ON Christmas Day, 1893, the Kingsley Settlement House opened its doors at 1707 Penn Avenue to the residents of Pittsburgh's Twelfth Ward. Within twelve blocks of this modest undertaking, Andrew Carnegie began constructing the city's first skyscraper, and a new Joseph Horne department store was completed. At the beginning of a four-year depression, local entrepreneurs were expanding their economic domain, while altruistic social workers labored in a neighborhood where "conditions were hard but where people had courage and aspiration, where there were good citizens who waited only for an opportunity to be better. . . ."  

This contrast was typical of late-nineteenth-century America. Cities witnessed the high tide of southeastern European immigration, consolidation and bureaucratization of business and professions, and labor-management conflict, culminating in stereotypes of opulent captains of industry and impoverished day laborers. Out of this milieu came the Progressive reform movement, which reacted to a perceived crisis in America's cultural, moral, economic, and governmental functions.

The settlement movement, only part of the social reform mainstream, was a synthesis of many reform elements. Claiming common roots but lacking national direction, settlements were a middle-class idea of what an urban, poor, and ethnic neighborhood required to transcend its environmental deficiencies. Kingsley House, in particular, reflected local characteristics and, at each period of its development, the individual caprices and goals of its specific leaders. This created a reflexive social program marked by a lack of continuity, yet Kingsley House enjoyed a ninety-year history in three different Pitts-
burgh neighborhoods. What factors existed in the urban setting precipitating a supposed need for settlements? What programs were created to combat these factors? How did their leaders reconcile neighborhood realities with settlement goals and activities?

The motivating principles of the settlement movement were rooted in a blend of religious and secular interpretations of urban-industrial society. The seminal philosophy grew out of the work of English religious and reform leaders such as Charles Kingsley, Frederick Denison Maurice, John Ruskin, and Samuel A. Barnett, whose ideas and efforts produced the Toynbee Hall Association in the East London slums of 1884. Charles Kingsley was a proponent of “tory radicalism,” a Christian Socialist support of the working class against liberal capitalists on matters of social reform. This stance produced a strong vein of social criticism combined with social responsibility and paternalism. Kingsley, a clergyman, believed that his class must wage a “holy war against the social abuses which are England’s shame, and, first and foremost, against the fiend of competition.” To Kingsley’s adherents the abuse of competition produced child and women labor situations detrimental to the middle-class notion of the family and home. But beyond this, they viewed the working class as being relegated to a life of subsistence wages and economic immobility. Living in clearly defined slum areas, removed in location and amenities from middle-class accommodations, the wage earner appeared to lack the capacity for art, play, or amusement. Settlement advocates sought to restore the capacity for cultured leisure to the working class by social interaction with the middle-class reformers. They sought, as well, to reduce class distinctions by stressing common bonds of Christianity shared by all classes.

Similar stirrings were being felt in the United States around 1870. Clergymen spoke out first, but by the 1890s, secular proponents were more active. The particular impetus for social settlements came from the Protestant moral reform movement called the Social Gospel. On the one hand, adherents to the Social Gospel were repelled by conditions in urban pockets of poverty, while on the other, the various Protestant sects tried to contain the outmigration of churches and
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4 Weaver, *Settlement Movement*, 11.
clientele from these areas. Borrowing from many doctrines, the Social Gospel embraced a humanistic attitude towards science and industrialism; it was a concept of divine judgment tempered by optimism where crisis gave way to progress and a resolve to provide social justice through service and moral strength. With strong spokesmen like Washington Gladden and Pittsburgh's George Hodges, the movement came to the "realization that the individual is saved in his social context rather than out of it, and therefore the customs of society must change if he is to develop full potentialities." At first, this was attempted through "institutional churches" offering vocational training, health advice, and meeting rooms for special groups within poor urban neighborhoods. Since these organizations were branches or extensions of more prosperous Congregationalist or Episcopal churches, they lacked the common touch of permanent residence. Settlement houses provided this added dimension while maintaining a Christian social outlook.

A summary of pronouncements merely hints at what motivated these forebears of the settlements. The crux of their philosophy was a reaction to a perceived crisis in the way cultural life was unfolding as industrialism gathered momentum. The settlement movement and the Social Gospel represented a belief that the individual within the city was exposed to debasing elements that had the potential to destroy America's social fabric. This belief linked the latter two movements to each other and the larger reforms historians have attributed to the Progressive umbrella. Recent historians, especially, have portrayed the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the years up to the First World War as a period of realization and reevaluation of America's industrial rise and urban growth.

Robert H. Wiebe saw it as a period of a national "search for order." "In a manner that eludes precise explanation," he wrote, "countless citizens in towns and cities across the land sensed that something fundamental was happening to their lives, something they had not willed and did not want, and they responded by striking out at


whatever enemies their view of the world allowed them to see.” 9 Samuel P. Hays maintained that this perception was most keenly observed by organized religion, middle- and upper-class women, the “on the make” middle class, and intellectuals. Without decrying industrialism, these groups wondered about the individual’s role in such a society and possessed a “stricken conscience” over the wretched conditions of the poor. What emerged was an environmental approach to understanding urban society. Poverty, health, and crime were not the result of the inherent immorality of individuals or groups nor would these evils go away or be suppressed unless the causes were discovered and ameliorated. 10

Beyond the feelings of guilt and the environmental perspective was a belief in the durability of what Wiebe called the “island community.” This notion held that sovereignty and management were in the hands of community interests rather than industrial giants bent on the destruction of these bastions of self-determination. So self-determination became a goal of the reformers, and it took the guise of antimonopolism, antialienism, and the formation of community organizations fostering purity and unity through public education and moral behavior. 11 Jane Addams, in the vanguard of the settlement movement, reinforced this interpretation by applying it to settlements:

