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The Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis experienced founding, maturing, and corporate phases between 1879 and 1922. Indianapolis provided the ideal setting for the organized charity movement to flourish. Men and women innovated to act on their civic ideal to make Indianapolis a desirable city. As charity leaders applied the new techniques of scientific philanthropy, they assembled data one case at a time and based solutions to social problems on reforming individuals.

The COS enjoyed its peak influence and legitimacy between 1891 and 1911. The organization continually learned from its work and advised other charities in Indianapolis and the U.S. The connected men and women engaged in organized charity learned that it was not enough to reform every individual who came to them for help. Industrialization created new socioeconomic strata and new forms of dependence. As the COS evolved, it implemented more systemic solutions to combat illness, unemployment, and poverty.

After 1911 the COS stagnated while Indianapolis diversified economically, culturally, ethnically, and socially. The COS failed to adapt to its rapidly changing environment; it could not withstand competition, internal upheaval, specialization, and professionalization. Its general mission, to aid anyone in need, became lost in the shadow of child saving. Mid-level businessmen, corporate entities, professional social workers, service club members, and ethnic and racial minorities all participated in philanthropy. The powerful cache of social capital enervated and the
civic ideal took on different dimensions. In 1922 the COS merged with other agencies to form the Family Welfare Society.

This dissertation contributes to the scholarship of charity organization societies and social welfare policy. The scientific philanthropy movement did not represent an enormous leap from neighborhood benevolence. COSs represented neither a sinister agenda nor the best system to eradicate poverty. Organized charity did not create a single response to poverty, but a series of incremental responses that evolved over more than four decades. The women of Indianapolis exhibited more agency in their charitable work than is commonly understood. Charitable actors worked to harness giving and volunteering, bring an end to misery, and make Indianapolis an ideal city.

Dwight F. Burlingame, Ph.D., Chair
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Curriculum Vitae
Charity organization societies, archetypal structures of the American scientific philanthropy movement, do not engender glowing tributes from historians of social welfare policy. Scholars describe them as hard-hearted, narrow-minded, moralistic, even sinister. Fortunately for society, many scholars tell us, the fashion of charity organization ran its course and was eclipsed by the welfare state. The typical interpretation, that charity organization societies screened the worthy from the unworthy poor and valued efficiency above benevolence, has been remarkably persistent. Yet the men and women who participated in charity organization societies as trustees, administrators, donors, staff, and volunteers all envisioned and worked toward making Indianapolis a prosperous and healthy city in which to live. A close examination of the Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis, its charitable partners, and its actors reveals interactions with clients whom they hoped to serve far more complex than hard-heartedness and social control. This study tells the story, not from the standard view, but of men and women who shared a civic ideal and a hope of creating a better community for all citizens of Indianapolis.

This study focuses on a central phenomenon, how the men and women of Indianapolis responded during the late nineteenth-century organized charity movement. The only full-length scholarly study of a single charity organization society (COS) covers the New York Charity Organization Society. The Indianapolis COS is an appropriate organization to examine, because it was a pioneer institution in the COS movement, no full-length scholarly studies exist of the COS movement in a mid-sized city, and sufficient records (all housed in Indianapolis) exist.
Why study Indianapolis at all? Robert Barrows notes in *Albion Fellows Bacon* (2000) that, “Although often overlooked, Dayton, Terre Haute, Peoria, and the like were as representative of the nation’s urban experience as were the much more frequently examined New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago.”¹ In *The Freedom of the Streets* (2005) Sharon Wood illuminates women’s politics in the small community of Davenport, Iowa. Great questions, she finds, “can be asked in small places.”² These scholars remind us of the potential value of examining the organized charity phenomenon in a city of modest size beyond the extant literature on COSs in major cities.

Charity organization societies proliferated in the U.S. between the 1870s and 1890s. These charity clearing-houses promised efficient and rational solutions to communities’ intractable problems brought on by accelerating industrialization, urbanization, and immigration. Volunteer friendly visitors, charged with inculcating middle-class values in the needy, conducted much of the face-to-face investigation until trained social workers replaced them. Business and academia lauded COSs’ language of science, efficiency, analysis, and order.

The Indianapolis COS began operations as the Indianapolis Benevolent Society (IBS) in 1835. Reverend Oscar McCulloch reorganized the IBS in 1878 and quickly merged it with the newly created COS. The IBS and the COS operated as two branches of the same organization with common board and staff leadership from 1879 to 1922. The COS coordinated what it called a “circle of charities,” including

the Center Township trustee’s office, the IBS, and prominent churches, asylums, and
other charities in the city. During this period the COS screened and approved all
cases for assistance, then assigned cases with the circle of charities for relief and other
types of assistance. In 1922 the COS, IBS, Children’s Aid Association, and Mothers’
Aid Society, under pressure from external funders, merged to form the Family
Welfare Society. This project traces the IBS’s early decades, then examines the COS
over its entire existence from 1879 to 1922.

To fully understand the charitable landscape in Indianapolis, this study
explores operations beyond the institutional boundaries of the COS. Gender,
professionalization, and complex relationships all affected the COS’s mission in
theory and practice. This project examines the influence of gender, as women filled
many roles: leaders of related charities, COS staff, volunteers, and clients.
Examination of key institutions within the circle of charities illuminates the role of
women and the dynamics between them and male COS leaders. Prominent
women’s organizations included the Indianapolis Woman’s Club, Flower Mission,
multiple orphans’ asylums, Mothers’ Aid Society, Indianapolis Free Kindergarten
and Children’s Aid Society, and Woman’s Sanitary Association. The putative
tension among women of disparate socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds, whose
respective roles in the COS shaped complex interactions, presents an area of inquiry
that scholars have not examined in this organization.

This study also considers ways in which the increasing importance of
professionalization enhanced social workers’ authority. Their influence rose hand in
hand with their training and education, which in turn caused the organization’s
mission to evolve over time. Clients did not passively accept the COS’s and related agencies’ philanthropy but challenged case workers’ authority.

The COS worked with Indiana’s state institutions, Indianapolis’ municipal government, and the business community. Relationships among the sectors could be competitive or cooperative, depending on the situation, the specific point in time, or the people in key positions. The three sectors – charitable, government, and business – were indistinct, porous, and fluid during this time period. Each sector negotiated its place in shaping the city, creating public policy, and serving the poor and dependent. To develop a holistic view of the COS, its actors, sub-agencies, charitable, business, and government partners, this project considers the multiplicity of social service solutions available at the time to provide for citizens, such as outdoor relief, outpatient medical treatment, hospitalization, indoor relief such as asylum or poorhouse institutionalization, work programs, and family members’ assistance.³

The COS was the most powerful nonprofit organization in Indianapolis for decades, and the organized charity movement’s theory and practice left an indelible imprint on the charitable, business, and government sectors. The COS did much more than screen the worthy from the unworthy poor. It aided thousands of families and developed principles that today undergird social welfare policy. The organization not only subsumed other charities, it nearly obviated the need for the public sector’s township trustee’s poor relief function. As the business sector organized and became interested in philanthropy, it collaborated with the COS and

³ Indoor relief means relief inside an institution, such as an asylum or poorhouse. Outdoor relief means assistance to the poor in their normal residence. U.S. laws adopted these terms from English Elizabethan Poor Laws. Chapter Two discusses these terms in more detail.
embraced its principles. Dense, interdependent networks of prominent men and women, through their participation in a plethora of voluntary associations, including the COS and its circle of charities, helped shape what the city of Indianapolis looks like today.

Scholarly literature on philanthropy and social welfare policy reflects the complexity and shifting landscape within charity organization societies during the scientific philanthropy movement. Little research, however, explores the Indianapolis COS and its actors beyond the organization’s founder, Reverend Oscar McCulloch, and none of the Indianapolis-based studies consider the role of donors, the influence of gender, or professionalization. Social control theory, often applied to COSs, does not adequately explain the complex relationships, gender dynamics, and philanthropy/business/government partnerships that existed. This analysis illuminates the participation of philanthropic actors whom historians have not yet investigated, the story of a network of women in Indianapolis not previously told.

The resulting story is a detailed narrative of how the organized charity movement played out in the city, set in the historical context of the philanthropic landscape in Indianapolis during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Each chapter reflects a distinct period in the COS’s lifecycle and places the organizational phase in local and national historical context. Chapters trace the key thematic elements of the study through this chronology:

*Literature Review* – The literature review chapter discusses selected secondary and primary sources and notes their limitations.
Neighborhood Benevolence, 1835-1879 – This chapter examines the Indianapolis setting prior to the COS’s establishment, including the roles of men and women and the relationships between philanthropy, government, and business. Informal charity and the asylum movement characterized philanthropy in the United States during the mid-nineteenth century, undergirded by a favorable legal framework, religious tradition, and proclivity toward voluntary association. The chapter begins with the city’s overseers of the poor, public institutions for special groups of dependents, and the 1835 founding of the Indianapolis Benevolent Society (IBS). Both men and women participated in the IBS and together decided that a separate association was appropriate to care for widows and children. Prominent women in 1850 founded the Widows and Orphans Friends’ Society, which by 1855 operated the Widows’ and Orphans’ Asylum. The mix of public and private solutions gradually proved to be inadequate as Indianapolis grew and industrialized.

Founding Phase, 1879-1891 – This chapter explores the founding of the COS and its formative years of operation. The scientific philanthropy movement, including the roots of organized charity, began after the Civil War. Indianapolis was one of the first cities in the U.S. to establish a COS and the organization expanded quickly to gain virtual control over poverty relief. During this time, the COS had to gain community consensus and struggle for legitimacy. Records reflect how the COS created its circle of charities and wrestled with the balance of religious versus scientific influences. Women participated in the COS in several capacities, as volunteer friendly visitors, staff, donors, and clients. Women also played leading
roles in related agencies such as the IBS, Flower Mission, Free Kindergarten Society, orphanages, and the Home for Friendless Women.

_Let us throw open the pages of history again._

**Maturing Phase, 1891-1911** – This chapter begins with Reverend McCulloch’s death (1891). Between 1891 and 1911, the nation witnessed the City Beautiful movement and two economic depressions. All affected Indianapolis. By 1891 the COS was accepted as the charitable leader in the community. After McCulloch’s death, key businessmen assumed control of the COS and drove strong collaboration among philanthropy, government, and business. With the rise of business leaders and the founding of the Indianapolis Commercial Club (1891) came an interesting three-sector response to the 1893 economic depression.

The COS continually evaluated the data it collected to develop a greater understanding of the causes of poverty. As the organization grew more sophisticated it turned to more systemic, long-term solutions such as the Fairview Settlement widows’ colony and Mothers’ Aid Society (MAS). Women served as members of the MAS and presidents of many other agencies in the COS circle of charities. Women founded a prominent literary club, the Indianapolis Woman’s Club, which provided a vehicle for self-improvement, networking, and remaining abreast of the philanthropic matters of the day. Clubwomen took a great interest in public welfare matters, including forming a task force, the Woman’s Sanitary Association, which addressed a plethora of public health issues in the city.

By 1911, organized charity principles could be found in public policy. Government created the Indiana Board of State Charities, a volunteer body to supervise public institutions, and reformed poor laws. COS principles also informed
children’s welfare as Indiana created one of the country’s first juvenile courts. Subsequently the Children’s Aid Association (CAA) formed to assist the juvenile court and conduct many children’s aid services.

*Corporate Phase, 1911-1922* – The last chapter examines the COS’s mission and practice in its final phase. The COS experienced mounting competition from other charities and a sense of stagnation set in. The 1911 founding of the Social Service Department at Indiana University, later the School of Social Work, provides a window into the COS not previously examined. Social work training and professionalization became increasingly important, focusing more on the treatment of illness than other criteria for relief. Women ran the department and served on its Advisory Board, and trained social workers occupied positions in the COS and other agencies.

A multitude of events affected business, philanthropy, and government in the city between 1911 and 1922. Indianapolis felt the effects of industrialization, urbanization, and immigration to the greatest extent yet. In response, the COS witnessed increased competition, social work professionalization, and board, staff, and volunteer turnover. When the world went to war, the national humanitarian response brought changes to philanthropy with war chests, the American Red Cross, and federated giving. With momentum for change all around it, the COS did not, however, adapt its operations. A merger with the Mothers’ Aid Society and Children’s Aid Association brought an end to the Charity Organization Society in Indianapolis.
This study should resonate as the reader can hear clearly the voices of the men and women of Indianapolis. Archival sources allow many perspectives on organized charity to be heard, illuminating multiple experiences, interrelationships among individuals and organizations, and contradictory views on organized charity and public welfare. As Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre says of her research subjects, “I assure you they are speaking to you in every word you read.” This project tells the story of the Charity Organization Society in Indianapolis between 1879 and 1922. The men and women involved in the scientific philanthropy movement in the city are speaking to you in every word you read.

---

Chapter One: Literature Review
“Sinister Agenda” or the “Best Yet Devised”?

Scholarly Literature – Philanthropic Studies

Any discussion of charity, philanthropy, and social welfare policy must begin by defining the field of study in which the work is located. The most comprehensive text to date on the field of philanthropic studies, *Understanding Philanthropy* (2008) by Robert L. Payton and Michael L. Moody, elucidates the broad working definition of philanthropy as voluntary action for the public good. The authors argue that philanthropy seeks to address the most fundamental questions of the human condition, and thus scholars should seek to understand why philanthropy exists and how it relates to good works, good life, and society in general. Philanthropy’s benefits are myriad: it touches every human being in some way, is an essential tool in solving public problems, and is fundamental to democratic society. Payton and Moody moreover find philanthropy fulfills multiple roles: society, service, advocacy, cultural, civic, and vanguard. The duality of giving coupled with service, of vision plus action, differentiates philanthropy from philosophy or other fields of study.

Payton and Moody unpack the elements of voluntary action for the public good to build a case for their broad conception of philanthropy. Each component, voluntary – action – public good, must be present to complete the notion of philanthropy. The authors take care to note that philanthropic ideals and actions are continually contested and negotiated across cultures and over time. Although people often use the term “philanthropy” interchangeably with the “nonprofit sector,” the authors are careful to distinguish between the two. If the reader accepts philanthropy as the proposed broad concept, it encompasses voluntary associations and the
nonprofit sector as crucial organizational elements that provide structure and leverage to philanthropic values and ideals.

Surveys of the history of philanthropy provide context and explanation for the ways in which the COS movement fit into the development of American philanthropy. Kathleen D. McCarthy’s *American Creed* (2005) synthesizes civil society literature. COSs emerged after McCarthy’s time period of interest, 1700 through 1865, but her text lays the groundwork for the movement’s development. McCarthy argues that nonprofits and philanthropy, broadly understood, have played several key roles throughout American history. The philanthropic sector has wielded the power to shape public interpretation of reality, engaged citizens outside government in public affairs through public/private partnerships, promoted social advocacy, and made economic impact.

Peter Dobkin Hall has authored many articles and books on voluntary, nonprofit, and religious organizations. His chapter in *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook* (2006), which provides a broad synthesis of the history of philanthropy, includes a comprehensive section on “private institutions and the creation of the modern state, 1860-1920.” Hall depicts COS workers, who aimed to make charity more systematic, efficient, and effective, as actually having a “sinister agenda.” Hall conveys zero tolerance for COSs’ methods and notes that their harsh approaches generated resistance from clients and other charity leaders. Walter I. Trattner’s discussion of the charity organization movement in *From Poor Law to Welfare State* (1999) is more balanced than Hall’s. Trattner acknowledges the fraud,

---

inefficiency, and duplicity in the charitable field which reformers were attempting to eliminate and notes that the COS mantras of rationality, efficiency, self-help, and investigation were consistent with middle-class virtues at the time. Trattner concludes that the narrow and moralistic views of charity organization had positive consequences in that they fostered the development of broader views and social work techniques such as casework. Robert H. Bremner’s *American Philanthropy* (1988) includes a chapter on “Scientific Philanthropy.” Bremner treats COSs positively, in stark contrast to Peter Dobkin Hall.

**Scholarly Literature – Social Welfare Policy History**

Historians of German social welfare policy provide background on European predecessors to American systems, as America’s historic poor relief schemes clearly can trace their roots back to eighteenth-century Europe. Mary Lindemann’s *Patriots and Paupers: Hamburg, 1712-1830* (1990) examines Hamburg, Germany’s poor relief systems during the eighteenth century. In *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany from the Reformation to World War I* (2008), Larry Frohman places the Hamburg poor relief system in larger context. The Elberfeld system, established in 1853, followed the Hamburg relief model. Elberfeld mobilized the urban middle classes around a common social program that broadened participation in civic life. Middle-class men gained the opportunity to serve as so-called “poor guardians,” charged with visiting the poor at home and instilling values such as order, cleanliness, and honesty. The poor guardians clearly were the forerunners of COS friendly visitors and later professional social workers. The system valued work over charity and aimed to transform the working classes into members of the self-governing bourgeoisie.
Historians of U.S. social welfare policy, social work, and women’s studies have examined COSs’ legacies. Historians have interpreted the ideology of charity reformers and COSs in different ways, and usually not positively. Paul Boyer’s *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America* (1978) represents the social control school of thought which has held sway for some time in historiography. He connects all manner of reform and poor relief over one hundred years as similar attempts at planned, systematic, organized efforts by elites to maintain stability and cohesion in their communities. Boyer includes charity organization as an intellectual movement in this overall trajectory of reform and calls it the most comprehensive reform strategy of the Gilded Age. He argues that COS ideology, one of explicit social control, paved the way for Progressive Era reformers who fought to subdue the “wicked city” through coercion.² Boyer finds settlements, in contrast to COSs, exhibited more nuanced social control and worked to mold the city into a moral habitat by improving its environment.

Edward N. Saveth’s examination of three philanthropists in “Patrician Philanthropy in America” (1980) provides another example of the social-control interpretation. Saveth argues that their motives and activities reflected their time in that patrician, or middle-class, philanthropy extended *noblesse oblige*. Their service was personal in nature and impelled by a mixture of religion and genuine desire to serve their communities. Patricians saw themselves as a breed apart, graced with moral superiority, who sought to rehabilitate the poor. Professionals, Saveth

---

concludes, co-opted the ideals of duty and service, ultimately crowding out patrician philanthropy.\(^3\)

Michael B. Katz has published extensively on the history of poverty and public welfare. *In the Shadow of the Poorhouse* (1996) attempts to bridge what he perceives as a historiographic gap between historians and social scientists who study social welfare policy. Katz traces the social history of nineteenth-century poor relief through present-day welfare systems, including a chapter on scientific charity. He touches on the Indianapolis COS, noting that it was one of the most powerful organizations in the country during its heyday. Katz ultimately concludes that COSs were full of contradictions and ultimately failed on every major dimension.

Joel Schwartz presents an alternative view in *Fighting Poverty with Virtue* (2000). His book sympathetically treats three nineteenth-century moral reformers, who putatively represent the broader reform movement: New Yorkers Josephine Shaw Lowell, Charles Loring Brace, and Robert M. Hartley. Schwartz contrasts their views on virtues with the ideologies of Jane Addams and Walter Rauschenbusch, who critiqued yet supported their own interpretations of moral reform. Schwartz upholds the moral reformers’ positions on work ethic, sobriety, thrift, and family values, cautioning along the way that the poor today would benefit from adopting these values in earnest. Schwartz calls for a return to moral reform, as the welfare state and efforts to improve societal structures have not been successful in eradicating poverty. Some reviewers take exception to the book as a controversial

work of historical analysis, but nonetheless grudgingly acknowledge a place for the
value systems promoted by moral reformers, both then and now.

Joan Waugh’s *Unsentimental Reformer* (1997) is a full-length biography of
Josephine Shaw Lowell, founder of New York’s Charity Organization Society and
leader of the COS movement at large. Waugh’s study revises prior interpretations of
Lowell, as the embodiment of the COS movement, as hard-hearted, elitist, and
abusive of those she was working to assist. She examines Lowell’s life not only using
social-control theory, but in terms of ideology, gender, and class. Waugh includes
rich context of the national COS movement as a solution to social chaos, Gilded Age
reform ideals, and the shift toward professional social work.

For a useful comparative perspective we can turn to *From Mutual Aid to the
Welfare State* (1999) by David T. Beito. *From Mutual Aid to the Welfare State* traces the
rise and fall of fraternal societies in the U.S. Beito argues that, in their heyday of the
late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, fraternal societies accomplished goals
that policy makers, reformers, and philanthropists have never achieved. Beito
explicitly compares fraternal societies to COSs in terms of their ideology, service
delivery, and clients’ perceptions. His useful contrast of fraternity to charity and
philanthropy reminds us that COSs were not the only available element of the social
safety net.

