable donors. Thus, her depiction highlights the multi-generational degradation of the community and the importance of the settlement work to arrest and reform it. Yezierska’s identity as a Polish immigrant and novelist who grew up in the Lower East Side, and Fernandis’s identity as an African American social worker allow them to make unique and important contributions to settlement knowledge. Yezierska and Fernandis possess intersectional identities that place them in the standpoint of the neighbor, since they share non-white racial/ethnic identities with the objects of local social work or charity. Yet, Yezierska and Fernandis also identify with men and women who come into the settlement neighborhood from outside with the privilege of education and greater
resources. In her short story “Children of Loneliness” Yezierska describes the intersectional identity of what we now call “generation 1.5”—in her stories the members of generation 1.5 are educated, East Side European immigrants. They are uneasily at home in both the local, working poor immigrant communities and the more privileged world of universities and department stores. These identities bridge class and racial identity too, as Yezierska’s characters have been “whitened” by their time away from the East Side and their intimate knowledge of American middle class culture.

Dunbar-Nelson’s stories in The Annals of ‘Steenth Street present complex relationships within the community and among the neighbors, settlement director, pastor, and philanthropist. The philanthropist and pastor gain little insight from their interactions with the ‘Steenth Street locals, but the neighbors and Mrs. Morton show nuanced understandings of the lives of those who occupy alternative identities. Yezierska and Dunbar-Nelson crafted stories depicting the lives of their characters that experience cross-class relationships, in part, due to the existence of social settlements. In doing so Yezierska and Dunbar-Nelson make a statement about the complicated outcome of such relationships. Their characters are critical of the objectifying and deforming influence of the settlement on the people in their neighborhood. Yezierska protagonist Sonya Vrunsky turns her back on the institution, but Dunbar-Nelson’s Abe Powers works hard to enjoy the benefits of the settlement. Neither character questions the motives of their neighbors who continue to participate in settlement activities. The stories themselves transmit the authors’ own situated knowledges as women who in life have experienced life as a neighbor and as a resident.
Lastly, Addams’s texts engage a variety of audiences and within their specific historical context were persuasive and pragmatic. I explore examples maternal rhetoric in the service of liberating young middle-class women who would find it hard to break from the constraints of domestic and filial obligations in order to find freedom and a vocation in the social settlement. In some instances, crafting such an argument naturally leads to problematic relations of benevolent maternalism between the emancipated young female reformer or charity worker and the necessarily needy neighbor or local community. Addams, though, directly addresses the charity workers and their deforming powers. “Charitable Efforts” and “The Subtle Problems of Charity” (excerpted in Chapter One) put the responsibility of mitigating deformance squarely in the hands of the charity and settlement worker. She tacitly charges these women with undermining, resisting, or at least acknowledging the oppressive power of charity and reform work. Addams’s essays defy a simplistic reading, since Addams is crafting prose that is rhetorically sophisticated, at times underplaying her own arguments due to her own limitations as a female reformer, activist, and philosopher in a generally hostile environment. Her texts function as technologies of critique, protest, and resistance uncovering the problems of the benevolence-deformance cycle. Addams’s unflinching depictions of desperate poverty and the abuses of women, men, and children at the hands of unscrupulous employers show how inhumane treatment and scarcity can lead to illness, impairment, or death. She is just as unwavering in her accounts of the problems of poverty. For Addams impairment, illness, and destitution do not mean an individual is less than human or less than equal.
Complex examinations of intersectional identities and an array of situated knowledges are possible in Progressive Era settlement literature. These stories place generally educated and middle class, often white, women in neighborhoods where the neighbors are ethnically, racially, educationally, and culturally diverse. At times a young, white, native born, settlement worker from the countryside may pay a friendly visit to an elderly upper class, well-educated woman from Berlin or St. Petersburg. In this encounter who will help whom? Which woman will be deformed by the other’s gaze? Perhaps in this meeting both women will exchange their own situated knowledges of how to survive and how to define success. Settlement literature, which encompasses many more texts than those examined here, provides a hint that settlement workers may be more varied than they are generally portrayed. Addams provides glimpses into the radical motives that fuel some settlement residents. Complex intersectional identities are not the purview of the neighbors alone, the residents come to the Nineteenth Ward or Lower East Side embodying all manner of social identities too. Some are public, some private.