The settlement aims in measure to develop whatever social life its neighborhood may afford to focus and give form to that life, to bring to bear upon it the results of cultivation and training... The Settlement then is an experimental effort to aid in the solution of the social and industrial problems which are engendered by the modern conditions in a great city... to relieve... over-accumulation at one end of society and the destitution at the other, but it assumes that this... is most sorely felt in the things that pertain to social and educational advantages. 12

Jane Addams represented a cadre of middle-class, well-educated, and committed young persons who desired to change the great “social maladjustment,” “socialize democracy,” and foster Christian social progress. 13 The settlement movement offered an ideal avenue for a

11 Wiebe, *Search for Order*, 44-61. Wiebe’s thesis suggests the demise of the “island community” brought on by the restructuring of the urban landscape by industrialism. More precisely this concept operated best in a small-town setting which was rendered obsolete in many areas by massive industrial development. It was local self-control, associated with the “island community,” that appealed to social reformers seeking to stem the change in city environments.
13 Ibid., 120-23.
pious, politicized, and activist personality. With their capabilities blunted in the industrial malaise, Addams and others like her applied their unique skills to founding and directing permanent settlements. Thus during the late 1880s and 1890s, a body of reform elements emerged that expressed notions of individualism, loss of community autonomy, environmentalism, and middle-class guilt in reaction to the perceptible shifts in American society wrought by urban-industrial development. Comprehending and accepting these tenets, however, tends to mask some simple yet vital questions: What were the actual living conditions that provoked the settlement response; and what did the settlement offer that would effect a positive improvement?

Although sporadic labor disputes and social unrest created a dramatic tension within the ranks of aware citizens, quiet desperation ruled much of daily life in Pittsburgh during the 1890s. Disease, death, and stunted life were constant companions of steelmaking, coal mining, and bridgebuilding. Thomas W. Baker, Pittsburgh health superintendent, remarked that “Pittsburgh being a great manufacturing and railroad centre naturally has an excessive number of deaths from violent causes. . .” The accuracy of this statement cannot be tested against available data for cities comparable to Pittsburgh. “Violent” death in the 1893 records for Pittsburgh meant all deaths that were untimely such as homicides, accidents, and poisonings which attained a rate of 2 out of every 1,000 deaths. Yet the annual death rate that year was 22.4 per 1,000 (compared to 10.1 in 1978), a figure that was exceeded by only eight other cities [Table 1]. Clearly Pittsburgh’s death rate encompassed more than the industrial accident or the fit of rage. The difference was attributable to the environment, and therefore became a concern for the settlement worker. Kingsley’s first social worker, Kate A. Everest, lamented the condition of her first neighborhood. Landlord-neglected apartments, Irish-American predominance, children working in mills, illiteracy, and poor sanitary conditions in basement apartments all moved her to describe the adjoined Ninth, Tenth, and Twelfth wards as “degraded.”

15 Fifth Annual Report of the Pittsburgh Department of Public Safety, 1892 (Pittsburgh, 1892), 100 (hereafter cited as DPS Report with year).
16 DPS Report, 1894, 27. The average for cities in the 200,000-500,000 range was 19.87, while the approximate national urban average was 20.08.
17 Kingsley Association Yearbook, 1894 (Pittsburgh 1894), 4-5 (hereafter cited as Kingsley Yearbook, with year). Everest is listed in various Kingsley material as either the head worker or resident director, but there is no information available concerning her education nor where she came from before 1893. The Twelfth Ward adjoined Wards Nine and Ten until 1907.
TABLE 1

MORTALITY IN SELECTED U.S. CITIES 1893,
RANKED ACCORDING TO DEATH RATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Deaths (per 1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>254,000</td>
<td>7,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>65,165</td>
<td>1,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>31,076</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>4,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>2,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>487,397</td>
<td>11,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1,891,306</td>
<td>44,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>6,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>264,000</td>
<td>5,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>1,115,562</td>
<td>23,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>990,881</td>
<td>21,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>3,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>5,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>4,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>6,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>6,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td>5,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>4,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>2,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>27,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>2,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>3,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Wheeling</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>1,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>1,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>223,700</td>
<td>2,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>1,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DPS Report, 1894, 27.

What Everest failed to mention in her report were the specific conditions prevalent not only in her bailiwick, but the entire city. Analysis of the 22.4 per 1,000 death rate reveals an appalling urban environment to the modern observer. Four out of every twenty-two when all three became the Second Ward. Kingsley House first located on Penn Avenue which is now in the heart of Pittsburgh's wholesale food district known as the Strip.
deaths were caused by either infectious disease (measles, diphtheria, typhoid, and so forth), respiratory disease (pneumonia and tuberculosis) or digestive disorders (diarrhea, enteritis) (Table 2). Ten out of the twenty-two were less than three years old, and the infant mortality rate was 231 out of 1,000 births. Racially, fifteen of the twenty-two were native white, six were foreign born, and one was black. During Kingsley's fifth year, 1898, there was some improvement in the percentage figures, but totals and population were higher. The death rate did drop to 17 per 1,000 and causes declined: infectious disease accounted for two deaths, respiratory three, digestive one, and violent

### TABLE 2

**Death Rates, Birth Rates, and Selected Death Rate Factors for the City of Pittsburgh for 1893 and 1898**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1893</th>
<th>1898</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>264000</td>
<td>298772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths*</td>
<td>5902</td>
<td>5114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate Per 1000*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Factors</td>
<td>Number*</td>
<td>Rate*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infectious Disease</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory Disease</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digestive Disease</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Causes</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 Years of Age</td>
<td>2649</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native White</td>
<td>4075</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3274</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2628</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births</td>
<td>7044</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths Under 1 Year</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Rate per 1000 live births)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1626</th>
<th>1376</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single (10 Years+)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widows</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowers</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (Under 10)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *DPS Reports, 1894, 1898.*
causes stayed at two. Infant mortality remained high — 190 out of 1,000 births — and seven out of seventeen deaths were under three years old. Despite the decline in rates, the urban environment in Pittsburgh was deadly, and in 1898 Kingsley House was located in the third most deadly ward (Twelfth) with the first (Ninth) and fourth (Tenth) ones adjoining it. These locations had an aggregate death rate of 23.5, six more than the city as a whole.  