Scholarly Literature – Indiana History

In addition to the national COS movement, several local studies specifically
consider the Indianapolis COS. Although dated, three master’s theses remain
useful. Warren G. Bailey’s “The Social Agencies of Indianapolis; A Study of
Benevolent Social Agencies in Urban Life” (1917) describes the purposes and services of social service agencies in Indianapolis, with additional details on the COS as the coordinating agency. Bailey categorizes the applicants by demographics, frequency of application, referring agency, and reasons for application. An appendix lists the approximately 80 agencies operating in the city at the time. Mary Lewis Nash authored “Recent Tendencies in Charity Organization Society Work” (1913), an overview of the principles of organized charity and descriptions of the major sub-agencies of the Indianapolis COS. Nash had direct access to the COS staff, which enhanced her insights into the organizations, although her thesis did not interpret charity in historical context or cite secondary literature. Ruby Little traced the organization’s history in “History of the Family Service Association of Indianapolis, Indiana, 1835 to 1950” (1951). She included descriptions of operations and integrates both primary and secondary sources. Citations from individual case records were not included. Little’s thesis is more chronicle than historical argument, with emphasis on social case work evaluation, which is understandable as she served as the FSA’s case work director in the 1950s.

More contemporary studies analyze charities in Indianapolis. Ruth Crocker’s Social Work and Social Order (1991) looks at seven Indiana settlements. Instead of sharply contrasting COSs and settlements, Crocker notes their close relationship in Indianapolis. She observes that Indianapolis COS leader Reverend Oscar McCulloch envisioned a citywide network of settlements to complement COS operations. The Indianapolis COS founded both the Indiana Avenue Neighborhood House and Flanner House settlements, which was unconventional at the time.
Crocker’s “Making Charity Modern: Business and the Reform of Charities in Indianapolis, 1879-1930” (1984) examines the relationship of the COS movement, business, and charity reform in Indianapolis. She argues business leaders expected charity to become more businesslike as corporate dollars were increasingly funding charities. The establishment of the city’s community chest further reinforced business principles in charity operations.

Articles by other Indiana historians touch on the Indianapolis COS and illuminate organized charity in the city during the Gilded Age and Progressive Era. Brad Sample’s “A Truly Midwestern City: Indianapolis on the Eve of the Great Depression” (2001) describes the economic landscape of Indianapolis in the late 1920s, including the close-knit relationships among leaders of the business and major philanthropic institutions. Although the article primarily addresses the post-COS time period, it places the organization in the context of leadership in the city. Sample depicts philanthropy as a wholly male world and does not encompass women’s organizations or women’s presence on boards.

The State of Indiana in 1889 established the Indiana Board of State Charities, a volunteer board which McCulloch had championed shortly before his death. The governor presided over the board, filled with prominent women, doctors, businessmen, and charity leaders from around the state. Indiana’s board, one of the first in the country, was soon replicated in other states. In “The Rise and Fall of a Pedagogical Empire: The Board of State Charities and the Indiana Philosophy of Giving” (2000), Milton Gaither describes the change from Indiana’s patchwork system of poor relief to a bureaucratic system of preventive measures. Gaither
examines the ideology of the early leaders of the Board of State Charities, the shift from outdoor to indoor relief, and the board’s educational strategies. He also discusses the complex relationship between the Board and the COS.

Stephen T. Ziliak conducted an econometric analysis to attempt to predict Indianapolis COS clients’ exit from the relief system based on a variety of independent variables including family size, race, alcoholism, and skill level of the head of household. Ziliak’s narrative in “Self Reliance before the Welfare State” (2004) is helpful, although his model and data are not necessarily conclusive.

Other studies examine McCulloch more closely. The only full-length biography, Genevieve C. Weeks’ *Oscar Carleton McCulloch* (1976), encompasses his ideology of poor relief, his vision for the COS, and descriptions of the COS’s sub-agencies. Weeks finds that McCulloch generally agreed with the prevailing worthy-unworthy poor construct. She situates McCulloch amid the Social Gospel movement that informed his practical philanthropy. Weeks cites, for example, his view that the poor “are hardly human beings but they can be made something of by changed surroundings” yet she notes without irony that he believed in the then-typical paradigm of the worthy and unworthy poor, a juxtaposition that may not square with readers today.4 McCulloch modeled the Indianapolis COS after the Buffalo organization and based its constitution on principles consistent with the national movement. Interpretation of McCulloch and the COS as part of a longer intellectual trajectory of the eugenics movement is outside the scope of Weeks’ biography.
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While Weeks focuses on McCulloch’s life, Stephen Ray Hall examines how his views on the poor shaped the eugenics movement. Hall’s dissertation, “Oscar McCulloch and Indiana Eugenics” (1993), establishes social Darwinism and English philosopher Herbert Spencer as the foundation for McCulloch’s approach to philanthropy. Hall delves into McCulloch’s at times conflicted relationship with local business leaders and the general public and briefly profiles a few of these businessmen as donors to the COS.

*Almost Worthy* (2013) by Brent Ruswick uses McCulloch and the Indianapolis COS to examine the ideology of poverty analysis in twentieth-century America. Ruswick argues that the discourse during the COS movement’s heyday continues to inform current attitudes toward poverty. His primary objective is to demonstrate national charity leaders’ evolving views on poverty and attendant solutions. While he includes sections on McCulloch and the Indianapolis COS’s operations, the historiography in which he situates his study ignores classic philanthropic texts. Ruswick does not examine how the COS changed as a result of social work professionalization, nor does he consider the influence of gender, staff, volunteers, or donors. *Almost Worthy* ends with the demise of charity organization societies in the 1920s and the author muses that he doubts the movement’s stepping stones led anywhere good. Ruswick finds that the organized charity movement left a mixed legacy, one that he himself cannot seem to reconcile. The book’s emphasis on the downfalls of the organized charity movement, however, obfuscates COSs’ contributions.
Another recent work on McCulloch is Nathaniel Deutsch’s *Inventing America’s “Worst” Family: Eugenics, Islam, and the Fall and Rise of the Tribe of Ishmael* (2009). This book is an in-depth examination of Oscar McCulloch’s discovery and codification of the “Tribe of Ishmael” and the ramifications for the broader eugenics movement. Deutsch includes descriptions of McCulloch’s collaborator James Wright and Indianapolis during their time. Deutsch’s argument connects McCulloch to Orientalism, racial and religious prejudice against Asian Muslims, and scathingly Indicts eugenicists and their legacy. Deutsch covers the COS only to the extent that it illuminates McCulloch’s position in Indianapolis society and charitable circles.

Scholarly Literature – Social Work History

Many social welfare studies allude to or explicitly address the professionalization of social work, often concluding that paid, trained, professional social workers gradually replaced COSs’ volunteer friendly visitors. Originally published in 1965, *The Professional Altruist* by Roy Lubove remains an enduring history of the social work profession. Lubove argues the roots of social work lay in charity organization societies’ zealous volunteers, for whom friendly visiting was more a closing of ranks between classes than a cooperative or teaching of essential skills. He traces the shift from COS-rooted voluntarism through the birth of Mary Richmond’s *Social Diagnosis* and the emergence of psychiatry. Bureaucratization, education, and professional standards together reconciled relief and casework and allowed social work to become a way of life for practitioners.

Kathleen D. McCarthy’s study of Chicago philanthropy, *Noblesse Oblige* (1982), addresses the shift from voluntarism to professionalism more explicitly than
Boyer’s social control thesis. McCarthy traces the transition from engaged and active to removed and donative philanthropy and argues that professionalization was a significant aspect of the transition. By 1929 the separation of donor from recipient was virtually complete. The Chicago Relief and Aid Society functioned as the city’s charity organization society, staffed by volunteers; its professional counterpart was the Chicago Visiting Nurse Association, staffed by paid nurses. In the 1920s nurses’ attitudes toward untrained volunteers grew rigid and helped to limit the role of the volunteer. By 1929 social workers, professional fundraisers, and the community chest structure collectively wrote the “epitaph for the individualistic volunteer.”

McCarthy concludes that the meaning of the gift of philanthropy was shattered and that any sense of social bonding or humanitarianism evaporated.

Mary Richmond was one of the pioneer leaders of the social work profession. The in-depth biography, From Charity to Social Work (2004) by Elizabeth N. Agnew, examines Mary Richmond’s life, her philosophical and religious influences, and her career at the Baltimore and Philadelphia COSs and New York School of Philanthropy (later the Columbia School of Social Work). Agnew charts Richmond’s life against the development of the social work profession. Concerned about the importance of the volunteer role coupled with the failures of clients to respond to service, Richmond delivered a historic speech in 1897 at the National Conference of Charities and Correction, calling for a professional school in “applied” philanthropy to train social workers. She published the first comprehensive presentation of practical suggestions, Friendly Visiting Among the Poor (1899). Her
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landmark *Social Diagnosis* (1917) codified twenty years of incubating her ideas, and readings in history, law, logic, medical social work, psychology, and psychiatry. Still widely hailed as the first formulation of theory and method in identifying the problems of clients, *Social Diagnosis* formalized the concept of social work as a democratic process in which the caseworker and client could cooperate for mutual advantage. Richmond’s publications remain the basis for social work curricula today. Agnew concludes that Richmond ultimately came to view social work as akin to religious calling, despite the language of social science, hard science, and medicine that had made its way into social work language.

Indiana University formed its Social Service Department (which became the School of Social Work) in 1911, a few years after Columbia, as a sub-department of the Department of Economics and Social Science. The Social Service Department began in Indianapolis to operate in conjunction with the City Dispensary and the new Indiana University School of Medicine. Helen Cintilda Rogers’s *Seventy Years of Social Work Education at Indiana University* (1983) includes a chapter on the tenure of Dr. Edna G. Henry as director of the new department. The author mentions the interdependency of the school with the city’s charitable leaders, including Oscar McCulloch, Alexander Johnson, and Amos W. Butler, suggesting that these civic leaders had made the Indiana climate favorable to the development of the social work department.

Social work scholars often cite Abraham Flexner’s 1915 speech as a catalyst for the field to solidify its professional practices including development of a common practice method, education, and specialization. While addressing 900 social workers
Flexner offered his answer to the question, “Is Social Work a Profession?” He concluded that social work was a humanitarian endeavor, but not a profession such as medicine or engineering. The conventional view that the field reacted almost overnight and sought to supplant volunteers in order to enhance social workers’ own credibility has persisted among social welfare scholars for decades. Patricia McGrath Morris recently challenged this assumption in “Reinterpreting Abraham Flexner’s Speech” (2008), concluding that contemporary social work’s identification with Flexner’s speech instead grew out of internal debates over the field’s identity beginning in the 1950s, not in the 1910s.

In the historiographic essay “Between Women” (2004), Laura S. Abrams and Laura Curran examine the themes of professionalism, maternalism, and race, and identify new possibilities for historical research. They cite a number of studies that reveal the limitations of the social control argument: Linda Gordon, “Social Insurance and Public Assistance” (1992); Regina G. Kunzel, Fallen Women, Problem Girls (1993); Robyn Muncy, Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform (1991); and Barbara J. Nelson, “The Origins of the Two-Channel Welfare State” (1990). This study builds upon this literature by thoroughly considering the dimensions of gender and professionalism within the Indianapolis COS.

Among the social welfare literature are two works that make extensive use of the New York Charity Organization Society (NYCOS) case records, just as this research will use Indianapolis COS case records. Emily K. Abel uses 800 NYCOS case files to explore charity workers’ maternalism. In “Valuing Care” (1998), Abel concludes that charity workers pushed women clients into the workforce rather than
striving to keep their clients at home. She finds social control theory insufficient to explain the complex impact of welfare services on women. Abel identifies the need for more scholarly attention to charity organization societies, which signals opportunity for this research.

Dawn Marie Greeley’s 1995 dissertation “Beyond Benevolence” presents an excellent model for the Indianapolis COS study. Like Abel, Greeley relies heavily on case files to explore the NY COS’s relationships among its staff, clients, and donors. She reconstructs the tripartite relationship among these three groups as she charts the change over time in the organization’s mission and practices. Greeley considers gender, class, philanthropy, and the shift toward professionalization, all of which are important lenses of examination for this project.

Primary Sources – Charity and Philanthropy

The Indiana Historical Society’s (IHS) Family Service Association of Indianapolis Records Collection constitutes the core primary source for this study. The Family Service Association (FSA), the successor organization to the Indianapolis COS, began as the Indianapolis Benevolent Society in 1835. The extensive FSA collection includes annual reports, minutes, reports, ledgers, case books, newspaper clippings, donation records, and pamphlets of the COS and specific charitable agencies that operated under its auspices. The Indiana State Library also houses a variety of publications from the COS and related agencies.

Case records in the FSA collection at least seventy-five years old are open to researchers, which allows for in-depth examination of individual cases. The collection includes thirty-three case books, dating from 1880 to 1898, that include
several thousand individual cases. I reviewed one-third of the case books, equally representing each year and working district. Case record excerpts appear throughout other minute books and records, often extracted by the General Secretary for discussion with the board. The General Secretary chose cases illustrative of the trends in clientele and the social, health, and financial problems they faced.

Several scholars presume general unanimity in COS leaders’ views during this time period and look to the National Conference of Charities and Correction (NCCC) as evidence of unity. The NCCC operated as the umbrella organization for state boards of charity, and later for charity organization societies, between 1874 and 1917. In 1917 the conference became the National Conference of Social Work. Indianapolis COS leader, Oscar McCulloch, attended annual meetings and served as the Conference’s president in 1891. The NCCC’s Proceedings volumes 9 through 43 (1882 – 1916) reflects the theory and practice of charity leaders that informed the Indianapolis setting. The NCCC retained Frank J. Bruno to publish its history, Trends in Social Work as Reflected in the Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work 1874-1946 (Second edition, 1957). Bruno described the COS movement as “still the most successful answer” for benefactors who wish to help the poor. Bruno wrote with a fond, almost romantic, view decades after the COS movement had passed and governmental social welfare programs had eclipsed its relevance.

The NCCC’s local counterpart, the Indiana State Conference of Charities, published The Indiana Bulletin, Proceedings of the Annual State Conference of Charities and Corrections (1890 – 1904). The State Conference brought together leaders from
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charities and government agencies throughout Indiana. Indianapolis COS leaders often held leadership positions with the Indiana Conference. Topics reflect the issues of the day including care of dependent children, the feeble-minded, the mentally ill, the proper balance of charitable and public poor relief, and testimonials on the benefits of organized charity with Indianapolis as the model organization.

In addition to Oscar McCulloch, Amos W. Butler and Alexander Johnson played prominent roles in Indiana public welfare. As secretary of the Indiana Board of State Charities, Butler published *A Century of Progress: A Study of the Development of Public Charities and Correction, 1790-1915* (1916). The Board of State Charities, a volunteer board which McCulloch had championed shortly before his death, functioned as the primary public counterpart to the Indianapolis COS between 1889 and 1930. The public welfare setting reveals what options the poor and dependent had for relief, which may have influenced their decisions in seeking aid from the COS. *A Century of Progress* includes the state’s history of public charity and correction, status of existing facilities and public oversight, recommended treatments for different types of citizens, and the merits of indoor versus outdoor public relief. Butler proudly reported that it enhanced “business methods,” improved institutional conditions, and reduced outdoor poor relief while increasing institutional occupancy.\(^7\) The report conveys the fluidity with which inmates of charity and corrections institutions moved between the two types of settings, although they rarely escaped the system altogether.
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Alexander Johnson’s *Adventures in Social Welfare* (1923) endorsed organized charity principles and the importance of cooperation among relief agencies and politicians. Johnson helped to drive the 1890s overhaul of Indiana poor laws, published numerous articles in NCCC’s *Proceedings*, and lectured nationally on social welfare issues. He concluded at the twilight of his forty-year career that Indiana’s application of scientific knowledge in social work ranked “much superior” to most, if not any, other state.⁸

None of the COS literature specifically considers the organization as part of Indianapolis’ three sectors or the interplay of charity, business, and government in administering poor relief. Manuscript collections as well as published sources illuminate the COS’s role vis-à-vis other stakeholders in the city. The Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, the city’s business league that collaborated on economic development issues, formed in 1890 as the Indianapolis Commercial Club. The Commercial Club, COS, and city government collaborated to conduct a comprehensive relief scheme for the city’s unemployed during the winter of 1893 to 1894. The employment and relief operation garnered national attention for Indianapolis and illustrates the workings of the three sectors at the time. The Chamber’s manuscript collection at the Indiana Historical Society and its published report, *Relief for the Unemployed in Indianapolis* (1894), together illustrate the Chamber’s bold foray into matters of poor relief and bridging philanthropy and government.
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The COS established itself as the leading professional organization in the emerging field of social work by providing students the opportunity for practical experience during their training. It created a formal lecture series in practical sociology, in which its experienced staff taught Butler University and Indiana University students. Social work students could, in addition, intern or attend four-month training programs at the COS offices. The Indiana University School of Social Work Records at the Ruth Lilly Special Collections and Archives reflect the school's view of the COS from the academic perspective. While the public face of the COS and Indiana University was one of cooperation, personal correspondence reveals that the organizations in fact had an uneasy relationship. Letters reflect tension and a struggle for control of social service education, training, and legitimacy.

The struggle for control should not surprise us as the professional social work field was rapidly coming into its own. Outside of Indiana, national social work leaders authored works that reflected state-of-the-art organized charity and social work practice and created a template for smaller agencies to replicate. New York’s Josephine Shaw Lowell’s highly influential primer *Public Relief and Private Charity* (1884) called for the shift in public welfare from outdoor relief to indoor relief and expansion of the voluntary sector, so that public and private efforts complement one another. Lowell recommended the voluntary inspections of public institutions, which Indiana put into practice a few years later. Lowell believed the New York COS’s major tenet should be the uplift and reform of welfare recipients into productive and independent citizens. Her work inspired a generation of moral
reformers and COS leaders. Many of the key passages in Carnegie’s *Wealth* (1889), for example, can be traced back to Shaw’s work.

Edward T. Devine headed New York City’s COS after Josephine Lowell’s retirement, was professor at the New York School of Applied Philanthropy (Columbia University), and edited the social work journal *Survey*. His *The Practice of Charity* (1901) defended the role of organized charity in society. Devine argued that religion should play a lesser role in poor relief because of the increasingly important role of professionalization in charity operations. His essay outlines the basic tenets of organized charity and the importance of the modern foundation and scientific research. A subsequent volume, *The Principles of Relief* (1910), included a glowing review of Indianapolis’ poor relief during the winter of 1893-1894.

Amos G. Warner, of Baltimore’s COS, taught social work at the university level. Warner’s *American Charities* (1894) circulated widely until the 1930s as the authority in applied philanthropy. His textbook includes the history and theory of the “dependent” classes, discussion of charity administration, and recommendations for organized charities. Warner touched on donor motivation and best practices in fundraising to maximize donations and eliminate fraud. Warner’s reflections on government grants to private social service institutions remain relevant today.

The only true synthesis of the COS movement remains Frank Dekker Watson’s *The Charity Organization Movement* (1922), which surveys American COSs’ history, functions, and operating principles. As director of the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity and professor of sociology and social work, Watson viewed COSs as modern and relevant agencies that rehabilitate families, educate
communities, and eliminate the causes of poverty. Watson believed the charity organization worker claimed “the whole field of dependence” as his own, rather than defaulting to the “worthy/unworthy” poor construct, which he claimed the field had outgrown by 1922.9 Watson held dearly to the volunteer friendly visitor even as professionals came to prominence in the social work field. He argued for the partnering of volunteers with trained paid agents, as professionals alone could not give all the personal service necessary in a community. His sentiment reveals an interesting dissonance in his view of volunteers and their changing role during the movement toward professional philanthropy. Scholars continue to refer to Warner and Watson in studies of social work and social welfare policy.

Not all public officials, administrators, and social workers, however, believed in the COS model of dispensing poor relief. Jane Addams, founder of Hull House and the settlement movement, social justice advocate, and public health reformer, spoke out in objection to COS methods. Of all her voluminous writings, her 1899 essay “The Subtle Problems of Charity” (1899) most directly attacks charity organization societies, their volunteer friendly visitors, and their morally superior attitudes that blame the poor for their state of need. Addams’ dissenting view of organized charity gives credence to historians’ social control interpretation and yields an interesting counterpoint to that of the COS directors and social workers.

Benevolence literature, a popular genre of late nineteenth-century literature, provides insight into how the men and women of Indianapolis felt about their responsibility toward the poor and dependent. Short stories and novels by Mary
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Eleanor Wilkins Freeman, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Sarah Orne Jewett, and Elizabeth Stuart Phelps explore questions of *noblesse oblige*, women's participation in public life, communal and individual acts of charity, scientific philanthropy, and cycles of giving and generosity. Popular periodical articles and editorials on charity, benevolence, or giving were also common during the time period this research examines. Periodicals including the *Arena, Forum, Ladies' Repository*, and *World's Work* ran stories, authored by both men and women, which provide insight into the dilemmas of the difficult art of giving. Prominent Indianapolis citizens belonged to cultural and literary societies and were informed by the benefactor-beneficiary relationships often represented in stories and novels at the turn of the century.