Settlement literature is a rich, relatively underexplored set of texts, and scholars should be open to the breadth of written works that fall into this collection. For instance in the case of baby Bollinger, settlement directors were solicited as national experts on disability, education, and social practice. The social creation of disability is rife in these fictional and non-fiction texts. Clearly the ubiquitous examples of motherhood and charity in these texts are frequent complicit producers of disability. This is only part of the story though. Examples of fierce resistance to the deforming power of motherhood and disability are evident as well. Discussions of historical progressive reform initiatives will benefit from the depictions and descriptions in settlement literature. These texts
transmit experience and knowledge about the unique powers of maternal rhetoric, benevolent maternalism, charitable efforts, and deformance, but they also transmit powerful messages about resistance and agency that are just as important.
Notes

Introduction

Sidney Bremer wrote the “Introduction” to the 1989 publication of *The Precipice* situating the novel as one in a group of novels by women from and about Chicago. For additional scholarship on Peattie’s *The Precipice* see Raftery and Lock.

In the 1880s Chicago eclipsed other major cities on the east coast to become the second largest city in the country behind New York City.

For additional discussion of the changing roles and living conditions for women in American cities during the nineteenth and early twentieth century see Meyerwitz, Stansell, Wood, and Israel.

For more on the life of Vida Dutton Scudder, see her memoir *On Journey* (1937) or Frederick’s biographical essay.

See Frederick.

Kathryn Kish Sklar’s *Florence Kelley & the Nation’s Work* offers a detailed description of Kelley’s life and the impact of her work.


For an example of a neighbor who was a Polish immigrant and worked with Hull House and Addams, see Polachek.

Theory, for Addams, should be informed by praxis, not the other way around. Addams believed democracy is a social ethic, one that could improve the lives of all people in the U.S. To have a democratic society, according to Addams, all people must be included. People, all people, must have not only political equality but more importantly social equality and equality of opportunity. Addams writes that as long as people isolate themselves in safe, comfortable homogeneous enclaves American society will continue to be rife with anti-democratic injustice, racism, capitalist greed, and poverty. Thus, the social settlement was conceived as place of shared experience with the desire to create a space of democratic participation. In the “Introduction” to *Democracy and Social Ethics*, Addams writes:

> We are learning that a standard of social ethics is not attained by travelling a sequestered byway, but by mixing on the thronged and common road where all must turn out for one another, and at least see the size of one another’s burdens. To follow the path of social morality results perforce in the temper if not the practice of the democratic spirit, for it implies that diversified human experience and resultant sympathy which are the foundation and guarantee of Democracy. (*Democracy* 7)

Addams urged her listeners and readers to evaluate their own position to the “thronged and common road” and, if they found themselves isolated in a homogeneous community they should step beyond their comfortable confines and participate in the social ethics of democracy. Such a statement as the one quoted above, speaks to the inclusion of all people. However, Jane Addams was especially committed to the political and social
equality of women and wrote and lectured the need for equality of opportunity for women. Christopher Lasch identifies Addams as a visionary feminist intellectual who understood how class and race impacted the difficulties that women had in exerting influence in political and cultural realms, while many other groundbreaking women of the time looked to gender inequality for the origin of prejudice (64). In terms of understanding race, Seigfried writes that Addams’s approach to social problems could “recognize that nonwhites are a necessary part of the process of dismantling white privilege. Privilege does not arise from theoretic or linguistic structures alone, but through actual encounters, processes, practices, and assumptions, and therefore requires that these also be sites of dismantling” (Seigfried, “Shedding” 184). Thus it is Addams’s tenure living on Halsted Street that allowed her to help dismantle some of the inequality built upon white privilege. These scholars ascribe to Addams a combination of subtle insight and a willingness to put her philosophical commitments into practice in her day-to-day work.