The Reverend George Hodges, rector of the Calvary Episcopal Church, founded the Kingsley Association along with businessman H. D. W. English. The Reverend Hodges was committed to the Social Gospel and the teachings of Charles Kingsley. He believed that part of that commitment was a concern for “sanitation and the administration of the city, and politics, and rent, and wages, and the conditions generally under which men work and live between Sundays. . . .”  

English was the son of an abolitionist Baptist minister and rose from menial printing jobs to head the Berkshire Insurance Company in Pittsburgh. He was a noted civic leader from the 1890s to his death in 1916, and was instrumental in bringing the questions of housing and sanitation to the attention of the chamber of commerce. It was the first time the chamber became actively involved in such issues. The settlement was founded for “work and study”; as Hodges said, “We want to know what the realities are in Pittsburgh.”  

Two of those realities were the health status of the community and the prevalence of crime.  

Police Station Number Three had jurisdiction in Kingsley’s Ninth, Tenth, and Twelfth ward locale, serving 19,162 persons in 1893 and 14,750 persons in 1898. From all indications, it was a busy place during those years. Today’s so-called victimless crimes — drunkenness, disorderly conduct, streetwalking, and gambling — were disturbing urban elements to the settlement worker who wanted “to prune away evil tendencies . . . with love and vital growth.” Yet rooting out these crimes was the daily work of Number Three policemen. In 1893 they made 24 percent of all arrests in the city. Seventy-five per cent of those were for drunkenness, disorderly conduct, streetwalking, keeping/visiting disorderly houses, and gambling. Drunken- 
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21 Weaver, *Settlement Movement*, 16-17.  
22 Kingsley Yearbook, 1895, 5.
William H. Matthews, Kingsley House director, 1902-1911. Under Matthews, the settlement directed its programs toward environmental reform.

Charles C. Cooper replaced Matthews as director in 1911.
Kingsley House at Bedford Avenue and Fulton Street. The settlement moved to the Hill District in 1901 in response to deteriorating conditions at the former Penn Avenue site.
Children's playroom at Kingsley House around 1905.

Boys working in the settlement's manual training department around 1905.
Both boys and girls had clubs at Kingsley House under Matthews's directorship. Here is a basketry and beadwork class in the Girls Club.

Gardening at Kingsley House around 1913.
ness and disorderly conduct together accounted for 68 percent of the arrest total. Even more telling was that Wards Nine, Ten, and Twelve had an arrest rate of 187 per 1,000 population in 1893, and it climbed to 304 per 1,000 in 1899. These rates were second to Station Number One's 268 per 1,000 and 318 per 1,000 respectively, but compared unfavorably to the entire city rates of 58 per 1,000 in 1893 and 63 per 1,000 in 1899. Furthermore, within a one-mile radius of Kingsley, seventeen murders were committed between 1892 and 1899, representing 41 percent of all the detected homicides in the entire city.23 An unhealthy and crime-prone environment served as the Kingsley House home for eight years, and much of the settlement's work was intended to offset these evident environmental deficiencies.

Between 1893 and 1920, Kingsley House passed through three phases of settlement activity. Two were basically passive and dealt with symptomatic neighborhood problems, while the middle period was most noted for promulgating an environmentalist view. The foundation of the first symptomatic stage was built upon Kate A. Everest's belief in education, cultural contact, and the necessity of daily physical contact in order to build and maintain a notion of social progress. In the annual reports of her years the summation of activities was carefully worded to convey the element of cultivation. A definite air of class distinction permeated descriptions of settlement work, and small moments of progress were treated with social significance and dramatic effect: "Our half dozen Poles looked with greatest suspicion upon the five Jews and the Irish and Americans were united in their contempt of both other races. A great romp all together... made them forget everything but their fun... Through the daily development of common interests, and most vitally of all through love of common country, a broad platform of unity has been established."

This dramatic phrasing seems to belie the fact that the objects of this unity were five- and six-year-old kindergarteners. Furthermore, the cultural differences between students and their teachers were evident at Kingsley House during these years. Variously, the Polish children were granted the distinction of combining "keen perception with utmost patience," the American and Irish were more "brilliant and versatile but irresponsible," and the Jewish and German children showed a "slow persistence that always achieved its end."24 Such generalizations about class and ethnic characteristics on the part of Kingsley workers sharply contrasted with the settlement movement's

24 Kingsley Yearbook, 1895, 5-6.
emphasis on individual response to a changing urban setting.

Kindergarten was not the only program Kingsley House offered to improve the "degraded" aspects of the community. The settlement credo maintained that social clubs, dramatics, debates, and public speaking would enhance self-development, awaken individuals to a sense of community, and give expression and stability to the requirements of social intercourse. To these ends, Kingsley House sponsored clubs such as the "Newtonian," "Elite," the "Kingsley House Juniors," and the "Joan of Arc." Although they had no stated purpose they may have had neighborhood beginnings and found Kingsley House to be a good location for their activities. Other groups met for specific purposes; they included the "Literary Society," "Soroses," and the "Dramatic Association." The Literary Society and Soroses staged She Stoops to Conquer at the settlement, while the Dramatic Association ambitiously staged Leah the Forsaken at the Grand Opera House in 1895. In addition to these special groups, evening classes were offered in penmanship, advanced English, zoology, arithmetic, and music. Attendance at these classes was reported as being "not large" and "irregular," but for those who attended "good progress" was the announced result. Attendance figures are not available for this period, making it difficult to determine the scope or the success of the settlement's programs. But it is certain that the workers at Kingsley House were cautiously optimistic about the benefits of their cultural programs in uplifting the younger members of the community.