**Primary Sources - Indianapolis History**

General Indianapolis and Indiana histories have been indispensable in understanding the civic culture and interrelationships among philanthropy, business, and government. Many early Indianapolis histories allow this study to make the city, the COS, and its founders come alive. Jacob Piatt Dunn's two-volume *Greater Indianapolis: The History, the Industries, the Institutions, and the People of a City of Homes* (1910) has been a standard reference for the last century. Dunn served as the state's librarian and compiled this massive account of people and organizations in Indianapolis. The books contain encyclopedia-type entries, including vignettes of the people and institutions involved in the COS. W.R. Holloway published *Indianapolis: A Historical and Statistical Sketch of the Railroad City* (1870), another local history which has been useful for locating facts about early COS board members and obscure benevolent organizations. Berry R. Sulgrove's extensive *History of Indianapolis and*
Marion County, Indiana (1884) was gathered largely from oral histories of early Indianapolis settlers. Profiles of many COS founders and detailed chapters on charities and churches are included.

One of the most important primary sources, *The Diary of Calvin Fletcher*, ed. Thornbrough and Riker, has served local historians as a treasure trove of Indianapolis lore for decades. Authors as far back as Jacob Piatt Dunn, who published the often cited two-volume *Greater Indianapolis* (1910), have relied on the diary. Most Indianapolis residents today probably recognize the early citizen and lawyer Calvin Fletcher (1798-1866). The Fletcher family was large, and many family members remained in the city throughout their lives. Their name is embedded in the city: Fletcher Place Historic Neighborhood, the [Stoughton] Fletcher Mansion, for many years American Fletcher National Bank, Calvin Fletcher Apartments, Calvin Fletcher School No. 8, Fletcher Pointe Methodist Church, even the Calvin Fletcher Coffee Company. Fletcher kept a nine-volume diary, which covers the period 1817 to 1864, the product of keen observation and meticulous maintenance. Fletcher, his first wife Sarah (1801-1854), and his second wife Keziah (1813-?) were involved in the IBS from its formation and numerous entries describe their activities on behalf of the society. As most early IBS records have not survived, much of what historians know of the society’s activities comes from Fletcher’s diaries. The volumes, taken together, provide a comprehensive picture of the city’s development. Indiana historians often turn to Fletcher’s diary, one of his greatest legacies left to the city.

Indianapolis author Booth Tarkington (1869-1946) helped create the “Golden Age of Literature” through his novels about modern life. His *Harper’s* article “The
“Middle West” (1902) is a thinly veiled composite of midwestern cities, based in fact on Indianapolis. He lovingly memorialized all that was charming, fine, friendly, inclusive, honest in his home city. The *Growth* (1927) trilogy of novels was set entirely in Indianapolis: *The Turmoil* (1915), *The Magnificent Ambersons* (1918), and *National Avenue* (a/k/a *The Midlander*, 1923). The trilogy novels all explore the positive aspects of economic growth alongside the social and spiritual upheaval of materialism. *The Magnificent Ambersons*, a Pulitzer Prize-winning novel, portrays the changing landscape of Indianapolis into an urban, detached society and bemoans the loss of simplicity and order of a lifestyle gone by. James Woodress, Tarkington’s biographer, believed that when taken together these four novels that scrutinize Indianapolis’ social and economic life represent the “major phase” of Tarkington’s career. Woodress, in fact, wrote in 1955 that “all four are Indiana family chronicles against a business background, and together they paint a valuable picture of the urban Midwest during the early decades of this century. When the time comes that American life of this period must be reconstructed from documents, Tarkington’s tetralogy will be immensely useful to the social historian.”

Tarkington’s contemporaries also recognized this important body of work. Sinclair Lewis, for example, wrote his publisher Alfred Harcourt as he was conducting research for *Babbitt*, that “no one has even touched” the subject of the real average American “except Booth Tarkington in *Turmoil* and *Magnificent Ambersons*,” despite the fact that Lewis felt Tarkington tilted a bit too much toward
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10 Tarkington also won a Pulitzer Prize for *Alice Adams* in 1921. He had intended for *Alice Adams* to be the third volume in the *Growth* trilogy but later decided it should stand as a separate study of an individual family. James Woodress, *Booth Tarkington: Gentleman from Indiana* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1955), 182, 245.
romanticism. In an unpublished introduction to Babbitt, Lewis wrote that only Booth Tarkington had dealt with midwestern cities of a few hundred thousand, which were enormously important as they “more than New York, produce our wares and elect our presidents – and buy our books …. They are great enough to deserve the compliment of being told one’s perception of the truth about them.”

Tarkington’s work during this time, together with his memoir The World Does Move (1929), contextualizes the final phase of the Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis as well as any other primary source from the period. This study engages the Tarkington oeuvre in Chapter Five.

Primary sources related to Indiana women have illuminated the role of women as civically engaged clubwomen, volunteers, social justice advocates, entrepreneurs, and benefactors. Women, for example, participated in the City Beautiful movement in unique ways, recognizing that for cities to be beautiful, they first had to be clean. Hester M. McClung published the fascinating, yet rarely cited, Sketch of the Woman’s Sanitary Association of Indianapolis (1900), which describes a ladies-only task force created by Catharine Merrill and Mary Louise Lodge McKee. The task force addressed all manner of sanitary and public health issues in Indianapolis: garbage collection, parks, pure milk, schools, streets, food markets, hospital and dispensary. This publication reflects women’s civic engagement, use of both public and private networks, and savvy businesslike practices.

Clubwoman May Wright Sewall (1844-1920) founded a private girls’ school, proposed the creation of the Propylaeum, co-founded the Art Association, and co-

12 Light, Studies in Babbitt, 11.
founded the Woman’s Club in Indianapolis. She became national president of the General Federation of Woman’s Clubs. She led the Local Council of Women, comprised of thirty-four women’s organizations in the city to facilitate communication and collaboration among women. *The Indianapolis Local Council of Women, 1892-1924* includes highlights of the Council’s involvement in civic matters (1901-1903, 1909-1921). The Council encompassed literary clubs, missionary and church societies, ladies’ auxiliaries, and charities (Flower Mission, Indianapolis Free Kindergarten, Hebrew Ladies’ Benevolent Association, Home for Friendless Women, and Orphans’ Home). The COS considered each of these groups part of its circle of charities.

Arcada Stark Balz compiled *History Indiana Federation of Clubs* (1936) to summarize the key activities from annual meetings of the women’s Indiana Literary Clubs (1890-1906) and the state’s federation of clubs (1906-1937). In the 1910s, committees were devoted to public health, child labor, and housing. Blanche Foster Boruff, an Indianapolis newspaperwoman and active club member, compiled *Women of Indiana* (1941), a valuable resource which Anita Ashendel Morgan calls “an important building block” for research on women in Indiana.13 It remains the only work of its kind that profiles turn-of-the-century women from Indiana. Some women were not involved in the COS circle of charities, as they were artists, educators, younger than COS women, or from other parts of the state, but many influential Indiana women had some direct or familial connection to the social service organizations in this study.

These valuable primary sources, when taken together, reveal the dense networks not only of women and their philanthropic engagement, but the connections between women’s and men’s networks in the city. Women and men, prominent in their respective philanthropic and business endeavors, were often wives and husbands, sisters and brothers, daughters and fathers, neighbors, club members, and co-congregants. We understand, through scholarship in large cities such as Boston, New York, and Chicago, but only anecdotally in Indianapolis, how social capital can be amassed and deployed to identify public concerns, gain consensus, and forge solutions. This project examines women’s and men’s networks as part of this community and facilitates the characterization of a distinctive civic ideal at work the city of Indianapolis.
Chapter Two: Neighborhood Benevolence, 1835-1879
“Our Poor of the City Have Been Well Taken Care Of”

In 1820, just four years after achieving statehood, Indiana’s State Capital Selection Committee chose to move the capital from Corydon, fifteen miles north of the Ohio River, to the center of the state. The committee chose a location at the confluence of White River and Fall Creek, based on the site’s centrality and the erroneous assumption that the river was navigable year-round. Indianapolis is located at the center of Marion County and in the precise center of the state. Eight of the county’s nine townships surround the aptly named Center Township, with Indianapolis at its center. Surveyors Alexander Ralston, who had assisted in mapping Washington, D.C., and Elias Pym Fordham platted Indianapolis, suggesting a “Mile Square” plan with most streets laid out in a grid and four diagonal streets radiating from a central point. Along three of the diagonals, one block each was reserved for religious purposes. Ralston never expected the city to extend beyond the Mile Square; thirty years passed before the population spilled over the Mile Square boundaries.¹

The community of Indianapolis consisted of only about fifteen white families when it was nominated as the new capital. Until 1818, the area had been wilderness covered with dense thickets of trees and inhabited by Miami, Delaware, and Shawnee Native Americans. The tribes ceded the land to the U.S. government via treaty, which cleared the path for statehood. When Indiana was admitted to the

Union, Congress authorized the donation of four square miles of public land for the state capital. Once Ralston and Fordham finished laying out Indianapolis in the fall of 1821, citizens began purchasing lots. Many men were farmers; others represented the “firsts” in the city of essential occupations: postmaster, lawyer, doctor, druggist, miller, blacksmith, cooper, publisher, teacher, and tavern operator. The roster of pioneer settlers who purchased the city’s first lots formed a coterie of men who would guide the city in economic, political, social, and philanthropic circles. A few families will illuminate this study: Blake, Bolton, Fletcher, McClung, Ray, and Yandes. Proceeds from land sales financed construction of the State House and other public buildings. Indianapolis became the seat of government in 1825 and people migrated from around the state to settle in the new capital.

Indianapolis grew slowly through the 1820s and 1830s. The unfortunate lack of a year-round navigable river through the city limited its development relative to other midwestern capitals as it remained isolated from other communities. When it stormed, bayous and creeks swelled and roads became impassable. Reverend James Scott, one of the area’s first regular ministers, arrived a month later than expected because it was so difficult to find the town. Most streets were mud, a few were corduroyed with logs, and only the National Road (Washington Street), built in the 1830s, had macadamized pavement. Population rose from the initial band of a few hundred settlers to 1,900 in 1830 and only 2,700 by 1840. Small farm, retail, and
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3 Ignatius Brown, A.C. Howard’s Directory for the City of Indianapolis: Containing a Correct List of Citizens’ Names, Their Residence and Place of Business; With a Historical Sketch of Indianapolis from its Earliest History to the Present Day (Indianapolis: A.C. Howard, 1857), 25.
manufacturing businesses emerged in the form of sole proprietorships and partnerships.

The Legal Framework: “A Claim upon the Aid and Beneficence of Society”

Government’s nineteenth-century demeanor toward philanthropy was one of general tolerance and minimal regulation. Indiana inherited a relationship between government and philanthropy from hundreds of years ago. British laws, from which the U.S. legal system was largely derived, developed as charities emerged as legal entities, closely tied to religious philosophy and wills and testamentary dispositions. Under English King Henry VIII, a 1531 statute distinguished between the truly helpless and the idle but able-bodied poor, and promulgated different methods for the church to handle the two groups of dependent parishioners. The subsequent English Statute of Uses of 1535 ("uses" are methods of conveyances of land) declared that legal title of land could pass to a beneficiary without reverting to the Crown, thus codifying that a charitable use can exist in perpetuity. Laws gave wide latitude to donors in creating charitable trusts as long as three elements were present: assets or property, evidence of intention to create the entity, and devotion to charitable purpose. The landmark, dual-purpose English Statute of Charitable Uses of 1601 provided methods for correcting fraud and abuse in the administration of charitable gifts and it encouraged gifts by defining specific charitable purposes. The related Elizabethan Poor Law of 1601 established three categories of poor and further codified the worthy/unworthy poor construct: children without parents (or functional parents), the incapacitated or helpless, and the able-bodied who refused

work. The able-bodied poor could be punished, jailed, or even put to death, but the state assumed care of the truly dependent. The law required church parishes to care for the poor within their borders and permitted local governments, usually a parish or county, to levy taxes to care for the poor. Church parishes, in essence, acted as government agencies with their responsibility backed by the force of law.

English charitable law, however, was not adopted wholesale in early America. Religious diversity, both essential to and firmly embedded in colonial life, and resistance to government taxation prevented churches from becoming the sole provider of poor relief. After protracted debate, Americans in the early Republic ultimately separated church and state, in a process known as disestablishment. The U.S. thus did not sanction government taxation to underwrite a state church to care for the poor. Care for the poor became rooted at the local and at times state level, not at the federal level until the twentieth century, and formally separated from the church. The Ordinance of 1787 created the Northwest Territory of which Indiana was a part. The ordinance, with several key amendments, included elements of the Elizabethan Poor Laws such as categorizing people in need of assistance.

A few cases in New England challenged English precedents regarding trustees' fiduciary duties, but by the 1820s all aspects of charitable trusteeship and its
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testamentary, institutional, and fiduciary aspects were in place.⁹ States held the
authority for formation of charitable trusts and corporations, but did not have
authority to change the initial purpose or charter, as established by the Dartmouth
College Case (1818).¹⁰ Taken together, this body of law formed the basis for trust
law that was eventually adopted in most U.S. colonies, and later U.S. states.
Charitable trusts further evolved into charitable corporations, the legal structure of
most nonprofit organizations today.

Of public concern in all communities is the condition of the poor and
dependent and the government/philanthropy relationship always influences public
welfare service delivery. Nineteenth-century government spending on dependent
care reflected the assumption that the federal government should assume a minimal
role in social welfare, a philosophy that held until the 1930s and the beginning of the
American welfare state. Federal government funding to nonprofits for social services
has been high since the 1960s War on Poverty and Amendments to the Social
Security Act (Title IV-A and Title XX).¹¹ Scholars of social welfare policy, therefore,
commonly consider government devolution to the nonprofit sector a modern
phenomenon. Local government, however, has funded nonprofits to address social
problems since colonial times by subsidizing private hospitals and children’s
societies.¹² Early Indianapolis history reflects this relationship of state and local

¹² Smith and Lipsky, *Nonprofits for Hire*, 47.
funding against an attitude of limited government and a social policy preference to assist the putative truly dependent.

Indianapolis and Marion County had to address care of the local poor and dependent almost immediately, although the first charitable organization did not develop for a few years. Physically demanding pioneer life, poor nutrition, impure water, inadequate housing, and recurring malaria and cholera created illness, suffering, and poverty. Poor relief at the joint township/county level fell under the criminal justice system from the state’s Northwest Territory origins well into the twentieth century. Territorial law, and subsequent state law, provided for the appointment of two overseers of the poor in each township with responsibility for poor relief supported by taxes to carry out their duties. Relief was based on the presumption that townships cared for their own poor; counties allocated funding to townships accordingly. County commissioners held the authority to levy taxes, place the funds in the county treasury, and grant overseers access to dispense the funds.

Overseers could be any township citizen whom the county deemed appropriate. Overseers received no payment for this public service yet were subject to a nominal fine if they refused. In 1822, Marion County commissioners appointed two men to act as overseers of the poor in Center Township. Overseers of the poor,

---

15 County Commissioners William McCartney, John McCormick, and John Osborn appointed Calvin Fletcher and John Packer as the first overseers of the poor for Center Township. Gayle Thornbrough and D.L. Riker, eds., The Diary of Calvin Fletcher (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1972-1983), v. 1, 57, n. 4; Weintraut & Associates Historians, For the Children’s Sake: A History of the
whose duties in 1852 were ceded to township trustees, bore the legislated responsibility to assure citizens’ basic needs of food, clothing, and shelter. Overseers’ responsibility and authority remain strikingly similar to the township trustees’ obligations of today. Poor laws’ jurisdiction encompassed a wide range of dependent people, not only low-income families or individuals: the ill, infirm, aged, orphaned, widowed, and “every idiot, lunatic, and insane person who is or shall become a pauper.”

Governmental poor relief in nineteenth-century Indiana assumed several forms: outdoor relief, indoor relief, contracting, farming out, and apprenticing of children. Outdoor relief, or direct monetary assistance outside of an institution and in the normal place of residence, was available on a small scale. The overseers, later the township trustees, received requests for outdoor relief and conducted investigations of potential recipients. Overseers could access a small fund to dispense limited amounts of relief to the needy or allow for funeral expenses in the event of death. Authorities generally viewed outdoor relief as a temporary measure, to be used until the recipient could become self-sufficient or some other solution arranged.

---

19 Shaffer, Keefer, and Breckenridge, The Indiana Poor Law, 4.
Indoor relief meant gathering the poor, including the ill, into poorhouses, asylums, or poor farms. Marion County’s first public institutions, the jail and the poorhouse, were established soon after Indianapolis was named the capital. The jail opened in 1822. The Marion County Farm, the county’s first poorhouse, opened in 1832 to shelter the poor. Marion County Commissioners purchased land, built the poorhouse, and retained staff to supervise the operation. The poorhouse began as a log cabin on 160 acres, three miles northwest of the Mile Square. Poor inhabitants could be adults and children alike, with family units not necessarily intact. Always at capacity, the poorhouse expanded in phases for the next fifty years. Poor asylum care represented the earliest form of indoor relief, or care of the indigent within an institution, in Indiana.

An early iteration of the poorhouse involved the poor being contracted out to private individuals for their care. The lowest bidder, essentially an outsourced government contractor, assumed the entire responsibility for welfare of poorhouse or poor farm inmates. As counties built and established poorhouses, public employees assumed the superintendent’s function. In addition to overseers’ outdoor relief and indoor relief in the poorhouse, the able-bodied, employable poor could also be “farmed out” to work for private individuals who offered the lowest bid. Overseers or sheriffs held public sales to bid on the poor, unfortunately reminiscent of slave auctions. The poor were required to perform “moderate labor” on an annual basis, in exchange for basic needs such as room and board. Overseers paid the successful

bidder out of the treasury and could withhold or modify payment if the poor laborer had not been treated properly. \(^{21}\)

If families were willing to part with their children, or if children did not have functional parents or parents at all, minors could be apprenticed or “bound out.”\(^{22}\) The apprenticeship of teen-aged children began with the European guild system and served to teach children a trade. Elizabethan poor laws adapted apprenticeship to caring for poor children. A master workman took a child into his home, raised the child, and taught him or her his trade, all based on the assumption that the child’s work eventually would return value to the master. At times, masters provided not only training but a homelike environment, love, and security to children, acting essentially as surrogate parents. Other masters accepted indentured children only for their value as laborers and did not provide any care beyond the absolute minimum. Child indenture in the U.S. began in 1636 Massachusetts and remained a common practice, as well as the basis for child care laws, through the nineteenth century.\(^{23}\) Indiana law hailed from this tradition. Overseers of the poor, in addition to their other responsibilities, possessed the authority to control children’s destinies.

A final option for dependent care existed but was not invoked for three decades. Indiana’s 1816 constitution, modeled after those of Kentucky and Ohio,

\(^{21}\) Alexander Johnson, “A State Aged 100,” Survey 36 (April 22, 1916): 97; Shaffer, Keefer, and Breckenridge, The Indiana Poor Law, 12. In Massachusetts poor auctions, the lowest bidder for individual children was often a relative, so in practice an auction could allow a family to remain together. In other states children were never auctioned, but bound out individually. Holly Brewer, By Birth or Consent: Children, Law, and the Anglo-American Revolution in Authority (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 257.


contained a provision for special classes of dependents. Not intended for widespread poor relief, the provision allowed the state legislature to create farms or asylums for those who “by reason of age or infirmity or other misfortunes may have a claim upon the aid and beneficence of society.” This passage insisted that persons in certain classes must work within the asylums to stave off any sense of dependence. This constitutional provision, while on record, lay dormant until the 1840s when the first state institutions for the insane, blind, and deaf would be created.

The legal structure and multifaceted approach to poor relief changed little in Indiana through the nineteenth century. In practice, indoor and outdoor relief evolved to become the dominant methods of caring for the poor. In general, citizens frowned upon public assistance and viewed it as a last resort. The Indiana heartland represented a land of abundance, plentiful resources, and virtually unlimited opportunity. While residents looked sympathetically toward the truly dependent, they simultaneously believed that anyone who wanted to could work. The poor relief debate would revolve around which strategy best achieved the goals society believed were paramount, such as quality of care or the lowest possible cost, and whether philanthropic or public entities, or some hybrid, should carry out the majority of the poor relief function.

The prevailing tolerance of the charitable form and patchwork of minimal social welfare rooted at the local level coincided with small municipal government. In fact, the Indianapolis community predated formal and elaborate government, exemplifying what Daniel Boorstin called the “do-it-yourself government” of

---

24 Brown’s history states that this provision was “original to Indiana;” Rice states this provision was “an advance.” Brown, Historical Sketches of Public Welfare in Indiana, 4; Thurman B. Rice, “A Time of Ferment,” Indiana State Board of Health Monthly Bulletin (April 1950): 89-90.
midwestern cities. City infrastructure, public structures, and public offices developed gradually and remained circumscribed in the early decades. The pioneer town incorporated in 1832 and was initially divided into five wards under the direction of five trustees. Trustees elected their own president and held broad authority: they enacted ordinances, granted licenses, borrowed money, maintained fire departments, and levied and collected taxes. In 1838, trustees were made councilmen. Councilmen, as the trustees before them, were drawn from civically engaged men who, because of the city’s small and tightly knit nature, were well known to one another.