10 In fact, Hamilton’s 1943 autobiography Exploring the Dangerous Trades includes an observation that resonates with the experiences of many a jaded radical: “There were two things I acquired from my life at Hull-House which were certainly undesirable, and which, at long last, I have rid myself of: a deep suspicion and fear of the police and a hostility toward newspaper reporters. Both feelings had plenty of foundation in experience” (76).

11 For instance, in 1916 Madison Grant, a lawyer, physical anthropologist, and conservationist, published his treatise on scientific racism The Passing of the Great Race, which ranks the races—the Nordic races of Northern and Western Europe, top the list—and decries the degradation of American racial stock with the influx of Eastern and Southern European immigrant. He advocates immigration limits, selective breeding, and segregation in ghettos as some mechanisms to maintain and improve the racial strength of the American people. Some of the racial hierarchies of peoples within Europe were also commonly held in Europe and hence some intra-European prejudices were brought to the U.S. with the immigrants, i.e. Northern Italians are racially superior to Southern Italians. More discussion of race, racism, and European immigration can be found in Jacobson and Roediger. For more on the history of scientific racism, eugenics, and race see, Barkan, Black, Gould, Jacobson, Omi and Winant, Roediger, Spiro, and Stanton.

12 Motherhood was so clearly a location for eugenic gatekeeping that sterilization later became a common, forced practice from the 1940s to the 1960s. See Kline 32-94, and Kluchin for further discussion of sterilization. For additional discussion of the role of motherhood in eugenic nation building, in the Progressive Era, see Berg and Kline.

13 “African American ‘self-help’ emerged, in part, because of the group’s overwhelming exclusion from full participation in the American social system, because of the limited response of White social workers to the individual and social problems of African Americans in the early twentieth century, and out of a desire to take care of their own. By necessity, welfare practices designed to attack, in an organized way, the many social problems affecting these rapidly growing African American communities were developed within the African American community itself,” writes Iris Carlton-LaNey (29). For more on African American social work and settlements see Carlton-LaNey, Lasch-Quinn, and Lock.
For more information on Fannie Barrier Williams, see Deegan. Very little research has been done on fictional texts related to the African American social settlement movement. However, Sarah Lock’s 2008 dissertation People in the Neighborhood: Samaritans and Saviors in Middle-Class Women’s Settlement Writings, 1895-1914 brings together extant texts and offers an analysis of their addition to the genre. See her chapter, “‘The Gospel of Clean Backyards’: African American Women’s Contributions to Social Settlement Literature” (69-111).

Chicago Commons was a settlement founded by Graham Taylor in 1894 on N. Union Street. Chicago Commons is still operating today, more than a century later.

Even though there are no novels by African American writers about East Coast or Northern social settlements, the isolation and oppression that African American and Asian city-dwellers suffered is an additional character to the settlement literature in its conspicuous absence. In terms of African American social work and its textual legacy in archives about Progressive Era social settlements and social work, Carlton-LeNay writes: [T]heir work was a strategic response to the myriad social problems and individual hardships that confronted the African American community. In general, their contributions as professionally trained social workers have been excluded from the social work literature. This gives a skewed picture of the history of social work and social welfare and leaves one to conclude that African Americans contributed very little to the organization and development of the social work profession” (30).

Textual tourists to settlement house neighborhoods regarded the depictions of deviation from middle-class cultural expectations (or more accurately, the myriad of deviations) with opprobrium and/or pity, but also perhaps with a little titillation. Such depictions inspire some individuals to action. These people hope to improve the lives of women and men like those in the books and exposés. In fact, Addams argues that the emotions of young people can be fueled by texts or lectures about how poverty and municipal or societal abandonment ravage communities and individuals. With their passions stirred they find a vocation in public service or reform work, such as that done at settlement houses across the country (“Filial Relations”; “Subjective Necessity of Social Settlements”). This real world urban location of disparate values, racial difference, the relative social isolation of communities, and charitable relations yields a tangled assortment of interactions fraught with inequality and false presuppositions.