In addition to children, Kingsley House aimed its programs at adults. In 1896 and 1897, the settlement sponsored a "Thirty Day Food Examination" and attempted to answer the "Liquor Question." Details are sketchy at best on what were Kate Everest's first and last attempts at addressing larger community issues. At the behest of a Dr. Atwater of the state agriculture department, "poor" families in Kingsley's vicinity were given a fixed amount of money and were encouraged to prepare nutritious meals within the budget. The purpose of the project was to teach families how to budget and provide nutrition simultaneously, and it required a great deal of scrutiny and communication. Since at least one family dropped from the survey, claiming that the results would be used for wage reductions, it seems that Kingsley House lacked the communicative ability to foster trust among the participants. The Liquor Question was an investigation led

by a Mr. Karen and an unidentified "Committee of Fifty" in which Kingsley House helped study "saloons as social centers" in the Ninth and Tenth wards. They uncovered thirty-nine licensed saloons, "untold numbers" of unlicensed ones, and social clubs where liquor was sold. In these wards with a total population of 9,879, the liquor establishments were offset by only five churches and five "dry" social clubs.27

These investigations most likely were undertaken by Kingsley House in an attempt to illustrate the deplorable conditions in the settlement's area. Because the programs appeared prominently in the Kingsley Yearbook, a publication directed at the charity-minded, middle-class membership of the association, it is probable that what the staff really knew about the conditions within the community and what they could realistically do about them were carefully concealed in descriptions of kindergarten "romps" and evening classes. George Hodges's concerns over workingmen's wages, rents, and sanitary conditions were never really incorporated into Kingsley's programs until the early 1900s.

At the turn of the century, Progressive reformers shifted from a "stricken conscience" motivation, where serving the poor was a moral act, to a concern for dealing with causes rather than changing surface conditions.28 Underlying this shift was the rise of a new middle class composed of professional and business specialists unified by the consciousness of unique skills and functions. The resulting effect on reform was a bureaucratic social theory and efficiency model of rational social processes that could both explain and change the urban environment. Settlements became more involved with a community's problems and developed procedures for their efficient management.29 Roughly during the same period there arose the industrialist's concern with "scientific philanthropy" through newly created foundations. Rationality guided the transfer, for example, of Rockefeller and Carnegie money into areas such as education, libraries, and public parks, while the continuous application of funds to an institution or community reflected a common philanthropic goal of efficiency.30 Behind this model of efficient social work was a consistent element of

27 Kingsley Yearbook, 1897, unpaginated.
29 Wiebe, Search for Order, 112-13, 147-50.
class distinctions. The gulf between the middle and working classes was large, and the burden of change was naturally thrust upon the lower groups of wage earners. They had to change — especially the recent immigrant. All that ailed society seemed to arise from their meager lifestyle. In particular, Barbara Howe argued that social work was an avenue of social control: “When the rich had an opportunity to determine who would receive and who would not, they had the perfect chance to set forth the required standards of behavior for assistance.” In the early 1900s rational efficiency, a desire to change the life style of clients, especially children, and a more comprehensive environmental view came together at Kingsley House.

In 1897, Mary B. Lippencott became the resident director upon the resignation of Kate A. Everest. During Lippencott’s tenure, Henry Clay Frick, a lifetime supporter of Kingsley House, purchased the Montooth property on Bedford Avenue and Fulton Street in the city’s Hill District. Frick financed the building’s remodeling for settlement use, and Kingsley House moved there in 1901. The settlement cited a lack of operating space on Penn Avenue as the chief reason for the move, but this was a moot point considering the paucity of membership and poor attendance figures published in those early years. What can be gleaned from public safety records and census data indicates that an undesirable change had occurred in the social climate of the Penn Avenue area while a positive one was underway in the Hill District. It was this alteration in the urban pattern that may have triggered the move.

The population within the Penn Avenue settlement territory had dropped significantly since 1890. Wards Nine and Ten lost 475 and 745 persons respectively between 1890 and 1900, while the Twelfth Ward gained 257 persons. This decline occurred while Police Station Number Three reported in 1899 a 24 percent increase in total arrests over 1893 and a leap in arrest rates from 187 to 304 per 1,000 during the same six years. Obviously Kingsley House was in the midst of an increasingly older and more volatile population with little evidence of family growth. As street crime outstripped the population and substandard health conditions predominated, Kingsley’s officials considered the Penn Avenue area a community unable to rise above its “degradation.”