Religious Tradition: “The Moral Foundation”

Rudimentary poor laws, the inchoate state and local government in Indiana, and separation of church and state combined to provide an environment conducive to the development of philanthropy in Indianapolis. The consequences of disestablishment on philanthropy were both immediate and profound, in the U.S. more broadly and in Indianapolis specifically. Separation of church and state meant that all churches became voluntary associations and allowed for prolific expansion and experimentation. As a predominantly Protestant nation, citizens had inherited Biblical teachings about compassion and charity toward their fellow man.

Philanthropic studies scholars Robert Payton and Michael Moody assert that the

26 An 1832 reorganization created six wards and an 1847 reorganization created seven wards. Brown, A.C. Howard’s Directory for the City of Indianapolis, 37-38; Holloway, Indianapolis, 132-133.
“charitable agenda for Christendom” which has held sway for two thousand years includes care of the poor, concern for justice, and giving as much as one can.28 The famous parable of the widow’s mite, for example, teaches not only the danger of excess wealth but the opportunity for eternal salvation through charity. Generations of Americans, steeped in these teachings, enjoyed a period of religious flourishing as the nineteenth century unfolded.

Religious ferment, coupled with the favorable legal climate, thus shaped the contours of antebellum philanthropy in the U.S. Religion was the single most important factor in the growth of nineteenth-century American philanthropy because it informed how people shaped their public lives and duty toward one another.29 Far from hierarchical or nationalized, the early nineteenth-century philanthropic landscape throughout the U.S. was an array of disconnected, largely church-related, activities, allowing for local responses to community problems.

This time of evangelical religious zeal and revivalism, collectively known as the Second Great Awakening, began in 1801 in Cane Ridge, Kentucky. Reverend Barton Stone, the pastor of Cane Ridge Presbyterian Church, took advantage of various communication networks, especially Methodist and Presbyterian meetings, to circulate word that the week-long Cane Ridge sacramental communion was to be one of the greatest meetings of its kind ever known.

Pastors and entire congregations, determined not to miss the spectacle, packed up for journeys from Kentucky, Ohio, and Tennessee. More than a dozen

Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian ministers participated, and people came from all social groups and all ages. In that single week in August, as many as 25,000 people at any one time participated in the Cane Ridge religious revival to fast and pray. This level of attendance was astounding. The nearest city, Lexington, had only 1,800 people; the entire state of Kentucky 250,000. One account speculated that virtually every able-bodied person in the surrounding countryside must have made their way there. The camp meeting kept up day and night. Methodist minister Peter Cartwright recorded the intensity of the experience:

Hundreds fell prostrate under the mighty power of God, as men slain in battle...[during one sermon] more than one thousand persons broke out into loud shouting all at once, and the shouts could be heard for miles around.\textsuperscript{30}

People reportedly dropped to their knees, shrieking, crying, fainting, and proclaiming repentance.

Cane Ridge was an instant legend. Cartwright wrote that the news spread “through all the land … the heavenly fire spread out in almost every direction.”\textsuperscript{31}

Revivals spread in huge waves throughout the country. Itinerant ministers swept through the countryside, spreading the gospel in passionate sermons to mass gatherings of sometimes thousands of people. Unprecedented religious innovation and popular evangelicalism occurred as a direct result of the Second Great Awakening. Membership in Baptist, Congregational, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches soared. National Presbyterian membership, for example, increased


\textsuperscript{31} McGriff, \textit{Amazing Grace}, 33.
elevenfold from 20,000 to 220,000 between 1801 and 1837.32 National Methodism grew from approximately 60,000 in 1800 to 1.2 million in 1850, not counting black Methodist groups.33 Religious innovation and popular evangelicalism gave rise to new religious denominations, including the Disciples of Christ, Mormons, and Shakers, and expanded others such as African-American churches, Adventists, and perfectionists. By mid-century, more than half the U.S. population was at least nominally associated with a Protestant church and all churches combined reported having twenty-six million seats for the nation’s thirty-one million people.34 Nearly four times as many Americans regularly attended church as voted in the crucial 1860 presidential election.35

Indiana had not yet achieved statehood, and Indianapolis was twenty years away from being the state’s capital during the Cane Ridge revival of 1801. But Cane Ridge sits only fifty miles from the Indiana-Kentucky border and its influence swept surely and swiftly into Indiana Territory. In 1822, the Methodist Church sponsored a four-day outdoor revival held at a makeshift camp on a farm just outside the Mile Square. People sat on logs, stumps, and grass, encircling Reverend James Scott who reportedly “held audiences spellbound night after night … and people got religion in droves.”36 Converts testified to their faith by the light of flaming torches, giving the proceedings an eerie glow.

The Second Great Awakening influenced Indianapolis in another way. 
Boston's Presbyterian minister Lyman Beecher (1775-1863) perfected the revival-style sermon and became nationally known as the embodiment of the religious reform movement. Beecher sought to redeem all of America through moral reform societies and temperance unions. All eight of his sons became ministers and his three daughters engaged in reform work, including the famous author and abolitionist daughter, Harriet Beecher Stowe, who wrote *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852). Lyman Beecher's son, Henry Ward Beecher, served from 1839 to 1847 as pastor of Indianapolis' Second Presbyterian Church, the New School congregation that branched off from First Presbyterian. Beecher's charismatic sermons from the pulpit made an indelible mark on the congregation. He increased membership multifold and his church became known as an urban, preacher's church. Residents of Indianapolis occasionally refer to Second Presbyterian as “Beecher's church” to this day.

Indianapolis' religious configuration quickly followed the national trends, with mainline Protestant denominations having the greatest number of churches and members throughout the nineteenth century. Organized congregations, classes, meetings, societies, stations, circuits, chapels, and churches developed quickly in the 1820s. A religious congregation can be defined not by its physical structure but by its people, as an organization that brings a body of believers together, on a regular basis, for communal worship. Embryonic Indianapolis was tantamount to a congregation in and of itself. Early on, nonsectarian religious meetings were held in settlers’

---

cabins or under the grove of trees at the center of Mile Square before any
denomination could afford a meeting house. Indiana historian B.R. Sulgrove noted
that a stranger might mistake one denomination for another if he happened upon a
public worship, as religious rituals and forms of authority were absent in the pioneer
town.38

Distinct Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian congregations formed as more
settlers arrived and immediately put down roots. They built meeting houses and
retained preachers to be stationed locally, rather than preaching on circuits, and
unique denominational characteristics gradually emerged. Churches collaborated in
the early decades by lending their meeting houses to other denominations that had
not yet built structures. The city’s Disciples of Christ, or Christian Church, amassed
sufficient membership, wealth, and influence by 1855 to establish Northwestern
Christian University (later Butler University).39 The African American population,
in contrast, was small and poor, and religious worship was always segregated from
white residents. While African American congregations organized even before
Indiana statehood, no society could afford a meeting house until mid-century.40 By
1850, Indianapolis was a “city of churches” with every major denomination
represented.41

---

38 Sulgrove, History of Indianapolis and Marion County, 387.
39 George M. Waller, Butler University: A Sesquicentennial History (Bloomington: Indiana University
Press, 2006), 1-22.
40 Jacob Piatt Dunn, Greater Indianapolis: The History, the Industries, the Institutions, and the People of a
City of Homes (Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1910), v. 1: 603.
41 Leary, Indianapolis, 72. Sulgrove recorded Baptist, Presbyterian, Methodist, Christian,
Episcopal, Lutheran, Congregationalist, Friends (Quaker), Universalist, Catholic, and Jewish
congregations by 1855. Many denominations had multiple congregations, and some had established
specific ethnic and/or African-American congregations. Sulgrove, History of Indianapolis and Marion
County, 387-417.
Two new national associations witnessed their branches exploding around the country, both patterned after British models: the American Bible Society (1816) and the American Tract Society (1825). By 1828 the American Bible Society grew to become the largest benevolent society in the U.S., in terms of annual income, and the American Tract Society was third. By 1830, over 130 Bible and tract society branches operated around the country.42 As Indianapolis congregations coalesced and built their churches, the Marion County Bible Society and Indianapolis Tract Society formed in 1825 to supply congregations and individual citizens with religious materials, embracing the national movement that rode the crest of the Second Great Awakening.

The Sunday School movement, intertwined with the Bible and tract society movement, arrived in Indianapolis almost at once. Pioneers perceived an urgency to inculcate their children with religious instruction. Government-supported Sunday schools proliferated, teaching reading and writing to children with the dual purpose of religious teaching and early literacy development. The Indianapolis Sabbath School Union formed ahead of the national association, the American Sunday School Union (1824), but generally followed a national blueprint with emphasis on the values of industry, sobriety, and obedience. The American Sunday School Magazine wrote in 1825 that, “character usually becomes fixed for life” during childhood so it was incumbent on Sunday schools to shape children’s character early; the schools described themselves “nurseries of piety.”43 In Indianapolis, the union included all denominations and non-church members and by 1829 the Sabbath School boasted

---

42 Mintz, Moralists & Modernizers, 54.
43 Ibid., 59.
over 1,100 students – half the city's total population. The assumption underlying
the moral instruction was that the external restraints placed on students would be
internalized, and the future adults would become model citizens. Hundreds of
thousands of schools formed around the country until by mid-century they were
absorbed into individual church congregations.

Taken together, churches, Sunday Schools, and Bible and Tract societies
provided what Jacob Piatt Dunn called “the moral foundation” of the city. Much
of early Indianapolis residents' lives was rooted in the church, as religion provided
the spiritual, moral, and social force in the community. Indianapolis resident
Catharine Merrill observed, “Nearly everybody, indeed every decent person, went to
church …. There was a sort of magnanimity in the hearts and lives of the first settlers
that for long stamped the character of the place with dignity and simplicity.”
Citizens strictly observed Sunday as a day of devotion. A visitor reported that “no
trains start, letters do not go, nor are they received … if Sunday intervenes.” By
1850, the Mile Square was dominated by religious structures and one estimate placed
two-thirds of the city's children in Sunday Schools. Citizens recognized churches
for their contributions to education of public morals, promotion of civic betterment,
and facilitation of social interaction.

44 Dunn, *Greater Indianapolis*, v. 1: 89.
45 Ibid., 1: 82.
46 Hester Anne Hale, *Indianapolis: The First Century* (Indianapolis: Marion County/Indianapolis
47 Catharine Merrill (1824-1900), daughter of Samuel Merrill (state treasurer; bank, railroad, and
publishing executive), volunteered as a pioneer schoolmaster in the Merrill home and became Butler
49 Ibid., 72.
29.
became the literal and figurative religious center of the city. Five of the most influential churches stood on Monument Circle, the center of the Mile Square, and most other churches arose within one block.\textsuperscript{51} Most of the city’s leaders, moreover, were members of the Protestant churches, forming a virtual religious establishment.

The solid moral foundation of the Protestant church network undergirded the attitudes toward poor relief and how philanthropy and public assistance should be balanced. John Winthrop’s sermon “A Model of Christian Charity” (1630) still held sway as Indianapolis pioneers were launching their own enterprise: the community members were bound together by love, not obligation, yet everyone had the possibility to be successful through their own efforts.\textsuperscript{52} The Protestant ethic demanded benevolence of its more successful citizens and expected the unfortunate to aspire to work if at all possible.

Voluntary Association: “The Mother of All Knowledge”

Closely connected to religious expression was a culture of voluntary association. Resistance to the authority of large government and corporations, embedded in early U.S. history, further contributed to the formation of civic associations as building blocks of philanthropy and nonprofit organizations. Arthur M. Schlesinger argued that Americans paradoxically eschewed collective organization via the state but exercised “the largest possible liberty in forming their

\begin{itemize}
\item Jan Shipps, “Religion,” in \textit{The Encyclopedia of Indianapolis}, ed. Bodenhamer and Barrows, 171-172. The five churches on the circle were Christ Church (Episcopal) Cathedral, First Presbyterian, Second Presbyterian, Wesley (Methodist) Chapel, and English Lutheran. \textit{Centennial Memorial First Presbyterian Church Indianapolis, Ind., 1823-1923} (Greenfield, IN: First Presbyterian Church, 1925), 204.
\end{itemize}
own voluntary organizations.”53 Dedicated men and women thus formed associations throughout the country to address a myriad of issues. Alexis de Tocqueville in the 1830s observed voluntary associations of “a thousand kinds, religious, moral, serious, futile, very general and very specialized, large and small” as uniquely American. Tocqueville described associational life in terms of two phenomena, which can be described as the instrumental and expressive purposes of philanthropy. He observed that Americans freely associated to get things done: build inns, churches, hospitals, and distribute books. But they also associated to build consensus, develop an opinion, or “highlight a truth.” Tocqueville believed that for associational life to be effective, it must be learned and polished like any other skill, referring to the knowledge of how to form associations as “the mother of all knowledge” in democratic countries. Rather than acting on an innate human trait, Americans of “all ages, conditions, and all dispositions” had learned the art of reciprocity and enlightened self-interest.54 Rugged American life was a great equalizer; if people wanted to accomplish anything, they had to help each other voluntarily.

Associational life proliferated in Indianapolis, just as Tocqueville witnessed during his tour of other U.S. states and for many of the reasons he described. Life was no doubt rugged. Epidemic illnesses and fevers plagued pioneers in the 1820s. A chronicle recorded that healthy citizens cared for the ill and “many instances of

generous and devoted friendship occurred,” creating bonds that lasted a lifetime.\textsuperscript{55}

Jacob Piatt Dunn described early Indianapolis life as “an American frontier settlement … set down in the primeval forest, with almost no roads, and very limited waterways. The settlers were thrown on their own resources for almost everything.”\textsuperscript{56} People necessarily helped each other when needed and mutually beneficial.

Kate Milner Rabb’s entertaining piece of historical fiction set in 1840 Indianapolis observed the city’s culture of civic engagement: “men are continually engaged in town meetings to promote civil affairs, in debating societies, in Bible classes, and the union Sunday School.”\textsuperscript{57} Neighbors banded together for barn raisings, quilting sessions, assistance with ailing family members, and the various other tasks of daily life conducive to mutuality.\textsuperscript{58} In classic Tocquevillian fashion, a member of the Indianapolis Benevolent Society recalled that when he first met James Blake, one of the society’s co-founders, Blake was lifting a heavy log to help his neighbors build a tavern.\textsuperscript{59} Most associations were united by a common interest in some aspect of the perceived public good. Voluntary associations undertook most civic activity in the new capital. By 1835, what one Indiana historian described as the “internal improvement fever,” with voluntary societies shouldering the

\textsuperscript{55} Brown, \textit{A.C. Howard’s Directory for the City of Indianapolis}, 9.
\textsuperscript{56} Dunn, \textit{Greater Indianapolis}, v. 1: 82.
\textsuperscript{57} Kate Milner Rabb (1866-1937) from Indianapolis; popular magazine editor, writer, and English teacher at Indiana University. She served as president of the Woman’s Press Club of Indiana. Kate Milner Rabb, \textit{A Tour through Indiana in 1840: The Diary of John Parsons of Petersburg, Virginia} (New York: R.M. McBride & Co., 1920), 153.
responsibility to get things done, was at its height.\textsuperscript{60} Catharine Merrill recalled that within twenty years of the city’s founding, “the City bristles with clubs like an army of Fijians or ancient Britons.”\textsuperscript{61} Indianapolis residents formed new associations readily and followed broader social patterns, ranging from Bible societies, volunteer fire departments, cultural and literary societies, to temperance organizations.

Early reminiscences recorded social life, religious life, and associational life as almost indistinguishable. Teas, church socials (often held at private homes), Bible study, open-air sermons à la Cane Ridge, barbecues, dances, and Fourth of July celebrations all connected community members with a general sense of fellowship. Of course natural leaders in town emerged, but Indianapolis did not inherit generations of wealthy, dynastic families or a solid class structure, so social distinctions developed slowly over time as the city grew.

The culture of trusteeship affected civic leaders’ attitudes toward and efforts to control voluntary association. Peter Dobkin Hall characterizes nineteenth-century cultures of trusteeship as having distinct patterns depending on the region of the country. He presents the Bostonian, or Brahmin, culture as the “classic model” which developed over many years in conjunction with wealth accumulation and an elite class. Under the Brahmin model, charitable associations served two functions: to collect capital – and therefore power – and to socialize future community leaders through education and training.\textsuperscript{62} In other settings, including ethnic or pioneer

\textsuperscript{60} Internal improvements generally referred to government-led infrastructure projects such as canals, railroads, turnpikes, and macadamized roads. Holloway encompasses charitable and literary societies, driven by voluntary association, in his discussion of internal improvements. Holloway, \textit{Indianapolis}, 49.

\textsuperscript{61} As quoted in Geib, \textit{Lives Touched by Faith}, 30.

\textsuperscript{62} Hall, \textit{Inventing the Nonprofit Sector}, 170-187.
communities, Hall describes associations that emerged from the grassroots. More well-developed midwestern cities approached voluntary association through a mixed public/private institutional lens and applied a culture of federationism.\textsuperscript{63}

Some early settlers had come to Indiana from the northeastern U.S. and may have brought with them the notions of community stewardship and civic responsibility.\textsuperscript{64} Neither Brahmin, grassroots, nor federationism applied wholesale in the early years in Indianapolis. Wealth accumulation was not yet sufficient to have produced an elite class, nor was one transplanted. Instead, men and women literally grew up with their city. Informal, constantly evolving grassroots associations no doubt developed in which neighbors banded together to build the city, even to survive. Yet an optimistic vision linked this rugged past with a modern future in which man controlled his environment. George Geib suggests that the popular nineteenth-century worldview of romanticism influenced urban ideals, thus the civic ideal, in Indianapolis, balancing the workaday world of the “real” city with the collection of hopes and dreams of the “imagined” city.\textsuperscript{65} His notion is persuasive, as pioneers had built the city, including its families, churches, societies, businesses, and government from the ground up with a culture of civic engagement, cooperation, and progress. One of Northwestern Christian University’s original faculty members, for example, promoted the role of the university’s graduates as “providers of safe and effective leadership, maintaining the civic and moral virtues of the state.”\textsuperscript{66}

Residents thereby learned the craft of citizenship through associational life and

\textsuperscript{63} Hall, \textit{Inventing the Nonprofit Sector}, 140-170.
\textsuperscript{65} Geib, \textit{Indianapolis}, 36.
\textsuperscript{66} Professor of ancient languages Allen R. Benton as quoted in Waller, \textit{Butler University}, 24.
shared experiences, forging the city’s culture along the way. Indianapolis, like every other American community large or small, as Arthur M. Schlesinger suggested, assumed a cellular structure of intertwined and overlapping human connections.\(^{67}\) As the century unfolded Indianapolis would ultimately embrace its own civic ideal that encompassed federated public-private partnerships, with heavy reliance on voluntarism and civic participation to identify community needs, debate alternatives, advocate for change, and develop and implement solutions.

Philanthropy in its broadest sense, voluntary action for the public good, flourished as Indianapolis developed and citizens strove to achieve their unique brand of the civic ideal for the city. The lines between the family, philanthropic, business, and government sectors in the embryonic community were blurred, at best, as each function was becoming established. Peter Frumkin’s four-quadrant description of the nonprofit sector illustrates voluntary associations’ explanation (why they are formed) and justification (why they continue to thrive):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental role</th>
<th>Demand-side orientation</th>
<th>Supply-side orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides services, responds to market/government failure</td>
<td>Creates social enterprise, combines commercial and charitable goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressive role</th>
<th>Civic and political engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobilizes political advocacy, builds social capital</td>
<td>Values and faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers, staff, and donors express values and faith through work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Philanthropy in its instrumental role has more flexibility to serve niches and fill gaps in services provided by business and government, known in economic theory as market failure and government failure. Philanthropy in its expressive role harnesses

\(^{67}\) Schlesinger, “Biography of a Nation of Joiners,” 21.
civic engagement and allows concerned citizens to express values and faith through their work. The four-quadrant configuration helps us understand early Indianapolis’ culture of voluntary association. In Indianapolis' formative years, the instrumental and expressive roles were intertwined and a rising coterie of influential citizens participated in both. Indianapolis pioneers worked, governed, socialized, and worshiped in close connection that allowed the recognition of public concerns and development of solutions, regardless of form or societal sector. The city’s first organized social service agency to aid the poor, with a unique local perspective, arose from the grassroots out of the legal, religious, economic, and social milieu of the time.