For more on institutionalization in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, see Gerald N. Grob, Mental Illness and American Society, 1875-1940, Andrew Scull, Madhouse: A Tragic Take of Megalomania and Modern Medicine, James W. Trent Jr.

The New Woman was the popular moniker, often used by the media, for a new model of young women that evolved in the late nineteenth century. She was often college educated and was depicted as independent and fearless. Additional information about the New Woman in the U.S. can be found in Ledger, Matthews, Smith-Rosenberg, Richardson and Willis.

Richard Harding Davis was the son of author Rebecca Harding Davis. Rebecca Harding Davis is hailed as one of the progenitors of American realism. The short story “Eleanore Cuyler” is in Davis’s collection Van Bibber and others from 1892. I have found references to a 1912 movie version of the story, starring Miriam Nesbitt as Eleanore and Marc McDermott as Wainwright, but I have not been able to locate any additional information about this film.

Yezierska fits the description of a New Jewish Woman. Historian Susan Glenn has identified the New Jewish Woman as a working-class version of the liberated New Woman. As such, Yezierska is uniquely positioned to critique progressive reform projects because she holds many of the same values about women's power and freedom, but she is also painfully aware of the prejudices and limitations that accompany her racialized identity. See Glenn 207-242, Rich Transcending the New Woman, 1-36, 157-89.

Chapter One

1 Crossing over the tops of buildings to arrive at the next destination was a shortcut. Climbing down many flights of stairs, walking down the sidewalk, just to climb back up the stairs was unnecessary.

2 Social settlement literature and A Hazard of New Fortune trades upon the popularity of slumming. Slumming was a pastime—often couched as a philanthropic practice—of the middle and upper middle classes of urban society in which they spend time within a community of people considered beneath them in social class. The social settlement was an institution regularly regarded as exotic due to its rich mix of people of different nationalities and classes. Social settlements were located amid the hustle and bustle of crowded streets where commerce took place in the open. They were located in a part of town that was not only actually dangerous but also perceived as such. For many people, at this time visiting the Lower East Side, as Basil and Isabel March do unintentionally in Howell’s novel, was a thrilling and emotional experience. Scott Herring’s Queering the Underworld: Slumming, Literature, and the Undoing of Lesbian and Gay History describes Hull House and its neighborhood as rife with wealthy, urban sightseers who
visited looking for a good time. Carrie Tirado Bramen, in “The Urban Picturesque and the Spectacle of Americanization” offers a similar description of the Lower East Side as novel and titillating to the outsider. Visitors perceived the settlement neighborhoods as exotic, or even as uniquely authentic in the way that one hopes to learn about “primitive peoples” at a natural history museum. A perception like this levels a deforming gaze upon the local population.

3 The masses of garbage that contaminated the neighborhood were a public health risk. In Chicago’s Nineteenth Ward the people of the took matters into their own hands documenting lapses in service and demanding that the process be rectified. Ultimately, Addams was named garbage inspector for the ward.

Chapter Two

1 See Luker.
2 For more on Victoria Earle Matthews and the White Rose Mission see Kramer. Matthews, a journalist and activist, begin the White Rose Mission after the death of her teenage son.
3 The mission had an extensive library of history and literature, and Dunbar-Nelson wrote letters to her future husband Paul Laurence Dunbar tell him about sharing the work of his contemporaries with her students (Kramer 248-49). The students read the poems of Phyllis Wheatley and supposedly were such fans of Dunbar that Alice urged him to come to New York and read at the mission (Kramer 248-49).
4 Hull describes the children of ‘Steenth Street as “Irish ghetto youth,” but based on the names of the characters and the historically multi-ethnic nature of New York City’s poorer neighborhoods, it is more likely that the families are a mix of ethnicities (and religions).
5 “The Free Vacation House” tells the story of a harried, impoverished East Side mother who is approached by agents of a local welfare institution about enjoying a much-needed rest at the free vacation house. When she finally assents to a vacation she is sent to the welfare office and grilled with questions to ascertain her worthiness and verify her poverty. The protagonist finds this demeaning and humiliating. Once at the free vacation house the young mother is subjected to rules and guidelines that control the movements and activities of the vacationing women. During their stay the mothers are subject to observation by visiting lady do-gooders and philanthropists. Yezierska captures the degradation and paternalism of social welfare in this story.
6 These students included Irwin Edman, Frances Bradshaw, Brand Blanshard, and occasionally Brand Blandshard’s twin brother Paul Blanshard.
7 While Yezierska critiques the social reformers’ lack of understanding, her criticism about the limits of democratic understanding echoed the beliefs of John Dewey and Jane Addams. Addams in “The Subjective Necessity for Social Settlements” comments on the missions and obligations of the young men and women who wish to work in the social settlement (Twenty Years 76). Thus, until everyone has the same rights and privileges they are secured for no one.
Chapter Three