31 Hays, Response to Industrialism, 99.
32 Barbara J. Howe, “Clubs, Culture, and Charity: Anglo-American Upper Class Activities in the Late Nineteenth Century City” (Ph.D. diss., Temple University, 1976), 554.
33 Weaver, Settlement Movement, 25-26.
The development of the Hill District during the years 1890 to 1900 stood in marked contrast to the blocks around Penn Avenue. Wards Seven, Eight, and Eleven, Kingsley's new home, increased in population 30, 27, and 20 percent respectively. In 1898, while the Penn Avenue area had a death rate of 23.5 the Hill's was 14.6, three less than the city average. Furthermore, between 1893 and 1899 the Hill, overseen by Police Station Number Two, reported only a 7 percent increase in arrests, while its arrest rate declined from 30 per 1,000 population to 27 compared to the city's rate of 58 and 63 per 1,000 during the same years. Beyond doubt, the Hill represented a community growth area, healthier and more crime free than Penn Avenue, and it gave Kingsley House a more youthful and fertile area to continue the settlement movement.

Within one year of Kingsley's move, Mary B. Lippencott resigned after Kingsley Association President H. D. W. English threatened to fire her. English claimed that the work of the settlement was beyond Lippencott's managerial skill, citing complaints in 1902 about "congregating young men, obscene language, poker playing, and improper gym attire." This episode, coupled with the possible reasons for Kingsley's move in 1901, marks a transition from a reactive treatment of symptoms to a more structured activist theme. The articulation of this shift was embodied in William H. Matthews, who began his tenure as director in 1902. He represented what Robert H. Wiebe called "humanitarian Progressivism," a unification of the campaigns for education, health, and housing, shifting from the individual's plight to a comprehensive environmental view where the vulnerable child was protected.

One of Matthews's first creations was the Kingsley House Boys Club, where "boys who have grown up in defiance of law and order . . . failed sometime to get a square deal . . . often bullied . . . find opportunity for all sorts of recreation — strenuous, wholesome
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34 Twelfth United States Census, 1900, "Dwellings and Families," Table 104, p. 655. DPS Reports, 1894 and 1898 were also used to compute these statistics. Wards Seven, Eight, and Eleven had a combined population of 28,464 with 5,719 families and 4,141 dwellings, while Wards Nine, Ten, and Twelve had 17,251 persons, 3,091 families, and 2,043 dwellings. The former had 1.38 families per dwelling, 6.9 persons per dwelling, and a family size of 4.98. The latter had 1.51 families per dwelling, 8.4 persons per dwelling, and a family size of 5.58. Wards Nine, Ten, and Twelve had the edge in overcrowded conditions, a problem that settlements later combated, but Kingsley House chose to take its fight elsewhere beyond the area's no-growth and crime-ridden population.

35 Pittsburgh Dispatch, Sept. 18, 1902. This and subsequent newspaper references were found in a scrapbook compiled by the Kingsley Association Auxiliary in 1980.

36 Wiebe, Search for Order, 168-69.
and with as little routine as is possible.” They were to work shoulder to shoulder with Matthews, who insisted upon “cleanliness, a spirit of fair play, and a squareness of action that smacks not of injustice to either party concerned.” Between 1902 and 1909, the membership of the Boys Club swelled from thirty-one to in excess of seven hundred, moving Matthews to remark: “streetcorners as convenient places at which boys might meet their friends have been driven out of business. . . .” Evidently Matthews succeeded where Lippencott failed in providing a procedure and a policy that enhanced the influence of the settlement.

Matthews, despite Kingsley’s improved locale, was appalled by life “in the poorer districts of the city.” To him, “evil” was inherent in the housing and living conditions surrounding Kingsley House, and the work of the association was to “offset in every possible way the evils and disadvantages which these conditions produce. . . .” The “evils and disadvantages” most debilitating were the “stress of poverty, and the evil of intemperance, sickness, incapacity and inability to work.” The causes were found in the quality of housing with their unsanitary closets, impure water supply, and unventilated damp cellar apartments. He despaired that this environment created a “meagre, bloodless and nerveless people” who would grow up with no “self respect, honor, and decency.” The key conceptualization was progress and growth, and only a child could experience that in Matthews’s eyes. Weekly attendance figures in January 1904 support Kingsley’s emphasis on children. Boys and girls over the age of fifteen numbered 408, yet the under-fifteen group totalled 1,272 in weekly attendance. These figures prompted a significant statement from Matthews:

You will see the work is largely with children. I am more convinced as I note conditions and results that in the child is found the largest opportunity for the most effective social work. We cannot begin too early. Life changes quickly from one of instincts to one of habits. The child should be given fair opportunities to master the difficulties that have in many cases already crushed the parents. With adults, redemptive social work can be in many cases . . . little more than patch work; with the children, we work with the whole stuff.19

Kingsley’s settlement credo thus had moved from its cultural contact roots to one where the child was the basis of progressive growth towards a middle-class standard. In essence, the Kingsley House tried to mold the children of a community while reacting against the habits of their parents.

---

37 Kingsley Yearbook, 1909, 35.
38 Matthews, Social Settlement Movement, 38.
39 Kingsley Yearbook, 1909, 56; ibid., 1905, 27.
Matthews’s programs reflected a practical outlook stressing recreation and manual training and deemphasizing the “cultural” activities begun in earlier years. Games offered a chance for “personal contact” with a “clubhouse” atmosphere replacing the street corner, therefore negating its dubious influence. Manual training or shop classes had a special meaning in Matthews’s words: “It means the uniting of mind, of body, in natural harmonious development and helpful exercise. . . . The boy who works out a problem with a plank in manual training class will be better equipped for the working out of some larger problem later in life. . . .” 40 This perception of play and manual activity echoed the work of psychologist G. Stanley Hall, philanthropist Joseph Lee, and Lester H. Gulick, head of the Russell Sage Foundation child hygiene department, who, in concert with other reformers, helped redefine the concept of “play” and promulgated it through the construction of playgrounds throughout the United States. To them, play recreated physical processes through which humanity adapted to and dominated the external world. They believed that adolescents craved social cooperation and that team games redirected an urban youth away from the gang and towards the team. Beyond this, physical activity developed will power because they saw morals and muscles as one. To many reformers, this play philosophy provided a solution to a child’s health, socialization, and moral problems in an urban industrial society. 41