The Indianapolis Benevolent Society: “To Relieve the Necessities of the Poor”

The Indianapolis Benevolent Society (IBS) exemplified nineteenth-century neighborhood benevolence and a sense of optimism for the citizens of Indiana’s capital in 1835. Communities enjoyed religious freedom and limited government but had to develop voluntary solutions to address care for dependent citizens, so benevolent societies had been forming in the U.S. for some time. Most benevolent organizations were secular, but many operated under the auspices of a particular religious denomination. Societies usually restricted their clientele to an ethnic group, class of need such as widows or orphans, or congregation. Large cities, such as Philadelphia and New York, naturally contained numerous societies with

---


overlapping or complementary missions. No evidence has survived that would indicate which, if any, extant organization may have served as a model for the IBS. The most directly comparable city-wide benevolent society in terms of structure, the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor of New York City, did not form until 1843, although the scales of poverty and population of Indianapolis and New York City at that time were worlds apart. The IBS was unique, then, as it was from the outset neither strictly secular nor denominational, but rather a midwestern, city-wide, non-sectarian organization.70

On Thanksgiving Day, 1835, James Blake, Calvin Fletcher, and other city fathers formed the IBS “to relieve the necessities of the poor of the city of Indianapolis … by means of voluntary contributions.”71 The organizers had been personally supplying the needy with food, clothing, and sometimes money to supplement Marion County’s limited allocation of public funds for poor relief, and sought to create a more systematic method of collecting donations and aiding neighbors.72 The society’s mission also encompassed broader notions of community, to help individuals and families with personal problems and “to strengthen family life.”73 Poverty endangered family units because accepting public relief could necessitate one or more family members moving to an institution. Maintaining family units became a priority for the IBS as it provided an alternative form of relief that allowed families to stay together.

70 The Family Service Association later claimed to be the oldest nonsectarian organization of its kind. “Since 1835, Family Service has Listened to the City’s Troubles,” Indianapolis Times, September 2, 1951, p. 13.
72 Weintraut & Associates, For the Children’s Sake, 3.
Colonel James Blake (1791-1870), a veteran of the War of 1812, arrived in Indianapolis from New England in the summer of 1821 and promptly bought land. He pursued a plethora of successful commercial interests as either proprietor or director: ginseng processing, wholesale dry goods, the Indianapolis Rolling Mill, the Indianapolis Steam Mill Company, the Indiana Mutual Fire Insurance Company, the Madison and Indianapolis Railroad, and the Lafayette and Indianapolis Railroad. His public life was equally active. Blake served as a militia captain, Sunday school organizer and volunteer, advocate for a state hospital for the insane, donor to Irish famine relief, supporter of the American Colonization Society, YMCA trustee, Hanover College trustee, and Crown Hill Cemetery trustee.74 He presided over virtually every public endeavor and parade in the city.

Blake acted as the heart and soul of the IBS for thirty-five years. He attended every annual meeting except two and led the society’s efforts to solicit donations the entire time. Contemporaries described him as kind, venerable, sympathetic, honorable, courageous, and devoted to his church.75 He was one of the local organizers of the city’s first Presbyterian church (known then as the Presbyterian Church of Christ). Within eighteen months of his arrival in the city, Blake had helped enroll the church’s charter members, raise funds for a meeting house, obtain incorporation from the state legislature, and recruit Indianapolis’ first settled minister.76 Friends believed Blake’s philanthropy emanated from deep religious
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conviction, not a need for recognition. “He was never ostentatious in his acts of charity,” one citizen remembered, “many of which were unknown to all save himself and the recipient.”

When he died, the Indianapolis Journal editor wrote that the loss of Blake “cast a gloom over the entire city” and the mayor described his passing as “a matter of public moment and importance.” His funeral cortege out to Crown Hill Cemetery formed the largest the city had yet seen. Colonel James Blake led the society as its president until his death in 1870.

Blake’s co-founder, Calvin Fletcher (1798-1866), had been functioning as one of the county’s original overseers of the poor when the IBS formed. Fletcher also arrived in Indianapolis in 1821. Although virtually penniless, he quickly invested in land and opened his practice as one of the city’s first lawyers. Like Blake, Fletcher pursued a variety of business, government, and philanthropic endeavors. He practiced law with partner Ovid Butler (for whom Butler University is named), farmed, invested in land, served in the Indiana State Senate, and founded or directed numerous banks. By the end of his life, Fletcher was one of the wealthiest men in Marion County, among the largest landowners, and the largest single taxpayer in 1865.

Fletcher’s philanthropy reached far into the community. He was active in the IBS, side by side with both his first wife, Sarah, and his second wife, Keziah.

---
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Among many civic commitments, he founded the Indiana Colonization Society and the Indiana Historical Society, co-founded the Indiana State Horticultural Society, and advocated for and acted as trustee of Crown Hill Cemetery, YMCA, Indianapolis Public Schools, Marion County Seminary, and the Indiana Female College. Trusteeship of charitable organizations often signals prominence and civic engagement. Blake’s and Fletcher’s service on the Crown Hill Board of Corporators in particular reinforced their unchallenged mark of social responsibility, as these seats passed only through bloodlines or intimate association.82

Calvin Fletcher has been virtually deified in the annals of Indiana pioneer history for his “rags-to-riches” self-made success, unpretentious character, and devotion to his community. Contemporaries believed his struggle with poverty early in life “aroused his disposition to take the part of the poor, the helpless, and the oppressed.”83 Fletcher, moreover, embodied the Methodist call to sacrificial giving, John Wesley’s rule to “gain all you can, save all you can, give all you can.”84 Fletcher believed the comfortable financial position he attained carried with it a responsibility toward others, as giving “liberally [was] a return of a portion that I hold as a steward.”85 Fletcher gave generously and taught others how to help themselves by seeking education and becoming independent. More than one of the tributes to Fletcher noted his unassuming kindness. A friend wrote that his “benevolence and kind regard for the needy were always effectual but quiet.”86 The
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IBS published resolutions to honor him and his family in recognition of his “unobtrusive, liberal and judicious relief to the needy … faithful to the end.” A dedicated parishioner of one of the first churches in Indianapolis, the Methodist Episcopal Roberts Chapel, religious instruction imbued him with a deep sense of duty toward his fellow man. In counseling his children, he once said:

I feel that I would have to account at that last day when He shall ask me if I have visited the sick in prison or bondage and fed the poor. The great of this world can take care of themselves, but God has made us stewards for the down-trodden, and we must account to Him.

Religion, he felt, formed the only reliable basis for successful private and community life. Fletcher acted as IBS secretary until his death in 1866.

Indianapolis’ church network supported the Benevolent Society in several ways. Informed by the Biblical message, “everyone is your neighbor,” citizens lived out the parable of the Good Samaritan through practical philanthropy. Payton and Moody note that Christianity required charitable neighbors to attend to the spiritual and material condition of the recipients of assistance, and society volunteers embraced this requirement. Jane Graydon, an early volunteer, reported that “frequent visits were made so that if any were sick, they might be attended both temporally and spiritually, as in that way to walk in the footsteps of the Divine Master.” Churches served as conduits of communication and reinforced the Christian duty to care for the poor. Calvin Fletcher routinely recorded that IBS meetings took place at churches, almost all clergymen supported and attended
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society meetings regularly, and notices of special fund drives were routed through churches to their parishioners. Elders stored donated items in their homes or churches until the IBS could distribute them. Churches set aside specific days for so-called “charity sermons,” when ministers preached about the society’s work and solicited donations. Ministers also provided meaningful information about families in need, as they visited homes of all socioeconomic status in the community. The IBS ultimately adopted a resolution to codify its symbiotic relationship with churches, requesting ministers to explain the “object of the society” to their congregations and urge liberal contributions. Society and church members viewed care of the needy as an individual, personal, and religious responsibility.

Members of the IBS comprised, donated to, and operated the all-volunteer charitable society. Members came from economically secure families and served as donors, fundraisers, friendly visitors, and distributors of aid. Calvin Fletcher reported with pride that “the poor have been an object of consideration by our best citizens [sic] from [the society’s] early settlement as well as churches.” Pioneer historian W.R. Holloway similarly described society volunteers as citizens always “of the highest respectability.” The society initially divided the city according to the five wards and assigned a gentleman and a lady to each ward. As the city grew and population density increased, smaller districts were created defined by city blocks. The duos would identify the needy, learn about their specific needs, and

96 Holloway, *Indianapolis*, 50.
counsel the poor on home care, employment, thrift, and religious observance, although the society did not permit volunteers to recommend any particular church. The pairs solicited donations door-to-door in their wards. They walked the streets armed with baskets, receiving mostly in-kind offerings of clothing, shoes, food, wood for fuel, and, to a lesser extent, money for rent or medical expenses.

The worthy/unworthy poor construct that historians so often associate exclusively with Charity Organization Societies (COS) was evident in charity workers’ theory and praxis long before the Indianapolis COS existed. While we might find the worthy/unworthy nomenclature unacceptable today, for centuries European nobility and the church had distinguished between the worthy and unworthy, and focused care on the worthy poor. Over time, societies have wrestled with philosophical questions surrounding the origins of poverty and the worthiness or unworthiness of aid recipients. In many cultures and faiths, people have felt especially compassionate toward the worthy poor such as orphans, widows, the pious or chaste, less so toward the elderly or sick poor, but far less generous to those willing to beg or commit crimes. By the antebellum decades in the U.S., David Rothman describes how an acute sense of peril over poverty coexisted with high expectations to ameliorate it, producing unprecedented attention to poor relief strategies with the worthy/unworthy at the center.97 Government and philanthropic leaders debated the relative strength of the forces of individual moral failings versus societal failings as explanations for dependence, a debate that has waxed and waned over the past two hundred years.

These ideological roots of nineteenth-century American poor relief thus date back hundreds of years and were evident in the IBS operations. As early as 1845, IBS members left cards with all donors so that they could refer worthy poor candidates to the society for investigation. Members felt the deserving poor were too proud to ask for help; instead, it was incumbent upon the society to seek them out in order to care for them. The society discouraged direct donations to people on the street and asked citizens to refer cases to its office. Once society members conducted their evaluations, they arranged work whenever possible in lieu of dispensing relief. As IBS volunteers came from financially secure and respected families, they presumed their influence on poor families would be both educational and welcomed, a criticism of paternalistic philanthropy to this day. Volunteers, the advance guard of the COS friendly visitors, covered the same districts from year to year, and called upon every single house in their districts, so that they became familiar with each donor and recipient in their area. These practices, which did not change substantively for forty years, demonstrate the roots of organized charity: formal social case work, screening according to need, advising on family matters, and coordination with churches and related charities. Organized charity thus was not the major leap that much of the historiography would have us believe, as most of the COS apparatus existed for decades, albeit without the scientific or businesslike nomenclature.

The IBS did not discriminate according to place of residence, race, ethnicity, age, religion, or other demographics, but it gave special priority to the putative worthy poor of its own community: widowed or abandoned women, orphans, the ill, and the destitute. Unlike public relief, however, it was willing to aid strangers or “transient poor as may from time to time be found in the city.” Within twenty-five years, visiting districts mushroomed from the initial five wards to thirty districts plus a special large district for “suburbs and transient persons.” Volunteers could provide transportation assistance for transients to return to their homes or other family or friends, based on the common practice of “warning out” or “warning out of town” that pressured newcomers to settle in other communities. It is not clear how strongly volunteers encouraged, coerced, or even forced transients to leave the city, but this option clearly was open to them.

Sources allow us to understand many facets of the inner workings of the IBS, but Calvin Fletcher’s diary provides the most personal illumination of the society’s expressive purpose. Fletcher chronicled year after year his diligence in soliciting donations, his “errand of mercy” for the poor. He recorded the general attitude of the community, ranging from unbridled optimism one year to low donations another year because of widespread illness. Many entries reveal Fletcher’s deep satisfaction in caring for people: “Much good has been done and not a poor person neglected,” “I feel gratified that I live in the place where the poor are provided for,” and “Our
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poor of the city have been well taken care of.” ¹⁰³ When conditions were conducive to generous donations, Fletcher seemed to be buoyed by the “excellent feeling” that prevailed and the satisfaction that the poor would receive what they needed.¹⁰⁴ He recorded neither fatigue nor resentment when making his rounds, even when weather conditions, widespread illness, economic uncertainty, or some sort of general malaise in the city made gathering provisions arduous. Such circumstances, instead, seem to have propelled him to work even harder.

Fletcher’s diary also provides insight into the role of women in the Indianapolis community. Public benevolent activities allowed women to participate in public life without challenging the nineteenth-century separate spheres metaphor, in which women occupied the private, domestic role. Men formed the IBS executive committee yet volunteer Visiting Committees for decades remained structured as teams of one man and one woman, but not husband-wife teams, with seven additional teams dividing the work of suburbs and transients. This structure placed men and women on equal footing for evaluation of families’ needs and domestic counseling, suggesting that the society recognized that poor families were undoubtedly made up of men, women, and children who could benefit from both male and female insights. The society’s structure also indicates a shared sense of civic responsibility among the men and women who enjoyed a comfortable economic situation and could afford to devote their time to aiding their neighbors.

Both of Calvin Fletcher’s wives participated as IBS members. He noted regularly that he and the first Mrs. Fletcher, Sarah, attended society meetings

¹⁰³ Thornbrough and Riker, The Diary of Calvin Fletcher, v.5: 140; v.4: 153; v.7: 607.
¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 4: 151.
together, as they had done since the IBS’ founding. After Sarah died, Fletcher met and married his second wife, Keziah. He met Keziah through his IBS volunteering at the depository for donated female clothing. The shared bond of civic responsibility appears to have strengthened their union. Fletcher noted their joint “duty to the poor was one of the objects of our marriage and our vows to take care of the poor.”

On the IBS’ fiftieth anniversary, Oscar McCulloch described the local culture: “The village life where one knows another makes neighborliness possible.” The traditional neighborhood benevolence approach to caring for the poor suited Indianapolis while the population remained small and relatively homogeneous, most people knew one another, and the outer points of the city could be reached on foot or horseback. As village turned to city, however, both the IBS and public relief had to adapt along with it. As the population grew, the numbers of needy plus more special classes of need developed, so solutions would have to become more complex in order to serve them.

Railroads Transform the City: “A Regional Crossroads”

Indianapolis grew slowly until the first railroad arrived in 1847, to be followed by several others in the 1850s. The railroads' effect relative to other midwestern cities cannot be overstated. Indianapolis had remained small, landlocked, and far from any major transportation system. An early chronicle despaired that the effort and risk of visiting Indianapolis thwarted most travelers and “a deathlike quiet
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pervaded the place.” As of 1847, the state’s capital was still smaller than the Ohio River towns of New Albany and Madison. When finally connected to the Ohio River via the Madison and Indianapolis Railroad, it was no longer bemoaned as a “dull country village” inaccessible by the rest of the country. Governor Joseph A. Wright once noted, presumably with regret, “There is less known abroad, this day, of Indiana, in her great elements of wealth, than of any other State in the Union of her age and position.” Once railroads ended Indianapolis’ isolation, the city changed in size as well as economically and demographically – and everything affected philanthropy.

Within ten years, Indianapolis grew to become the largest city in the state. Jon Teaford describes the transformation: “After a quarter of a century being in the middle of nowhere, Indianapolis had become a regional crossroads.”

Railroad expansion occurred at a brisk pace once the initial line was in operation. Within twenty-five years, sixty-four railroad lines criss-crossed the state with four thousand miles of track in eighty-five of ninety-two counties.

The 1870 Common Council commissioned a booster-style report to promote the city’s economic advantages. The pamphlet listed the railroads as the number one advantage, in that Indiana’s central location “compels every great, profitable, continental railway to pass over her surface.” Also during the 1850s and 1860s,
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Indiana farmers enjoyed the higher productivity of an agricultural revolution and embraced the attendant market economy that higher yields represented.\footnote{Geib, Indianapolis, 46.} Railroads now connected the region’s farms, plentiful natural resources such as timber, and the city’s retail, service, and manufacturing concerns to buyers and sellers outside the Mile Square. Many subsequent Indianapolis histories and business catalogues boasted rail access as its most distinguishing feature.

W.R. Holloway recalled that on the day that the Madison and Indianapolis Railroad arrived, thousands cheered at the sight of the city’s first engine and commemorated the day with fireworks. “Everybody felt the impulse,” he recorded, “of prosperity.”\footnote{Holloway, Indianapolis, 83.} Population and businesses did indeed boom, changing the city’s complexion. The city’s population increased multifold for three consecutive decades, rising from 2,692 in 1840 to 48,244 in 1870.\footnote{Indianapolis population by decade: 2,692 (1840); 8,091 (1850); 18,611 (1860); 48,244 (1870). U.S. Census www.census.gov.} Most Marion County residents had farmed for their livelihood, but now businesses grew, specialized, and gravitated to distinct areas of the Mile Square. Rail lines and cheap land attracted industry to the south side. In 1852, Union Station, the country’s first centralized passenger station for common use by multiple rail lines, opened on the near south side. From Union Station north, businesses catering to railroad passengers opened, including hotels, lodging houses, and restaurants. Washington Street developed into the undisputed retail hub, sporting all manner of shops and professional offices. A wholesale district emerged just south of Washington Street. The Virginia Avenue corridor began to emerge as the south side’s commercial center in the Fountain
Square neighborhood. Housing gradations followed occupations as real estate increased in value. Neighborhoods of more expensive housing developed north of the city center; a large section of inexpensive housing, and even a tenement row, to the south.\textsuperscript{115}

Industrial concerns flourished: all types of manufacturing; import/export; foundries; grist, iron, lumber, and textile mills; and meat packing. One of the city’s largest employers, Ireland-based Kingan and Co., opened in 1863 on the near west side and soon became one of the world’s largest pork packing houses. Railroads and industry brought a wide range of construction projects, and construction meant jobs. Indiana would no longer be the least ethnically diverse state in the Midwest as new groups of people flocked to Indiana, and especially Indianapolis, seeking opportunities. Irish immigrants had begun to arrive as early as the 1830s to build the optimistically planned but ill-fated Central Canal, and came in larger numbers in the 1840s to escape Ireland’s great potato famine. As railroad work exploded and Kingan opened, the Irish population in Indianapolis tripled. By 1870, over 1,000 Irish immigrants clustered in two closely knit communities in Fountain Square and a near-south side area still known today as Irish Hill. Many of the immigrants lacked skills and education, so had to resort to unskilled labor or domestic service. The Irish, like many ethnic immigrant groups, formed mutual-aid benevolent societies to promote social welfare, facilitate companionship, and nurture cultural heritage. The

\textsuperscript{115} Hale, Indianapolis, 52, 82-84; Brown, A.C. Howard’s Directory for the City of Indianapolis, 44.
first Catholic cemetery, Ancient Order of Hibernians, and three Catholic parishes were established within nine years.\textsuperscript{116}

German immigrants had arrived in Indianapolis beginning in the 1830s, then came in substantial numbers after the failed revolutions of 1848 in the German states. By 1850 a dense and distinct “Germantown” neighborhood in the near northeast had coalesced. Germans represented 50 percent of all immigrants in the city and one-eighth of the total population.\textsuperscript{117} Determined to become Americans from the moment they set sail for the U.S., Germans learned the English language readily and became fully involved in economic, cultural, and political life.\textsuperscript{118} Many were educated, middle-class, broad-minded, social-justice advocates prone to voluntary association. Generally more liberal than the earlier settlers of New England, Puritan descent, Germans brought a thriving musical element, but also a brewery and tavern culture, to Indianapolis. Accordingly, the earliest German philanthropic societies, the \textit{Turngemeinde} and \textit{Männerchor}, prepared members for civic leadership and predated social welfare or benevolent societies by a number of years.

German capital, labor, talent, and leadership substantially contributed to mid-century economic growth and development in Indianapolis. Two German immigrant brothers, August and Henry Schnull, built the city’s first wholesale house on Meridian Street just south of Washington Street. They bought up and replaced residential properties with commercial buildings and wholesale warehouses and
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influenced others to do the same, creating what became known as the Wholesale District. German professional, retail, and service businesses dominated Washington Street and its immediate cross-streets by the mid-1860s.

Germans represented a variety of religious traditions: Catholic, freethinkers, Lutheran, Methodist, Reformed, and Jewish. Jewish residents represented a small subset of the Germans in Indianapolis, and some early Jewish immigrants also arrived from European countries that bordered German states. The first three Jewish immigrants arrived in 1849 and a nucleus of a Jewish community slowly grew, forming the core of the city’s retail and wholesale clothing business. Clustered in ethnic enclaves just east and south of the Mile Square, Jews established the Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation (IHC) in 1856, a temple in 1865, and a plethora of social and secular institutions soon thereafter.