1 Dr. John Dill Robertson, Commissioner of Health of the City of Chicago, examined the child while he was still alive and ordered two separate autopsies after his death. He testified that the child did in fact have numerous severe physical impairments, but saw no evidence for Dr. Haiselden’s assertion that the child would be “mentally defective” (Robertson 2025).

2 Jane Addams's descriptions of disabled individuals may fall harshly on the ears and consciences of the twenty-first century reader, but "one era's 'scientific' designations become another era's derogatory epithets" until they are co-opted by the very people they were meant to describe as an act of resistance and power, i.e. queer and cripple for instance (Snyder and Mitchell 19).

3 Jane Mary Dewey, the sixth of the seven children of John and Alice Chipman Dewey, was named after Jane Addams and Addams’s partner, Mary Rozet Smith.

4 Moving to the city, particularly a neighborhood of people outside the world of the culture makers and the media controllers allowed her to create a space where men and women could live as they wished without much fear of censure. Scholars over the years have debated, or avoided addressing, whether Addams and many of her Hull House comrades were lesbians and gay men, but beyond debate, is the reality that Addams shared a lifelong partnership with Mary Rozet Smith. For more on Hull House as a queer space, see Jackson and Herring.

5 For more on Addams’s positions on the relationship of American nationalism, democracy, and institutions to immigrant populations see, “Pen and Book as Tests of Character” (1913) and “Americanization” (1919). Addams writes, “The application of a collective judgment in regard to aliens in the United States is particularly stupid. The twenty-seven million people of foreign birth living among us are not only quite as diversified in their political opinions as those of us forming the remaining millions of the population, but they are in fact more highly differentiated from each other by race, tradition, religion, and European background than the rest of us can possibly be even though we are as diverse as ‘the cracker’ in Georgia and the Yankee in Maine” (“Americanization” 246). Of particular interest on this subject may be her early essay “The Chicago Settlements and Social Unrest” (1908) spurred by the Averbach affair during which a young Russian Jewish man was shot dead in preemptive defense by the Chief of Police’s son. The essay describes the role of the social settlement in demanding a fair inquest into the murder. Addams asserts that all that was proven to the immigrant community by the Averbach affair is that American civil liberties and democracy is a sham and that the Chicago police are little better than the czarist government that had drove many to come to the United States.

6 Mary Jo Deegan named the “Hull House School of race relations.” It is not linked just to Jane Addams, but to feminist pragmatism as well. For more about the “Chicago School of Race Relations,” see Deegan, “Oliver C. Cox and the Chicago School of Race Relations, 1892-1940.”

7 For more information on the life and texts of Sarah Collins Fernandis, see Brice-Finch’s article in Notable Black Women, Book II; Honey, Shadowed Dreams: Women’s Poetry of

\(^5\) This 1909 essay was published in *The Negro in the Cities of the North* a special issue of *Charities,* a publication of the New York Charity Organization Society. *Charities* later merged with a notable settlement journal to become *Charities and the Commons.* *Charities* originally forwarded the philosophy of scientific charity, but soon became committed to the ideas of progressive reform that identified poverty as a systemic problem, not a personal flaw.
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