Matthews’s statements describing his programs with children in the Kingsley annual report were read by a relatively restricted group. At the same time, he railed against the housing within Kingsley’s environs to a less limited audience. Historian Roy Lubove wrote that “no voluntary institution was more active than Kingsley House in goading, rousing, and educating public opinion on housing.” This process was marked by the publication of pictures in the Kingsley House Record and annual reports at various times from 1903 to 1909. In true Progressive fashion, Matthews exposed, revealed, and diffused a particularly sore point in urban living and hoped others would get the message. Matthews’s ire was not only aroused by housing condi-

---

40 Kingsley Yearbook, 1905, 17, 25.
tions, but also by the lack of new housing legislation. He claimed that this situation was exacerbated by poor code enforcement on the part of the health department. This struggle was out of his hands and beyond the scope of this presentation, yet there was a salient relationship between Kingsley House and other reformers in Pittsburgh. This connection centered on H. D. W. English, who was at that time president of both the Kingsley Association and the Pittsburgh chamber of commerce. The chamber, under his leadership, pushed for housing reform under the aegis of model housing programs based upon voluntary, nonspeculative development. One such project was the Franklin Flats, a five-story tenement built at the corner of Logan and Ferry streets in 1903. Despite the English leadership role in both organizations, and the fact that the project was six blocks from Kingsley House, there is no direct evidence linking the settlement with any construction. English, however, as a prime example of bureaucratic rationalism where economic and social conditions were linked to environmental factors, hired Matthews as a kindred spirit to chronicle the social conditions, thus permeating those activist years with an articulate business-social work philosophy.42

Upon the resignation of William H. Matthews in 1911 Kingsley House discernibly shifted its environmental emphasis. Much of what Matthews developed in the way of child-centered programs and dramatic exhortation of urban conditions remained, but his comprehensive, organized, and lucid version of environmentalism faded. His successor in 1911, Charles C. Cooper, returned to a philosophy of reaction, retaining the tone of indignation but striking out at whatever seemed to distract Kingsley's clients. Cooper relied more on investigation and condemnation of child labor, white slavery, and houses of prostitution. He reserved his righteous indignation for what he considered the strongest purveyors of vice: the saloon and municipal government. Cooper's social comments meandered from one topic to another; he was generally vocal on issues but silent on successes, and yet he remained a force until his death in 1930.

The key variable in the Matthews-Cooper transition was the Russell Sage Foundation. Matthews and H. D. W. English were instrumental in beginning the historic Pittsburgh Survey funded by the Sage Foundation. The foundation sought to uncover the causes of crime, poverty, and disease without making any structural altera-

tion in the industrial-capitalist system. The study began in 1907 and was published through 1914 in the Sage organ Charities and Commons, later Survey. Essentially it concluded that there was a discrepancy between the rational work world and the disorganized social community. The foundation offered solutions in the form of data collection, education, and mitigating eyesores through the voluntaristic efforts of the emerging white-collar group. But fundamental problems remained unchallenged. In the personality of Charles C. Cooper was a fuller display of this middle-class and white-collar philosophy than any of his predecessors as director of Kingsley House.

Cooper began his tenure with a call for an “adequate ordinance covering the employment of children in the street trades.” He reasoned that the benefits to family support of child labor were outweighed by the detriments of a frustrated educational and recreational life. The negative effect on the child’s physical and social fiber was evident because early work gave children “knowledge of life that drags them down and often makes them later a burden on the state itself.” Cooper never mentioned the quality or content of this work, nor did he analyze the possibility that child labor was an efficient urban industrial device. Instead of speaking out against the practices of newspapers, warehouses, or Western Union employers, he chastised relief agencies for not providing enough family support to free the child from work. He did not call for an economic order of family independence, but rather for a social order rooted in institutional dependence.

This caretaker belief was more evident in Cooper’s attacks on that “social evil,” the saloon, and his call for municipal vice regulation. Echoing the “Liquor Question” of 1893, Cooper began in 1912 a campaign opposing more licensed saloons in the Third Ward. He felt that the settlement could only reach a small percentage of the people and that any increase in saloons would bolster the “powerful forces opposing Settlement work” and thus decrease the number of

43 Sheila Slaughter and Edward T. Silva, “Looking Backwards: How Foundations Formulated Ideology in the Progressive Period,” in Arnow, Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism, 59-62; Lubove, Twentieth-Century Pittsburgh, 6-10; Slaughter and Silva cite the role of Robert A. Woods in Formulating the Sage Foundation approach to urban problems. Woods was a former resident of Pittsburgh and spoke to Kingsley leaders on occasion. (See Weaver, Settlement Movement, 25.) The Reverend Hodges later in his career became the president of Andover House in Boston where Woods was head resident.