Charity remained segregated early on, so Jewish social welfare organizations developed to look after those of their own faith, including Hebrew Cemetery (1856), the Hebrew Ladies Benevolent Society (1859), and the Indianapolis Hebrew Benevolent Society (1861).¹¹⁹ The benevolent societies did not face many demands, however, as the primarily German Jewish immigrants of this period were relatively prosperous. Their businesses generally thrived and their numbers remained small, which allowed them to acculturate smoothly and rapidly, and participate fully in civic, cultural, and political life. The Jewish population remained consistent at approximately 1 percent of the city’s residents even as other immigrant groups fluctuated at times to much larger proportions. The IHC’s first long-tenured rabbi as

of 1868, Rabbi Meyer Messing (1843-1930), became Indianapolis’ first rabbi who was fully engaged as a secular and interdenominational charitable and civic leader.\textsuperscript{120}

Indianapolis lost its homogeneity as different groups of people moved into the city. Philanthropy often responds to societal changes; this change-response pattern clearly occurred in mid-century Indianapolis. The transformation that the railroads ushered in had profound consequences for the Benevolent Society. The successor agency’s president spoke of the tumult when recalling the society’s history: “We speak of this year 1847... because it was the beginning of a new era in the City’s life, commercially and industrially, which was to carry with it social problems of growing complexity.”\textsuperscript{121} Reactions to newcomers could be suspicious and resentful as situations changed. A brief economic downturn followed the initial frenzy of rail and business development, placing new arrivals to the city, now unemployed, in competition with long-term citizens for relief. Cholera raged during the summer of 1850 and some blamed the influx of itinerant workers for the outbreak.\textsuperscript{122} Married women crept outside the home into the workforce, in the clothing and laundry industries, at a time when it was uncommon for married women to be employed.\textsuperscript{123} The IBS maintained its existing structure and philosophy for several years after the railroads' arrival, but then began to change slowly in response to the city’s new dynamics.
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While the IBS had traditionally extended aid to strangers down on their luck, after 1847 the organization had difficulty grappling with large numbers of newcomers to the city. In 1851 it recorded for the first time that the foreign pauper had become “a problem.” It passed a resolution recommending that citizens refuse to assist “foreign paupers soliciting money at their door or in the street” and to refer such requests to the IBS executive committee. In 1857 the society appointed a committee of six men, including Blake and Fletcher, to call on businessmen for contributions for the first time. By 1859, individual donations remained generous and consistent but inflation, unemployment, and a growing population meant the IBS could not meet all the demands of the poor. The society began to go into debt to assist residents with food and fuel. The *Indianapolis Locomotive* ran a story describing the predicament of the destitute, especially widows, children, the elderly, and the ill, and made an appeal to the populace. The *Locomotive* acknowledged that many people, including church congregations, had already given liberally, but noted that the current situation was unusually dire. “If aid is not promptly rendered,” the paper warned, “the operations of this Society for aiding the poor of this city … must cease.”

The Civil War (1861-1865) would alter virtually every aspect of American life, including philanthropy. The war transformed the city into a thriving commercial center but strained residents’ resources even more. During the war, Camp Morton operated as a military training center and prison in Indianapolis.
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Soldiers’ families flocked to the city to be near their loved ones but often had no means of support. The IBS responded with higher levels of donations and family services but struggled to meet everyone’s needs. An anonymous letter to the *Indianapolis Daily Journal* editor bemoaned “everybody has been giving to soldiers’ families” but that the large proportion of chronically poor did not have enough “steady charity” from the IBS on which they could rely.\(^{127}\) Calvin Fletcher echoed residents’ exhaustion, what today we would describe as donor fatigue, because of repeated demands for donations.\(^{128}\) Indiana, like all Union states, created a branch of the U.S. Sanitary Commission, the first national voluntary association for war relief. The State of Indiana raised over $5,000,000 in monetary and in-kind donations over the course of the war.\(^{129}\) The Indiana Sanitary Commission, clearly a patriotic, necessary, and worthy cause, further strained everyone’s ability to donate to local poor relief.

In 1862, the IBS, and the Center Township trustee apportioned responsibility for care for those in Indianapolis. Marion County Commissioners reallocated $2,000, budgeted for a new courthouse, to the trustee for destitute soldiers’ families. Blake and Fletcher coordinated relief efforts with the trustee so that the IBS continued to aid longer-term residents. The society still reported that it aided the “suffering and the stranger,” although it began more assiduously collecting transients and sending them home, courtesy of the new railroads.\(^{130}\) Recognizing the role that illness plays in unemployment and poverty, society members lobbied the city to
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create a free dispensary (outpatient clinic) for the poor, but this did not come to fruition until after the war.

All things considered, the Indianapolis Benevolent Society appears to have fared well in achieving its mission in the wake of tremendous population growth and wartime challenges. The society’s record of expenditures in selected years between 1845 and 1864 reflects a number of trends: the overall growth in the city, the growth in poverty, and the society’s growing response to increased demand – even with minimal change in structure and new competition from wartime causes.\textsuperscript{131}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>IBS Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>$548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>$2,053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The society’s members achieved another accomplishment during this time; they founded the city’s first charitable social service institution.

The Asylum Movement: “As Nice as a Home with a Mother and Father”

The IBS operated against the backdrop of the asylum movement; therefore it was no coincidence that the IBS’s members, men and women, motivated by their shared vision to care for the city’s dependent, created the first charitable asylum in Indianapolis. By mid-century, U.S. state and local governments operated systems of confinement for the dependent and delinquent; charity and corrections were virtually one and the same. Institutionalization became in the nineteenth century the preferred public mechanism to impose order, protect productive citizens, and
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inculcate moral behavior. The independent were segregated from the dependent, and for the most part jails, asylums, and poorhouses confined people of society’s lowest classes.\textsuperscript{132} Throughout U.S. institutions, inhabitants were classed as “defective” in some immutable way: insane, feeble-minded, epileptic, or inebriate.\textsuperscript{133} Government accepted the burden of care for the defective and delinquent but viewed dependence as degrading, so institutional care was to be therapeutic and compelled citizens to become as “normal,” and therefore productive, as possible.\textsuperscript{134} Viewing asylums with what David Rothman calls an “almost utopian” perspective, citizens expected the order, routine, and structure of institutions would rehabilitate the needy and reduce crime and poverty.\textsuperscript{135} Community leaders embraced the asylum movement as it promised simultaneous benefit to dependent individuals and society.

The asylum movement gained momentum as other options for caring for dependents gradually eroded. Reports circulated that revealed neglect when auctioning off the poor to the lowest bidder or contracting all a town’s poor to one individual. Leaving the able-bodied poor to remain idle threatened their own lives as well as public order. Institutions relieved families and church networks, which may have been incapable of, unwilling to assume, or fatigued by the burden of care.\textsuperscript{136} Thus all manner of asylums – the poorhouse, insane asylum, blind and deaf school, and orphanage – shifted to the center of public policy by mid-century. Within a few
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short decades, institutions serving all classes of dependents dominated city landscapes as testaments to order and humanity.

The Marion County Farm, established in 1832, had already enlarged by the 1840s. After Dorothea Dix, the New England reformer and champion for the mentally ill, toured Indiana’s jails and poorhouses between 1845 and 1847, the Indiana State Journal published her findings in serial form. Her comments were mixed: the Marion County poorhouse was clean and carefully managed, “one of the best directed poor-houses in Indiana,” the fifteen inhabitants neat and well-clothed. The facility, however, was a complex of farm buildings and of insufficient size and therefore “wholly unsuitable” for the comforts of the poor and insane patients and caretakers who resided all together.\textsuperscript{137} Dix added legitimacy to the movement to build the Indiana State Hospital for the Insane that was already being championed by crusading physicians. The hospital opened in 1848, allowing the poor and insane to be placed in different facilities – to some extent. The poorhouse expanded in the 1860s to a large four-story building on 220 acres, yet it became a general dumping ground for not only the poor, but the elderly, the mentally ill, and the chronically ill who were rejected by other institutions. Confinement, as in other poorhouses around the country, was often permanent.\textsuperscript{138} An early chronicle of Indianapolis described the county farm as “merely a receptacle, into which was thrust that inconvenient class in the community who, being unable to help themselves, were thus stuck away out of sight and dismissed from public concern.”\textsuperscript{139} This sad state
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was not the case at the time of the poorhouse’s optimistic beginning but resulted from a long, slow decline.

Midwestern capital cities, natural seats for state legislatures, had to convince state governments to locate asylums within their municipal borders. State asylums, schools, and prisons brought jobs and a sense of public pride, and it was never a foregone conclusion that all such facilities had to reside in state capitals.

Indianapolis obtained the Indiana State Asylum for Deaf and Dumb (1843), Indiana State School for the Blind (1847), and Indiana State Hospital for the Insane (1848). Trustees for these institutions argued successfully that Indianapolis was the appropriate venue because of its centrality in the state and proximity to immediate supervision by legislators. After the facilities opened, local historians and officials described this trio of asylums as the “State Charitable Institutions” or the “State Benevolent Institutions.” These phrases juxtaposed the words “state,” implying government responsibility, and “charitable” or “benevolent,” implying private philanthropy, signaling a shift in Indiana’s public welfare policy. Care for the dependent in specialized facilities, outside of poorhouses, until the 1840s had been beyond the limited scope of required state government responsibility. Part of the reason for the moniker was due to the manner in which the institutions were financed. The state underwrote the initial capital investment to erect the facilities
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141 President Franklin Pierce soundly rejected federal responsibility for public welfare in 1854, when he vetoed a bill (championed by Dorothea Dix) to allocate federal land for the care of the mentally ill. Pierce rejected the proposal on the basis that the federal government did not have constitutional authority to become “the great almoner of public charity,” forcing the obligation on the states and “the fountains of charity” at home. Franklin Pierce, “Veto Message” May 3, 1854, in United States, President, A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, Prepared under the Direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, of the House and Senate (New York: Bureau of National Literature, 1897), v. 7: 2780-2789.
and originally intended that residents pay at least something toward ongoing expenses. Administrators soon realized the hardship that presented to people who had been unemployable and waived all costs. Indiana’s asylum for the deaf, in fact, was the first in the U.S. to house its residents gratis.\textsuperscript{142}

The state legislature in the 1850s created a single governing board to preside over the three benevolent institutions. Citizens considered stewardship of the state charities a solemn and burdensome responsibility. Patrick Henry Jameson, a prominent physician, was lauded for his civic devotion and beneficent contributions after serving three terms as commissioner of the institutions, a position Calvin Fletcher had declined because at age sixty-three he found the office too “onerous and responsible.”\textsuperscript{143} As the plethora of asylums opened and the poorhouse increased its reputation as a facility of last resort, people who fell into distinct classifications gradually moved out of the poorhouse and into specialized facilities.\textsuperscript{144}

Marion County and state government’s role in caring for society’s truly dependent and delinquent rose steadily, consistent with the national movement. Government’s gradual acceptance of its almoner’s role slightly shifted the burden of providing for needy families away from the overseer of the poor (later township trustee) or private bidder. States built correctional facilities to separate the delinquent from the ill or poor, and state-run correctional institutions emerged on the Indiana landscape by the 1870s: Indiana Reformatory, Jeffersonville (1821); Indiana Boys’ School, Plainfield (1851); Indiana State Prison, Michigan City (1859); Indiana...
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Reformatory Institution for Women and Girls, Indianapolis (1869); and the Indiana
Women’s Prison, Indianapolis (1869). The public sector created additional options
for the treatment or maintenance of the ill and others with special needs. In
Indianapolis, the City Hospital (1866) and City Dispensary (1879) opened to provide
free medical care to the poor and in Knightstown, the Indiana Soldiers’ and Sailors’
Orphans Home (1867) opened to shelter Civil War families left without a male head
of household.145

Philanthropy has long been the incubator that provides society with many
partially tested social innovations that can be adapted by government once proven.
Philanthropy also eliminates gaps in the delivery of public services. It is no surprise,
then, that the IBS recognized both the asylum movement and the unmet needs in
Indianapolis. As the state established its first benevolent institutions for the blind,
deaf, and insane, it assumed no responsibility for dependent children unless they
were members of one of the special classes. Orphaned Indiana children, or children
whose parents had abandoned or unreasonably neglected them, were either bound
out as apprentices or consigned to live in county poorhouses. Care of indentured
children could be uneven at best and those who lived in poorhouses received little
education and cohabitated with adult inmates.146 Yet around the country, the
number of orphanages was growing three times faster than the population.147
Orphanages provided both shelter and sanctuary; children could be raised by
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surrogate parents and protected from the temptations of sin that were omnipresent in the outside world.

The flurry of railroad building had produced a brief economic boomlet in Indianapolis. Men migrated, and brought their families, seeking work with the new lines. These short-lived opportunities drove men on to other cities to find work – frequently deserting their wives and children. The plight of the abandoned families troubled the city’s leaders. At the IBS’s 1849 annual meeting, members recognized “the great amount of suffering … especially the privations of the indigent widows and orphans” and deemed it advisable to create a separate society as government options were unacceptable and the IBS felt it could not reach these classes of dependent adequately.148

IBS members therefore created the Widows and Orphans Friends’ Society in 1850 “to relieve the physical, intellectual and moral wants of the widows and orphans of the city.”149 Originally, it paid private families to take in and care for individual orphans to accomplish one of members’ most pressing goals – to keep children out of the poorhouse and to keep mothers and their children together. The all-female Widows and Orphans Friends’ Society board of managers included a visiting committee who identified needy children and screened the candidate families for their suitability to take in orphans. The society’s managers began raising funds immediately through a door-to-door campaign. The women collected sufficient

donations, including land, to open the city’s first orphanage, the Widows’ and Orphans’ Asylum, in 1855.

The Widows and Orphans Friends’ Society specified upon its founding that all of its managers (directors and officers) would be ladies, with a small advisory board of nine men to provide their expertise and wisdom on philanthropy. Of the founding twenty-nine female managers, including Mrs. Calvin Fletcher, approximately half were either IBS members themselves or married to IBS members; six of the nine male advisors were married to founding women managers.\textsuperscript{150} The men held successful occupations such as lawyer, judge, banker, merchant, manufacturer, and even Indiana’s secretary of state. James Blake and Calvin Fletcher joined the advisory board and served for the remainder of their lives.\textsuperscript{151}

More than 200 citizens contributed to the orphanage’s initial building campaign; men and women donated in equal measure.\textsuperscript{152} The Friends’ Society required female members to donate $1.00, male members $3.00.\textsuperscript{153} This close-knit, interrelated team of men and women underscores that the civic vision for Indianapolis was not conceived solely by the city’s male leaders. Women devoted to the orphans were prominent in their own right, lauded in the \textit{Indianapolis Journal} as “always foremost in acts of practical benevolence and charity.”\textsuperscript{154} Caroline Scott Harrison, the future U.S. First Lady, served as a founder and manager and continued

\textsuperscript{150} Author compared names of founding Widows and Orphans Friends’ Society member names listed in Holloway, \textit{Indianapolis}, 197-198 and Sulgrove, \textit{History of Indianapolis and Marion County}, 382-384 with IBS member names listed in Thornbrough and Riker, \textit{The Diary of Calvin Fletcher}, v.6: \textsuperscript{p. 449.}
\textsuperscript{151} Donations and Bequeaths 1855-1863, BV 3661, CBI Records.
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her affiliation with the Friends’ Society while in the White House. Hannah Hadley, wife of the successful manufacturer and wholesaler William Hadley, served as the orphanage’s president for many years. Within a short time, local historians recognized the lady managers as “persistent,” “unwearying,” and “of indefatigable zeal.”¹⁵⁵ Men clearly participated in fundraising, but women emerged quickly as the leaders who conceived, built, managed, and sustained the institution.

Members of the IBS and the Widows and Orphans Friends’ Society partnered not just in delivering direct service to aid needy families, but in demonstrating philanthropy in its expressive role. Together the two societies’ members, speaking as individuals but also working together in voluntary associations, mobilized political advocacy on behalf of dependent children and indigent adults. Quickly after the Friends’ Society formed, Indiana in 1852 updated its child indenture law to create a minimum standard of care for bound out children and an enforcement mechanism for that level of care. The 1852 law required that children receive basic education in common schools, not have to work more than ten hours per day, and must be emancipated upon reaching the age of adulthood or a female child’s marriage. Several authority figures could authorize indenture agreements: a parent, guardian, township trustee, or the child him or herself if over the age of fourteen.¹⁵⁶ Judges held final approval and the authority to reform or revoke indenture agreements if the terms of the new law were not followed. The IBS also advocated to abolish the practice of selling the poor to the lowest bidder as the policy was “not in accordance

¹⁵⁵ Holloway, Indianapolis, 91, 198; Sulgrove, History of Indianapolis and Marion County, 382.
¹⁵⁶ Orchard, Early History of Child Welfare in Indiana, 1; Thornbrough, Indiana in the Civil War Era, 579.
with a generous and judicious charity.” 157 In practice, selling the poor by 1852 was
less common than early in the century. That the IBS chose to formalize its position
with a resolution underscores the society’s commitment to the preferred poor relief
strategies of indoor and outdoor relief.

The 1852 public policy change regarding children reflects the civic
engagement of men and women, the recognition of poor children as deserving of
special provisions, and a legislative response to a gap in services created by
government’s narrow perceived role and philanthropy’s limited resources at the time.
Indiana’s child welfare law passed early relative to other states. After the 1860s,
child welfare awareness rose around the country and several states established
orphanages and mandated the removal of children from poorhouses. 158

The IBS’ fundraising apparatus plus its position vis-à-vis the city’s churches
made it the natural vehicle to establish the city’s first orphanage. While the church
has cared for the poor for centuries, most Indianapolis’ churches were still relatively
new and did not have established social service operations. Second Presbyterian
Church, for example, provided almost no direct aid to individuals but preferred to
extend assistance to societies such as the Orphans’ Asylum. 159 The IBS accordingly
used its existing visiting committee structure to raise funds and supplies door-to-door
for the orphanage, and it held a variety of suppers, concerts, and benefits that anyone
today would recognize. The religious network in Indianapolis provided support in
several ways. Fundraising and public talks advocating for the orphanage took place
in churches and ministers preached at Masonic Hall to raise donations for the
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orphanage.\textsuperscript{160} Anniversary exercises rotated among the city’s churches and filled them to capacity.

While always a private charity, the Widows and Orphans Friends’ Society established a public/private partnership within just seven years of the orphanage’s opening. Marion County Commissioners began boarding children at the orphanage and paying regular per-diem support, $1.30 per child per week for room and board. By 1867, both the Indianapolis Common Council and the County Commissioners appropriated regular funding, prompting the orphanage to add representatives of these public organs, the mayor of Indianapolis and the Marion County Auditor respectively, as ex-officio board members.\textsuperscript{161} By 1882, circuit courts sent children from other Indiana counties to the orphanage in such numbers that aggregate public funding from “outcounty,” Marion County, and Indianapolis appropriations far outpaced private donations.\textsuperscript{162} The orphanage, therefore, was the city’s first example of a private, yet quasi-public, benevolent institution managed primarily by the women of Indianapolis, demonstrating the women’s ability and success in running a complex business, fundraising, and partnering with government.

The orphanage appears to have filled a vital role for Indianapolis children at the time. Occupancy grew steadily and destitute children, often of heartbreakingly desperate parents, resided there. The Friends’ Society secretary wrote in 1867 that “the inmates of the asylum come from the streets, from the abodes of poverty and

\textsuperscript{160} Thornbrough and Riker, \textit{The Diary of Calvin Fletcher}, v.4: 506, v. 6, 467, v. 6, 601.
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wretchedness.” One mother reportedly walked two hundred miles to deliver her children, including an eight-month old, to the orphanage because she could not care for them. Hopeless parents literally left babies on the asylum’s doorsteps, sometimes several dozen in any given year, no matter how urgently the organization begged parents not to abandon foundlings in this way. The asylum became well known not just in Indiana but around the country for the kind treatment of children in its custody. Potential adoptive parents came from more than a dozen states, and as far as San Francisco, Minneapolis, and New York City to meet children. Guests left comments praising the women’s work; one visitor remarked that the orphanage was “as nice as a home with a mother and father.” At a time during which orphanages were well-regarded predecessors to foster care and adoption, this institution earned high marks and served as a model for others.

Once the Widows’ and Orphans’ Asylum orphanage opened, children boarded in the institution until they could leave in one of several ways. Some returned to their immediate or extended families, occasionally children moved out and back, a few ran away, and the mortality of foundlings was tragically high. Most children were placed with families, whom the asylum managers worked hard to qualify, through indenture agreement or adoption, although the lines between those two arrangements were not clear.

165 Visitors’ Log included in Officers, Managers, and Advisory Committee 1867-1905, BV 3652, CBI Records.
166 In 1864, every one of the thirteen infants at the orphanage died as a result of whooping cough, mumps, and chicken pox outbreaks. Through 1900, the mortality rate of infants remained close to 50 percent. Financial Register 1866-1925, BV 3666, CBI Records; Henderson, “Early Midwestern Orphanage,” 11-12; Weintraut & Associates, *For the Children’s Sake*, 9.
Destitute women lived in the Widows’ and Orphans’ Asylum in its early years, but the managers realized the orphanage had undertaken a population of more women and children than it could adequately care for. By the 1870s the asylum only cared for orphans, half-orphans (those with one parent), foundlings, and indigent children, amending its name to the Indianapolis Orphan Asylum.\footnote{Children’s Bureau of Indianapolis, “Act of Incorporation, Amendment 1875,” CBI Records.} Another charitable institution arose simultaneously to assume care of single women: the Home for Friendless Women. B.R. Sulgrove described the home as a direct result of the Civil War and the “plague of harlots” that had floated into Indianapolis in the wake of soldiers.\footnote{Sulgrove, History of Indianapolis and Marion County, 383.} The home created at least a partial solution to that vexing rise in prostitution that had accompanied the Civil War’s installations in and near the capital.

The city’s YMCA branch played a role in founding the Home for Friendless Women in 1866. Established in Indianapolis in 1854, the YMCA had taken over the spiritual needs of the poorhouse and the Hospital for the Insane. YMCA members and other citizens, including the IBS’s Jane Graydon, wife of iron manufacturer Alexander Graydon III, volunteered at the jail to conduct religious services on Sundays on their way home from their own church services. Through these connections, men and women already involved with the IBS, the orphanage, or the YMCA became aware of the number of women released from jail with nowhere else to go. Prominent women including Mrs. Fletcher, Mrs. Graydon, Mrs. Harrison, and Mrs. Hadley began arranging employment and housing for women on an
informal basis, and finally devised a plan to establish a permanent home.  

Just as the orphanage managers hoped to rescue children from the poorhouse, the women’s home managers sought to rescue women from the brothel or jail. Calvin Fletcher’s brother, Stoughton A. Fletcher, Sr., donated land for the home. The YMCA hosted meetings and paid half of the matron’s salary, but as with the orphanage, Indianapolis women identified the need for philanthropy and drove the creation, fundraising, operations, and management of the institution. A husband and wife team managed day-to-day functions, James Smith as Superintendent and Sarah Smith as City Missionary. Like the orphanage, the women worked with a small advisory board of men, including IBS President James Blake.

The Home for Friendless Women represented a model of philanthropy in both its instrumental and expressive roles. A moral foundation was integral to the home’s mission upon its creation. The earliest extant articles of association describe the mission as “to protect unprotected women, house the homeless, help the tempted and save the erring.” Managers described the women who arrived at the home as “in a weak, helpless condition, ignorant, and incapable of steady industry” and thus sought to inculcate the inmates with Christian teaching and staunch work ethic. In the first year of operation, one quarter of the women who came to the home were

---
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placed out into jobs in the community. After a dozen years, the home proudly claimed that an average of twenty-five women annually were “rescued and restored to virtuous lives.” The home reported to the public that the residents decorated their home with industry and pride of ownership, sure signs of middle-class virtue. The managers strove to create a homelike atmosphere, not to simply replicate the jailhouse, and bring respectability to women they perceived as lost and susceptible to evil influences outside the home’s walls.

Public/private collaboration developed with the Home for Friendless Women, although at first in an arrangement that differed from the city’s arrangement with the orphanage. For the home’s first ten years of operation, it received proceeds from “fines and penalties assessed and collected for breach of certain classes of penal ordinances of the City.” When the first home burned to the ground in September, 1870, only five months after its opening, Indianapolis Common Council and the County Commissioners subsidized insurance proceeds and private donations to rebuild the facility. City and county government presumably justified financial support of the home in that the charity relieved the government of the burden of care of certain jailed women, reduced recidivism, and prevented other women from turning to prostitution.

Philanthropic citizens also created the other Indianapolis orphanages shortly after the Indianapolis Orphans’ Asylum opened: the German Protestant Orphan Home (1867) and the Indianapolis Asylum for Friendless Colored Children (1870).
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The German General Protestant Orphan Association modeled its orphanage after Cincinnati’s institution. The orphanage was German through and through: founded, financed, and run by German men, housed children of German descent, and operated in German language until America entered World War I.\textsuperscript{176} Accordingly the German orphanage received scant English-language newspaper coverage and operated solely on donations, not any public support, until it attained greater visibility in the city in the twentieth century.

Historians often describe Quakers as America’s first abolitionists, working for civil rights long before abolition grew into a national movement. A committee of equally dedicated Quaker women carried on this tradition locally. The women, including Indianapolis Orphans’ Asylum president Hannah Hadley, observed the plight of homeless and dependent African-American children in the city and set out to help them. Throughout 1869, the concerned women met with Freedmen’s Bureau representatives, Marion County commissioners, and leading Indianapolis citizens to consider how best to aid these destitute orphans, half-orphans, and indigent children. A pioneering orphanage for black children resulted from the women’s research.

The women who donated to and managed the orphanage demonstrated remarkable egalitarianism for their time. Board minutes in 1872 recorded the sentiment that guided the orphanage for many years: to care for “the friendless child, whose color may differ from our own, but still the mind capable of improvement and learning and whose souls are of the same incalculable value for
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who Christ died.” The Indianapolis Asylum for Friendless Colored Children bore
striking similarities to the Indianapolis Orphans’ Asylum: both private donations
and county governments throughout the state provided financial support, women
comprised the board of managers and operated the institution, a small male advisory
board offered financial advice, children came to and departed from the institution in
similar ways, and the managers consistently hoped to place orphans with their
relatives or adoptive families. The Indianapolis Orphans’ Asylum previously had
made provisions for black children to be placed into black family homes, but once
Quaker women established their orphanage for black children it served as the only
such institution for the entire state of Indiana and one of the few in the country.178

The Indianapolis Benevolent Society in Crisis: “Want of a Systematized Method”

By 1870, the state of Indiana was the sixth most populous in the country, a
size relative to other states not seen before or since.179 The capital’s population stood
at 48,244 and civic boosters claimed Indianapolis was the “largest inland city on the
continent.”180 The progression from town to commercial center brought a variety of
public improvements through the 1870s: gas, sewer, and water utilities; street
railways; expanded city streets; paid fire department; paid police department; and
public schools.

Indianapolis residents must have breathed a collective sigh of relief when the
Civil War ended, but the need for philanthropy grew even more during the postwar
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years. Many soldiers and their families settled in the city after the war; widows and orphans in particular remained stranded with no means of support. The composition of the population continued to change as well. After the Civil War, newly freed but destitute African Americans migrated to Indiana from the upper South. Indianapolis’ African-American population increased in both real and relative terms, from approximately 500 persons before the war to almost 3,000 shortly thereafter – and from 2.6 percent of the population to nearly 7 percent.\textsuperscript{181} All these new denizens without the ready ability to become self-sufficient placed more and more strain on philanthropic resources.

IBS expenditures climbed to keep up with rising demand. Expenditures in 1866 of $3,304 outpaced the 1864 mark by over 50 percent, then reached an all-time high of $4,389 in 1867. The society had so many people to reach that it began to distinguish between the poor and the \textit{extremely} poor. IBS records also reflect a new dimension of the worthy/unworthy poor construct. The worthy poor now included those so reticent to seek assistance that they faced absolute starvation versus the possible unworthy, those willing to ask for help. The society instructed its volunteer visitors to diligently search out those with the greatest need who were “always the most deserving.”\textsuperscript{182} Desperation led to a proposed ordinance before the City Council 1867 special session that would appropriate operating funds to the IBS. While such an appropriation would be the first to the IBS, it was consistent with other funding that was beginning to occur at the time. The precedent for public welfare had begun
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\textsuperscript{182} COS Historical Sketch ca. 1910, Box 3, Folder 5, FSA Records. The poor/extremely poor and modest worthy poor/outspoken unworthy poor contrasts also appeared in the press, for example “The Poor Still With Us,” \textit{Indianapolis People}, June 24, 1876, p. 4.
that same year with city subsidies to the Indianapolis Orphans’ Asylum and the Home for Friendless Women, and the opening of the Indiana Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Orphans Home.

The ordinance caused “considerable discussion” among council members that remains relevant today as partisan debates of public/private welfare financing show no signs of abating. One proponent of an allocation felt it would be a “burning shame” if the city refused money for benevolence when soldiers’ widows and orphans had been left behind. Another urgently argued for taxation until there was not a single widow or orphan in need, and “damnation be Indianapolis when it refused to succor them.” Opponents’ rhetoric sounded equally passionate. Charity should be a personal affair, meaning men should “go down in their own pockets” rather than make decisions on behalf of their neighbors’ pockets. And public funding would destroy the voluntary nature of the society, which itself would be killed if it accepted tax dollars.\(^{183}\) The ordinance passed eight to four.

The city thus subsidized the IBS with annual appropriations from 1867 to 1875 in an attempt to bolster the society’s capacity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1867 – 1871</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872 – 1874</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876 - &gt;</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strategy, however, appears to have produced the unintended consequence of crowding out private contributions. As soon as public appropriations began in 1867,

\(^{183}\) “City Council,” *Indianapolis Daily Journal*, August 16, 1867, p. 2
the society’s voluntary donations fell even as requests for aid rose. Annual voluntary donations began to erode from the $4,387 peak in 1867.\textsuperscript{184}

Genuine tumult overwhelmed the IBS during this time period. Calvin Fletcher died in 1866, then James Blake died in 1870. The YMCA began furnishing meals, clothing, and lodging to the poor.\textsuperscript{185} A competing benevolent society formed, the Ladies’ Society for the Relief of the Poor. The Ladies’ Society, made up of both Catholic and Protestant women, held charity fairs and entertainment galas to raise funds rather than the IBS’s door-to-door, neighborhood district style. The Ladies’ Society survived fewer than ten years, but long enough to confuse the public as to its purpose vis-à-vis the IBS.\textsuperscript{186} One newspaper reference, for example, reminded readers not to “confound” the two societies.\textsuperscript{187}

The rise of new charities, public and private asylums, and the changing mix of public and private funding of charities would cause the Benevolent Society to reexamine its purpose. The IBS had acted as the major collector and provider of voluntary poor relief since 1835, supplemented by the township trustee and later by asylum care, but by 1870 it no longer held a monopoly position. Through the 1870s, pro-labor and pro-business citizens alike questioned the rise of competing organizations and the inefficiencies they created. An editorial in the pro-labor Indianapolis People romanticized Blake’s leadership and felt the Benevolent Society
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\item \textsuperscript{187} “The Charity Fair,” Indianapolis People, February 19, 1871, p. 2.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
had reverted to primarily distinguishing the worthy from unworthy poor. The author bemoaned the disadvantages of “employing so many disbursing agents” when “one can do the work so much better.” A similar letter to the Indianapolis Journal wrote that no man was suited to replace Blake, and one set of visitors representing all united societies would be more prompt, successful, and systematic. As early as 1872, the IBS considered disbanding but instead redoubled its efforts to aid the “best sufferers” and leave the “clamorous beggars to worry from the Township Trustee the pittance doled out by law.” The society publicly recognized its “want of a systematized method” and laid some of the blame for its internal struggles at the feet of the poor for being extravagant in their requests and conniving methods. These comments, taken together, unmistakably foreground the organized charity movement which lay seven years in the future and well before the IBS faced an even more severe test.

The famous investment bank Jay Cooke and Company failed in September 1873 and triggered a protracted economic depression that swept the U.S. and Europe until 1879. As the Panic of 1873 ground on, it became known as the Great Depression until the 1930s eclipsed it. In Indianapolis, hundreds of businesses failed annually and unemployment climbed steadily. The capital city had grown rapidly since the railroad boom and the Civil War, far outdistancing other Indiana cities in manufacturing, so when business suffered it affected thousands of people. Farm

188 “Epsom Salts,” Indianapolis People, October 29, 1871, p. 3
189 “The Poor,” Indianapolis Journal, November 16, 1871, p. 4
190 “Indianapolis Benevolent Society,” Indianapolis Journal, December 3, 1872, p.?
prices dropped and the city’s meat packers cut back production. Employers slashed wages. People went hungry.

Desperate people approached the township trustee and the charitable societies for help feeding their families and heating their homes. In 1870, only 314 families were receiving public assistance; the number more than doubled as soon as the depression hit. In 1873, 753 families received aid, and the requests continued to climb. By 1877 a staggering 3,000 families depended on the township trustee, translating to nearly 10,000 people—a fifth of the populace—on relief.\(^{192}\) Public assistance thus increased in two ways, via direct aid from the Center Township trustee and appropriations to the IBS. The reverse trend occurred in private contributions as citizens clamored for greater government aid and their ability to give shrank as the decade wore on. The net effect was somewhat of a zero-sum game: public aid increased, private aid decreased, and poverty deepened.

Citizens began to question the IBS’ effectiveness after decades of nothing but tributes and glowing remarks. Stories began to appear in the press that supplies did not get to the poor on a timely basis and that volunteer visitors could be duped by shifty applicants who in fact possessed plenty of resources.\(^{193}\) Township trustees from all over Indiana further exacerbated poverty in Center Township. Other township trustees, who could be viewed as fiscally responsible, savvy, or cunning, shipped their relief applicants to the capital city. By exporting their poor in this


manner, other counties rid themselves of a fiscal problem, declaring that “Indianapolis was such a benevolent city.”¹⁹⁴ Large numbers of indigent, unemployed men, commonly known at the time as “tramps,” meandered into the city with no promise of jobs or housing. Exasperated long-term citizens demanded compulsory labor, although the Indianapolis Journal insisted that tramps would “rather beg or steal than work.” The paper lobbied for new laws, asserting that arresting the loitering men would prevent the city from being “overrun by a swarm of lazy drones.”¹⁹⁵ Legislators agreed.

Indiana, consistent with other states, passed its vagrancy law in 1877. The law defined vagrants, required them either to accept labor if available, work on a street crew, pay a fine, or live on bread and water until they agreed to work. The law, not surprisingly, did little to dissipate groups of hundreds of homeless people, which the IBS records described as “masses of aggregated pauperism” reminiscent of the Roman Empire in decline.¹⁹⁶ Fear, frustration, pity, and anger seemed to simmer at the surface of residents’ consciousness.

Even the YMCA changed its outlook toward vagrants. Men crowded into its reading rooms in search of food, money, and clothing. A YMCA spokesman complained that the reading room had become “a rendezvous for tramps and dead beats.” YMCA was torn over how to handle them: “We clothe and feed the naked and hungry, as far as we can, but it is not our professed purpose. Our work is to improve the mental, social and religious condition of young men.”¹⁹⁷ The opening of

¹⁹⁴ COS Historical Sketch ca. 1910, Box 3, Folder 5, FSA Records.
¹⁹⁵ As quoted in Thornbrough, Indiana in the Civil War Era, 316.
¹⁹⁶ COS Historical Sketch ca. 1910, Box 3, Folder 5, FSA Records.
¹⁹⁷ Mercer, One Hundred Years of Service, 50.
its new gymnasium in 1876 caused the YMCA to examine its mission and seek a better of class of men in its facilities. The Association excluded men it considered tramps from then on.198

The City Council formed a Citizens Relief Committee in 1876 to adopt what it described as “an efficient means for furnishing relief to the distressed of the city.”199 The committee aimed to coordinate the functions of city and county government, the IBS, Ladies’ Society, and YMCA and develop more permanent relief strategies. The committee’s executives viewed work and relief as inextricably linked. The committee’s first target was the “immediate prosecution” of work programs anywhere in Marion County, such as any public improvements or street projects, in order to mobilize the labor of several hundred able-bodied men. The committee expressed no interest in tramps whatsoever; married men or men with families ranked first in line for jobs.200

The Citizens Relief Committee created a modest relief fund, but it was exhausted almost instantaneously.201 It also appears to have challenged the IBS and Ladies’ Society to coordinate efforts, at least nominally. The IBS reported after its 1876 annual meeting that it would enhance its efforts to “shut out completely the unworthy” and that the Ladies’ Society would concentrate on the city’s south side.202 None of these activities, however, produced systemic improvements in public welfare and discontent ran high. Enough residents objected to increased public welfare

198 Mercer, One Hundred Years of Service, 50-1.
200 “The Labor Agitation,” Indianapolis Journal, June 5, 1876, p. 5; “Relief Committee Meeting,” Indianapolis Journal, June 10, 1876, p. 3.
201 “The Poor Still With Us,” Indianapolis People, June 24, 1876, p. 4.
spending, however, that Center Township voters elected a new trustee, Smith King, in 1876. King, apparently acting on a mandate from his electorate, took exception to the increasing outdoor relief granted by his predecessor, Trustee Dougherty, and did not delay in reversing the trend. He assembled a staff to investigate all aid applicants and used the data to justify slashing his budget. From the peak of over $55,500 in 1876, he dropped outdoor relief spending to $9,300 in 1878 – a reduction of over 80 percent.203

Historians credit Republican Mayor John Caven with envisioning and implementing a unique public/private partnership that improved infrastructure, earned a profit for the city and the private sector, and addressed unemployment and hunger in the city. Caven accomplished construction of the Indianapolis Belt Railroad and Stockyards Company (the Belt) through a $500,000 bond issue that backed private investors in the new corporation. The Belt connected the multitude of railroads entering the city, prevented congestion around Union Station, and increased the ease of shipment of livestock to supply packers.204 Prominent citizen Eli Lilly lauded Caven decades later as “one of the strongest mayors Indianapolis ever had” and the Belt as “the Works Project Administration of the panic of ’73.”205 The project employed hundreds of men over two years.

203 “Helpers of the City’s Poor,” *Indianapolis Journal*, November 21, 1886, p. ?
205 Lilly, *History of the Little Church on the Circle*, 221.
The Belt nearly derailed, however, just as the construction was underway and Caven averted a crisis. Belt investors and landowners negotiated over the sale of real estate for the Belt to proceed. A disagreement over land valuation delayed the work and men became unemployed, again. Five hundred laborers assembled and threatened what became known as the “blood or bread” uprising. Caven led all the men from one bakery to another and purchased several loaves of bread for each one. The men peacefully dispersed and the Belt work resumed. Caven, moreover, continually met with unemployed men and ultimately created city jobs for striking railroad workers during the national rail strike of 1877.206

From its humble beginnings in 1821 to the end of the 1870s, Indianapolis experienced a metamorphosis from a homogeneous pioneer town to a large, heterogeneous, prominent capital city. Indiana’s flexible legal framework allowed for both philanthropic and government remedies to social problems, including government financing of philanthropy and public/private partnerships. The religious foundation remained strong and voluntary association vibrant. Sermons on social and economic questions were rare, but signs of change were beginning to appear. Reverend Reuben Andrus delivered the inaugural sermon in the Central Avenue Methodist Church. He preached in 1877:

God has so constituted man that he finds in all things a material element and a spiritual element …. This means the … diminution of poverty, better clothing, better shelter, better food for the people,

206 William Doherty, “John Caven,” in The Encyclopedia of Indianapolis, ed. Bodenhamer and Barrows, 392; Geib, Indianapolis, 55; Leary, Indianapolis, 134; Sulgrove, History of Indianapolis and Marion County, 210-213.
enlarged securities for health, more efficient schools, wiser preaching, more social morality.207

Andrus’ words succinctly captured the crux of the emerging Social Gospel movement, in which the church applied religious principles to solve social problems, that was about to transform philanthropy in Indianapolis.

The Indianapolis Benevolent Society had not materially changed its structure or system of collection and distribution after its inception in 1835, even as the city’s evolving demographics and needs may have dictated a fresh approach. The old-fashioned neighborhood benevolence, pairs of caring citizens walking the streets with baskets on their arms, could not address the needs of a city with 50,000 people living through a Great Depression. The IBS had neither scale nor system to be the sole solution to need in a major city. Donations plummeted through the 1870s from thousands of dollars annually to just $75 in 1878.208 By the late 1870s, the IBS was barely financially viable; its members grew fatigued and disillusioned.

No natural leader emerged after Blake’s death in 1870, even though the well-regarded civic leader and long-term IBS treasurer James M. Ray assumed the presidency. Even with its corps of dedicated volunteers, without Blake and Fletcher the IBS experienced a void in leadership, enthusiasm, purpose, and passion. At the 1878 annual meeting, only seven members attended and considered disbanding the society altogether.209 The poor of Indianapolis would have been left with even fewer options for aid had that occurred. The business and government sectors were neither

207 Andrus had been president of Asbury University (DePauw) for three years. As quoted in Ann J. Lane, ed., Making Women’s History: The Essential Mary Beard (New York: Feminist Press at The City University of New York, 2000), 11.

208 COS Historical Sketch ca. 1910, Box 3, Folder 5, FSA Records.

209 Ibid.
inclined nor equipped to fill the void in caring for the poor. Center Township outdoor relief had risen but then fallen precipitously. Government had financed the Belt Railroad, but once it was complete no other public works projects were in the offing. Businessmen had suffered financial losses that diminished their own resources and had no appropriate organization through which they could collectively consider employment solutions. Public and philanthropic asylums generally catered to specific dependent classes and usually entailed families breaking up. Fatigue over the protracted difficult times seemed to have cast a pall over all sectors of society.

The postwar years, the 1870s depression in particular, had severely tested the civic ideal that relied so heavily on voluntarism and public/private partnerships. Indianapolis' growth, industrialization, and population heterogeneity all challenged traditional neighborhood benevolence as the primary remedy for assisting those in need. Questions over the respective roles of men and women in philanthropy, and philanthropy, business, and government in assisting the poor, swirled in the press. The religious foundation that supported the civic ideal never eroded, but was beginning to evolve as the Social Gospel movement was in motion. All the conditions were ripe for a new leader and a new strategy to combat poverty in Indianapolis.