44 Kingsley House Record 14 (May 1912): unpaginated.
“saved” children. In particular, he called for the assistance of all good citizens, churches, and associations “to combat a fifty percent increase in licensed Third Ward saloons during 1912.” In addition to his anti-liquor stance, Cooper pushed for a vice commission, but the city created the Morals Commission instead, with no real power or representatives from social agencies. In 1912, the Morals Commission stressed the suppression of prostitution, the curtailment of liquor and entertainments used to entice customers, and issued a call to form a public welfare commission. Kingsley House nevertheless supported these measures because they were in line with its philosophy and because they called for prison, not fines, upon conviction for violations.45

Cooper was particularly adept at dramatizing social conditions and getting his name into print. In 1914 Cooper sent a thousand word letter to Public Safety Director Charles S. Hubbard listing the reopening of disorderly houses, illegal liquor traffic, prostitution propagandizing, and brutal attacks on women that had been suppressed or ignored by the police superintendent, W. Noble (“Muddled”) Matthews. This letter was published in full by the Pittsburgh Leader on February 14, 1914, with a comment that Matthews “hid himself from interview.” In 1916 Cooper petitioned the Liquor License Court to reinstitute liquor regulated districts because “low grade hotels” were veiled “disorderly houses” and yet they received liquor licenses. The day after Cooper’s court appearance, he received editorial support from the Pittsburgh Post which stated that “Mr. Cooper draws attention to a situation with which the public can have no patience.”46

What Kingsley’s director did was to draw attention towards his moral interpretations of urban consequences yet away from the day-to-day work of the settlement. Numbers were conspicuously absent from the director’s annual reports and Kingsley Record columns after 1911 when 1,700 boys and girls had been registered for activities. Although this figure indicated that Kingsley House at one time reached 22 percent of all children aged six to twenty years old in that ward, no one emphasized a similar community impact in subsequent years.47 Between 1911 and 1920, there is no evidence of any new programs or

45 Ibid. 14 (Mar., May, July 1912). In 1907 when Pittsburgh annexed Allegheny, Wards Seven, Eight, and Eleven became the present-day Third Ward.
47 These statistics were computed from the United States Census, Pennsylvania Population Tables. The 1910 statistics are from Table 5, p. 609, and the 1920 statistics are from Table 13, p. 900.
increased attendance at Kingsley House, while rhetoric and lamentations continued to issue forth.

As early as 1913, Cooper spoke of a new activity for the Kingsley House — an active "solution of the problems of city life." A note of urgency is evident in Cooper's words a year later: "I am struck by the fact that [the] fight for better laws and better requirements has not shown its effect as it should in the neighborhood. . . . Kingsley must create a community in the Third Ward. This community has never existed. . . ." 48 Kingsley House had been on the Hill for twelve years, and community solidarity had been a professed goal. In a sense, Cooper reprised antecedent settlement philosophy at a time when Kingsley should have advanced beyond such ideas. The evidence indicates an eroding clientele not only in the lack of attendance figures, but in the nature of a study made in 1913. Cooper wanted to discern the reasons for the shifting membership of young girls. The results were disturbing to him, because one-third of the girls moved away and 15 percent used working as an excuse for not attending. Noting these "problems," Cooper concluded that the former was a result of a larger population shift beyond Kingsley's control, while the latter prompted him to recommend a labor conditions study with long hours and underage work as his targets. In response to a vague mention of "nickelodeons" as a reason for not attending, Cooper overreacted, obscuring the urgency of the shifts in population and working habits of young girls. He called for an investigation of "nickelodeons," charging that they caused "nervous excitement" and were "detrimental" because opposite sexes "mingled" without supervision in a "darkened room." 49 Cooper's moral approach to community problems in the Third Ward was badly out of step with the qualitative social changes that were taking place just beyond Kingsley's doorstep.

This qualitative change was most acutely evident in the Third Ward's population. Between 1910 and 1920, the native white population declined 2.4 percent while the black population increased 4.1 percent and now accounted for nearly 22 percent of the ward's population. The ward itself experienced a 2 percent increase (396 persons over 1910), but in addition to the black increase, the foreign born, while losing numbers, changed in ethnicity. During the same decade foreign-born Russians outnumbered all other immigrants, but their numbers declined 11.2 percent while Italians increased nearly

48 Kingsley Yearbook, 1913, 16-18; ibid., 1914, 41-42.
49 Kingsley House Record 15 (Apr. 1913).
8 percent. This change could not have been missed by Kingsley's officials, yet the settlement's public pronouncements from 1894 until the 1920s scarcely mentioned ethnicity save for an occasional captioned picture; from a historical perspective one cannot estimate the ethnicity of its clientele nor their relationship to the settlement.

Before World War I, the popular American mind did not recognize ethnicity as a comprehensive social phenomenon. Immigrant life was transmitted to the dominant culture in a full array of negative impressions ranging from the political cartoons of Thomas Nast to Jacob Riis's *How the Other Half Lives*. Settlements tried to present another view by disseminating a sympathetic interpretation of immigrant culture for the middle class. John Daniels commented on this goal in 1920: "Before the advent of the settlements, immigrants were commonly viewed only from the outside ... with little real sympathy and still less understanding of him ... the attitude of most Americans towards the immigrant was one of indifference if not outright antipathy ..." Settlements countered this attitude with a stratagem proposed by Robert A. Woods: "Settlements seek to preserve the best of immigrant culture and ameliorate radical tendencies by explaining ... our laws and customs."

But Daniels, Woods, and Kingsley's leaders, while reinforcing the notion of sympathetic interpretation, harbored an ambivalent attitude towards immigrant culture. Woods argued that immigrants caused the disintegration of native white neighborhoods in the city while their cultures, steeped in primary relationships, were to be

---

50 U.S. Census, 1910, 1920. See note 47.
51 Jacob A. Riis, *How the Other Half Lives: Studies Among the Tenements of New York*, ed. by Sam Bass Warner (Cambridge, Mass., 1970); Morton Keller, *The Art and Politics of Thomas Nast* (New York, 1968). Of particular note was Riis's description of Italians: "The Italian comes in at the bottom, and in the generation that came over the sea he stays there. In the slums he is welcomed as a tenant who 'makes less trouble' than the contentious Irishman or the order-loving German, that is to say: is content to live in a pigsty ..." (p. 36). Keller maintains that: "There is in Thomas Nast's work a persistent, powerful, disturbing strain of hostility to Catholics in general and to Irish-Americans in particular ..." (p. 159). This attitude is typified by Nast's Sept. 30, 1871, cartoon: "The American Ganges." Despite their stereotyping, both men were in the forefront of late nineteenth-century reform elements. Riis in particular contributed considerably to the concept of "environmentalism" embraced by the settlement movement.
harnessed by settlements for effective community reconstruction. Although this ambitious plan found its way into compendiums of settlement philosophy, many settlements were reticent about embracing outright the immigrant culture with the full knowledge that their middle-class benefactors continued to view the immigrant with “indifference” and maybe “antipathy.” The least hazardous alternative was “sympathetic interpretation.” As Daniels explained it: “In every community where settlements are situated similar interpretation has been carried on, if not through press and platform at least through everyday intercourse between settlement workers and others. . . .”

In his writings Charles C. Cooper clearly exhibited ambivalence towards immigrants and reticence in public advocation of their interests, and as the war years approached his words contained less sympathy.

Between the years 1915 and 1918, the annual reports and the Kingsley House Record were printing statements that bordered on a siege mentality. Cooper in 1915 remarked that “the Settlement believes fundamentally in rapprochement rather than conflict, and in understanding rather than class hatred.” By 1916, he brusquely described the “laboring class composed largely of the foreign element,” juxtaposed to “the other class of bright energetic resourceful men of wealth.” He believed that the Third Ward “lacked . . . that solvent of society, a great middle class of cultured, refined, educated, and purposeful men and women. . . . It is this great class that acts as a solvent for many of the social and industrial ills of life. . . .” The settlement represented this class but never intended to treat it as a client. What emerged in these World War I years was a subtle displeasure with foreigners, ethnicity unknown, and a retrenchment into a middle-class nativism quite unlike Kingsley’s quiet paternalism of earlier years. In 1917, Charles L. Taylor, who had become president of the Kingsley Association after English’s death the year before, wrote: “The stress of war actually intensifies the settlement house activities . . . due to the . . . laxity of discipline causing certain neighborhoods to become more vicious. . . .” Taylor’s aim for the settlement was “Americanization,” stating, “We will never make true American citizens out of foreigners until they understand . . . that they have a definite duty and a part to perform with respect to this nation.”

\[54\] Ibid., 64-68.
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aim, granting its published ambivalence towards a “laboring class” and foreigners?

The question was answered on Christmas Day in 1919 when Kingsley House opened its doors to a new set of “neighbors” in the Larimer Avenue section of Pittsburgh’s Twelfth Ward. To the settlement this was the “homestretch of a hard race and the trials and experiences of the past have well fortified us to grasp the hoped for new order of world conditions, and the move onward and upward to greater and more lasting usefulness.” After moving, the Kingsley Association admitted that the “Great Migration” of the World War I years had turned the Hill District into “a veritable Black Belt” and that the settlement “had never been able to take up the Negro problem.” Fearing “race antipathies,” the association turned the settlement over to the American Baptist Society for use as a black settlement.58 While Kingsley’s leaders openly discussed the reasons for this second move in twenty-six years, corroborating evidence does not exist to verify their contention about the “laxity of discipline causing certain neighborhoods to become more vicious” during this period. There is no question that in both of Kingsley’s moves, there were striking changes in the neighborhood population that suggest a motivation for shifting locales, but other settlements responded to the same phenomena in different ways. In Chicago, for example, the Eli Bates House discontinued operation in the 1930s when the neighborhood shifted from Italian to black, while another settlement, the Marcy Center, moved with the Jewish community in the face of a black majority.59 In contrast, Boston’s West End contained three settlements that remained in place despite successive populations of Irish, Jewish, Polish, and Italians.60 And finally, the Irene Kaufmann Settlement, a contemporary of Kingsley on the Hill and a Jewish organization, maintained its site until 1957, while establishing branches when the Jewish population relocated.61 Evidently Kingsley’s movement in the wake of deteriorating conditions was not a universal feature of all settlements, but rather an exercise in the localized perceptions and decisions of its leaders.

Kingsley House, as an example of the settlement movement

---

during the Progressive Era, was a middle-class panacea for a working-class condition. Despite the documented changes in its philosophy, Kingsley retained an intellectual link with the founding movement and survived as an institution for nearly ninety years. It essentially treated the consequences of urban life in poorer neighborhoods with a moral indignation and tenacity whose goals conflicted with the settlement’s means to attain them. Charles C. Cooper, although at times acting as a valuable public conscience, represented a director whose solution to “problems of city life” was to study them and hope this alone would effect changes. Plainly, this was not enough, and it points to the telling argument that settlements did not affect the deplorable economic conditions of immigrants and blacks save for decrying them in less than specific terms. Besides this failure, settlements, for all their “neighborly intercourse” and “sympathetic interpretation,” rarely established an essential rapport with a community that could be translated into any ongoing civic improvement. John Daniels remarked in 1920 that “as a rule neighborhood participation is small compared with the part played by settlement workers in securing neighborhood improvements. . . . Settlements save time by doing for the neighborhood rather than having it done by the Neighborhood.” 62 The settlement, in concentrating on limited aspects of a community's social structure, misread the more comprehensive elements of that milieu — the mores of all age levels and ethnic groups that gave it character and continuity.