210 A Chamber of Commerce, Board of Trade, and Merchants & Manufacturers Association all existed in Indianapolis but none were active or organized enough to address massive unemployment. George Geib and Miriam Geib, Indianapolis First: A Commemorative History of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce and the Local Business Community (Indianapolis: Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, 1990), 13-15.
Chapter Three: Founding Phase, 1879-1891
“So Much Is Learned In These Days Of Broad and Sunny Philanthropy”

American communities looked toward their European antecedents for solutions to poverty after the Civil War left many needy and impoverished citizens in its wake. Poor relief systems in Hamburg and Elberfeld, Germany, and London, England, provided models and influenced the scientific philanthropy movement, organized charity in particular, in the U.S. Industrialization, immigration, and urbanization created increasing numbers of families subject to the harsh realities of urban life: orphans, single women, low wages, economic uncertainty, factory accidents, women and children working in sweatshops, life in tenements and slums, lack of sanitation, crime, and disease. The new industrial economy expanded the meaning of independence beyond self-employment, professions, and property ownership – it now included wage labor. As wage labor did not accommodate or suit all the people flowing into cities, some found themselves outside the evolving urban socioeconomic system.

The menacing symbol of the dependent pauper emerged as the person unwilling to work, but who chose to live on government poor relief and charity.¹ American civic and charitable leaders grew to believe that the existing kaleidoscope of churches, benevolent associations, asylums, and poorhouses could not keep pace with the rapidly changing industrial economy and related societal problems – especially urban poverty. New charities proliferated but did not coordinate relief or fundraising efforts, much less address all the need that existed. New York City’s Charles Loring Brace remarked in 1872, “This city is full of multiplied charities,

which are constantly encroaching on each other’s field; and yet there are masses of evil and calamity here which they scarcely touch.”² He presciently recommended “all the offices of the great charities in one building … or a ‘Bureau of Charities.’”³ Brace called for efficiency, prevention of the causes of poverty, more strategic charitable giving, and an end to the dependence on charity that the proliferation of agencies had unwittingly enabled. The able-bodied who depended on assistance, beyond the traditional orphans, widows, elderly, ill, and disabled, became increasingly stigmatized and something to be identified and driven away – not nurtured.

Taken together these changes provided the setting for the late nineteenth-century scientific philanthropy movement based on several fundamental concepts: use of businesslike processes to tackle societal problems, emphasis on data and root cause analysis, and strategies of prevention rather than relief. Scientific philanthropists attempted to purge charity of its sentimentality and organize relief into a comprehensive system of rules.⁴ Some historians equate scientific philanthropy with either charity organization societies or benevolent trusts. The broader movement was signaled more by philosophy than structure and encompassed a range of orderly or systematic approaches to giving; it included many charity organization societies, and, after 1900, federated giving, community foundations, and the early modern foundations of Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Sage.

³ Brace, *The Dangerous Classes of New York*, 386.
The movement’s methods melded voluntarism, *noblesse oblige*, religion, social Darwinism, and simultaneous benefit to donor, recipient, and community.⁵

Why did scientific philanthropy take root in Indianapolis? Growth and industrialization created both social problems and opportunity for philanthropy. The city’s population increased approximately 40 percent in one decade, from 75,000 in 1880 to 105,000 in 1890. The 1880s “gas boom,” the discovery of natural gas in east-central Indiana, contributed to general prosperity and an increase in manufacturing in the area. Between 1880 and 1900, the number of manufacturers in the city nearly tripled, from 688 to 1,910.⁶ Marion County produced more manufactured goods (in terms of dollar value) than any other county in Indiana, a status it would hold until 1919.⁷

Indianapolis, however, remained a far cry from the major metropolis of New York City and the latter’s wide wealth/poverty divide. Many accounts of 1880s Indianapolis convey the character of a charming provincial capital rather than a city of extreme affluence juxtaposed with extreme misery. A distinct cultural identity, civic unity, social order, and sense of community prevailed. Social work leader Alexander Johnson remembered “a city of the middle classes, of many small and modest homes, of comparatively little grinding poverty.”⁸ Ernest P. Bicknell’s *Indianapolis Illustrated* (1893), admittedly a boosterish promotional volume, boasted

---


“a model city …. a place among the healthiest and best governed and most prosperous and contented communities of the United States” with low cost of living, equitable wages for workers, and no sharply drawn line between the rich and the poor. Movement in and out of Indianapolis remained low relative to similar cities and single-family homes were generally available and affordable. As what Robert Barrows describes as a “central place” for families – not just another big city – Indianapolis popularly became known as the “City of Homes.” When long-time residents looked back on the 1880s, they fondly recalled the “best of all places” to be and a time in which almost everyone knew everyone else.

Indiana became a battleground state in national politics, viewed as a leader of public opinion, the key to winning the Midwest, and therefore the key to the nation. Between 1880 and 1896, Indiana placed more candidates on national party tickets than any state except New York. The country elected its only president from Indiana in 1888, Indianapolis' Republican attorney Benjamin Harrison. The Harrison campaign shone a spotlight on Indianapolis and brought guests to the city

10 Barrows considers geographic mobility the rate at which citizens moved into or out of Indianapolis rather than movement from neighborhood to neighborhood within the city. Robert G. Barrows, “Hurryin’ Hoosiers and the American ‘Pattern’: Geographic Mobility in Indianapolis and Urban North America,” Social Science History 5, no. 2 (Spring 1981): 216.
13 Benjamin Harrison (1833-1901), grandson of U.S. President William Henry Harrison and Civil War General.
who otherwise would not have had occasion to visit. Finnish Baroness Alexandra Gripenberg, for example, toured the city just before the 1888 Republican National Convention. She found it a “rich and modern” city with, perhaps to her surprise, enough wherewithal to have mustered an arts association.14

*Harper’s Weekly* covered the Harrison campaign with a lengthy feature story about his home city. The reporter commented on the business climate, civic culture, and moral foundation, all of which undergirded the scientific philanthropy movement once it arrived in Indianapolis. *Harper’s* promoted the “city of homes” reputation as the city had industrialized, weathered the 1870s depression, and now home building was at capacity. The wealth/poverty divide appeared narrow, the article noted, and homes were rarely either ostentatious or shabby. The reporter observed the civic ideal that must have been palpable:

> The real power is in the hands of the best citizens …. Above and beyond all else the chief charm of Indianapolis is its society …. It is not an aristocracy of clothes or money or forefathers, but of brains and merit and social qualities …. With its sterling character, its charming social nature, and its perpetual intellectual ferment, its future is secure.15

*Harper’s* and reminiscing residents no doubt exaggerated such harmony and bliss. But at the same time, historians overstate their descriptions of contrasts, deep divisions, and sharp class lines.16 Fewer European immigrants arrived in the 1870s and 1880s than in other midwestern cities, although almost 7,000 African Americans

---

arrived after the Civil War. Still, like most industrializing cities at the time, the Indianapolis landscape was still relatively unsegregated by class without a distinct residential concentration of poor. While laboring, merchant, and professional people lived in reasonably close proximity, two socioeconomic classes began to become more apparent. The “city of homes” was more likely what George Geib calls a “checkerboard of neighborhoods.” Newer neighborhoods Woodruff Place and Irvington, and fashionable north Meridian, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Capitol, and Alabama streets, catered to the affluent. Railroad and factory workers clustered on the near-west side and in Brightwood, Beech Grove, and Haughville. Local saloons and alleys anchored pockets of poverty, gangs, and crime.

Employment in manufacturing and transportation grew as the number of agricultural workers began a long, slow decline. Men, and women and children to a far lesser degree, increasingly worked as skilled and unskilled laborers. The number of wage earners increased in lockstep with manufacturing, from 10,000 in 1880 to 25,000 in 1900. Indiana’s first data on factory wages (1881) indicated that the average daily wage ranged from a low of $1.00 per day for common labor to a high of $4.50 per day for the most skilled workers. Common laborers, ever so gradually, joined the ill, infirm, aged, orphaned, widowed, and transients who depended on charity or public relief. When civically engaged men and women learned of the

---
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budding scientific philanthropy movement, they applied its precepts to the problems they perceived in their own backyards.

Scientific Philanthropy Emerges: “We Have Ourselves Created the Monster”

Highlights of the major European approaches illuminate the foundation and rationale for the American response to the organized charity movement. Hamburg, Germany’s late eighteenth-century General Poor Relief, born out of the Enlightenment belief that the poor could improve their situation in life through education and work, represented a new private/public approach to eliminating poverty. The years 1788 to 1799 represented the peak of the city’s new plan, the Hamburg General Poor Relief. The system evolved out of a centuries-old patchwork of parish institutions and private charities that cared for the poor. The Relief divided Hamburg into five districts, governed by fifty-four prominent directors and 180 relief officers who functioned as case workers. All directors and officers served voluntarily as the centralized scheme sought to animate civic engagement and a sense of community.

The Hamburg policy distinguished between what it described as the hopeless poor and those who could be productive. The Relief’s cornerstone was to return the able poor to work; accordingly it only granted additional assistance, over what the poor could earn on their own, to equate to a subsistence existence. The Relief required the poor to register for relief, then policed all related matters such as begging, sheltering beggars, and indiscriminate almsgiving. The police comprised an interesting partner in policymaking and guidance authority over poor relief, not merely law enforcement. The Relief’s multifaceted approach included work
programs, compulsory industry schools, free medical care, and micro-loans or advances. It proclaimed success when, after ten years, the ranks of those receiving assistance had shrunk by 40 percent.\textsuperscript{22} French occupation closed the Relief, but many elements of the Hamburg model would appear a few years later in Europe and a century later in the U.S.: districts, registration, visitation, and work programs.

The town of Elberfeld, Germany, in 1853 built upon the Hamburg General Poor Relief. The Elberfeld model mobilized the urban middle class around a common cause to end poverty that broadened participation in civic life. The Elberfeld system valued work over charity and aimed to transform the working class into members of the self-governing bourgeoisie. The elite authors of the Elberfeld plan also sought to strengthen a sense of shared community by uniting the upper, middle, and working classes through a common value system and social program.

Elberfeld’s middle-class men gained the opportunity to serve as poor guardians, or \textit{Armenpfleger}, of designated sections of the city. \textit{Armenpfleger} acted as agents of city government, not philanthropy, so the men occupied volunteer yet official positions akin to the early Indiana overseers of the poor. These positions did not pay a salary or stipend, so in that sense were voluntary. Yet poor guardianship was tethered to the privilege of voting, so men who received appointments rarely refused. Service as a poor guardian thus combined obligation and honor that brought the middle class into public life formerly reserved for the wealthy.\textsuperscript{23}

Poor guardians regularly visited the poor in their homes, investigated their cases for relief, and worked to instill values such as thrift, order, cleanliness, and honesty. Success in Elberfeld relied on the development of close personal bonds between the poor guardians and the poor. Individual relationships allowed the poor guardians to distinguish between the worthy and unworthy poor and apply a mixture of assistance and discipline, charity and authority. This shift toward emphasis on personal connections demonstrates that the poor guardians clearly were the forerunners of charity organization society (COS) friendly visitors and their successor professional social workers.

*Armenpfleger* met regularly to discuss the poor in their respective districts and collectively approve the best form of relief. Temporary outdoor relief was available in Elberfeld, but poor guardians’ primary challenge was to help find work for the poor in their quarters. Poor guardians came from the merchant and artisan classes so they had the best knowledge of work opportunities and could most easily make connections to employment. Women formed the Elberfeld Women’s Association in the 1860s so that they could participate and support their husbands in their duties as poor guardians. The Elberfeld model quickly proliferated and thrived throughout German cities until late in the nineteenth century.²⁴

The Charity Organization Society of London provided the model that would have the most direct effect on the U.S. Throughout the nineteenth century, religious and secular societies multiplied to combat poverty and vagrancy to no avail.

Watson’s COS history describes the ranks of London’s poor as growing by “leaps and bounds” in the 1860s in part due to the impact of the Crimean War and the American Civil War on Britain’s economy.\textsuperscript{25} Public and private expenditures for poor relief nearly doubled in that decade alone. Fraud, abuse, confusion, and inefficiency detracted from effectiveness in assisting people in need. In 1869 London’s clergy, scholars, philanthropists, social reformers, and politicians agreed to consolidate disparate charitable societies, municipal funds, emergency funds, and workhouses into a single entity. London’s COS featured elements already present in Elberfeld and in London’s array of existing societies: districts, investigation, individual visitation of the poor in their homes, screening of the truly dependent from able-bodied poor, practical and moral education, work programs, and coordination of agencies.\textsuperscript{26}

The other significant influence from Britain came from neither philanthropy nor religion, but science. Charles Darwin’s \textit{The Origin of Species} (1859) provided intellectual fodder that allowed civic leaders to fuse theory with practical systems such as the Elberfeld and London models. Darwinism was one of the great informing insights in scientific, scholarly, and popular American thought.\textsuperscript{27} People across the country seized upon his evolutionary theory, striving to interpret how Darwinian concepts informed their fields of study. Darwin’s work led to a revolution not only in scientific circles, but in man’s entire conception of himself and


\textsuperscript{26} The entity was officially titled the Society for Organizing Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicancy, popularly known as the Charity Organization Society of London. Watson, \textit{The Charity Organization Movement}, 49-63.

his place in the world. An applied theory of social Darwinism developed, and social Darwinists selectively applied his most popular concepts, such as “natural selection” and “survival of the fittest,” to men and society. The fittest humans, as in the animal kingdom, successfully competed, adapted, and dominated; society rewarded intelligence, self-control, skill, and industry. The logical codicil was that weaker individuals naturally fell to the bottom rung of the social and economic ladder.

British and American industrial tycoons embraced social Darwinism as the epistemological justification for their ability to amass tremendous wealth. Success was the natural reward for virtue, millionaires the logical by-product of natural selection. Scientific philanthropists relied on Darwin’s nomenclature and theory to validate and advance the worthy/unworthy poor construct and attendant solutions. Historians’ focus on COS’s application of Darwin’s terminology undergirds the social control thesis, yet belies potentially beneficial and principled missions. We must interrogate COS literature more closely to understand fully how organizations may have applied social Darwinism in practice.

Reverend Stephen Humphreys Gurteen (1836-1898) integrated aspects of the German and British models and Darwinian concepts when he established the Buffalo Charity Organization Society in 1877, the first in the country. Born in Canterbury,

---

29 Herbert Spencer first used the phrase “survival of the fittest” in *Social Statics* (1850); the phrase became mainstream after Darwin’s *The Origin of Species* (1859). Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, 6.
England, son of a Presbyterian minister, Gurteen was educated at Cambridge University and immigrated to New York City in 1863. He arrived just as the infamous Draft Riots exploded throughout the city. The riots terrified Gurteen and left him with fears of anarchy, revolution, poverty, and class divisions that haunted him for the rest of his life.

Gurteen did not achieve success or long-term employment for several years, although he was ambitious, brilliant, charming, and energetic. He became assistant minister at Trinity Episcopal Church in Geneva, New York, in 1874, then the church transferred him to St. Paul’s Church in Buffalo. Gurteen arrived in Buffalo in 1875 at the nadir of the economic depression, a time in which the needs of the unemployed and impoverished overtaxed the city’s philanthropic resources. Within four months of arriving in Buffalo, Gurteen became the warden of St. Paul’s Guild, a position that included responsibility for poor relief. Soon the 1877 railroad strikes conjured up his nightmares of the 1863 Draft Riots and the threat of revolution. His terror, combined with his perception of impermeable fault lines between the classes, proved to be a powerful motivator. Gurteen captured his sense of impending doom:

*We have ourselves created the monster, have ourselves infused life into it, and we shall have ourselves alone to blame if the poor, craving for human sympathy, yet feeling their own moral deformity, should some fine day wreak their vengeance upon society at large.*

31 Buffalo’s 1870 population was 117,714, more than double that of Indianapolis. U.S. Census [www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov).


He returned home to England amid the strikes, perhaps to escape his fears, but certainly in search of a systemic solution to poor relief – and therefore social chaos – that he could apply in Buffalo.

During his two months in London, Gurteen visited with COS district committees, made rounds with visitors as they called on the poor, and studied the micro-finance Penny Bank designed to instill thrift in poor families. He met with Octavia Hill (1838-1912), a housing reformer who was active in the COS and staunchly supported what she called “aiding the poor without alms-giving.” Gurteen became fascinated with how poverty had grown so rapidly despite more and more resources devoted to stemming the tide. Something must have been “strangely wrong” with the previous charitable method, he later recalled, and so a drastic overhaul had been in order. The COS structure had succeeded quickly in reducing poverty and deploying charitable resources more effectively. Organized charity would never curtail, much less destroy, individual charities, but would create intercommunication and cooperation that was desperately needed and not accomplished in any other way. It was exactly what Buffalo sought.

Totally inspired, Gurteen returned to Buffalo and immediately went to work to found an organized charity scheme patterned after the London COS. He dashed around Buffalo fueled by an intense sense of urgency, calling on men whom he deemed “prominent and clever.” He unveiled his plan, enlisted support, and challenged the men to create a system that would protect them against the rising tide

---
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of poverty and potential revolution. He delivered weekly sermons on charity and circulated a pamphlet, “The Proposed Charity Organization Society for the City of Buffalo,” to five hundred businessmen. Gurteen recalled later that three hundred men responded, approving the plan and promising financial backing. In December 1877 the Buffalo COS launched, complete with a city-wide business plan, constitution, and a plethora of forms copied virtually verbatim from the London blueprint.

Reverend Gurteen codified cardinal principles for the Buffalo COS that almost imperceptibly adapted the London model to suit the American landscape. London’s COS was nonsectarian, but the British city was not as religiously diverse as American cities. Gurteen therefore insisted upon a nonsectarian COS and explicitly prohibited visitors from proselytizing. He coined the phrase “charity clearing house,” a term reminiscent of the financial clearing house, to describe the central registration of relief cases. Gurteen wove self-help programs such as child care for working mothers into the COS’s operations and publicity. His mantra, “HELP THE POOR HELP THEMSELVES,” ran through the Buffalo COS’s operations. All of these three main elements – nonsectarianism, central registration, and work ethic – could be found to some extent in predecessor systems in Germany and London, but Gurteen branded them as distinctly American.

The Buffalo COS used its existing police districts as districts for registration and investigation and retained police officers to canvass the districts to develop an

---
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initial survey of those on relief. One might chastise the COS for deploying policemen as agents of philanthropy, in what Michael Katz calls the “dose of coercion” mixed with charity. What appears on the surface to be an almost cruel approach that viewed the poor as de facto criminals may not have been as heavy-handed as at first blush. Hamburg had set a precedent by involving the police in poor relief through the development of social policy. Buffalo charities had experienced a great deal of fraudulent aid applications and had neither the mindset nor the staff to investigate dishonest clients. In Indianapolis, as in most U.S. cities, policemen patrolled regular beats, became identified with their neighborhoods, provided lodging for transients, and returned lost children to their parents. Police monitored their districts for anyone injured or acutely ill and provided immediate care. Policemen were familiar in poorer neighborhoods, as they were drawn from the same working classes which they regulated. The police force was an integral community group and, as a city-wide public agency that covered all neighborhoods, had scale that no individual charity possessed. And, in 1877 charity and corrections were still inextricably intertwined. State Boards of Charities and Corrections would not be recast as public welfare agencies for decades.

Buffalo’s volunteer friendly visitors undertook investigation and registration. Gurteen believed that only two socioeconomic classes existed, rich and poor, and that the two were unknown to each other. Only close, individual relationships that

\[\textbf{References}\]

provided moral support could retrieve the city from the brink of disaster. He immediately lobbied for hundreds of visitors, especially women, to begin the “real work” of organized charity – house-to-house visitation. Women, he felt, were uniquely qualified to undertake this work in view of their maternal, domestic, and kind natures. The paradox is fascinating. Gurteen was terrified of the poor, especially the dishonest poor, yet he empowered a cadre of gentlewomen and sent them into tenements bearing olive branches of philanthropy.

Gurteen struggled to reconcile religious training, public administration, and scientific principles, a challenge for organized charity and social service agencies today. The few pages on the “Scientific Bases of Charity Organization” in his 1882 *Handbook* read as an awkward attempt to merge popular culture, scripture, and common-sense business principles. He applied Darwin’s most popular phrases, natural selection and survival of the fittest, to the human race’s successes and failures, but also fell back on John Winthrop’s teaching that each community member must perform the duty which he is best able to perform. If one clears away the unpleasant language (worthy, unworthy, and pauper), Gurteen appears guardedly optimistic, not sinister. He did not dispute the Biblical passage “the poor we will have always with us,” but remained hopeful that society would support the honest, truly dependent poor while compelling those who could take care of themselves to become self-sufficient.

The Elberfeld, London, and Buffalo organized charity models proved to be wildly popular throughout the U.S. COSs, the institutional embodiment of scientific

---

44 Ibid., 197-205.
philanthropy, promised efficient, rational, and scientific solutions to the intractable social and economic problem of poverty. Gurteen left his St. Paul’s position less than one year after launching the Buffalo COS over an intra-parish schism unrelated to his poor relief plan, but he remained a busy man for the next five years. His expertise was highly sought as word traveled of the success of the Buffalo plan, reportedly saving thousands of dollars in public and private expense, completely eradicating street begging, finding work for the able-bodied, prosecuting fraud, and educating the public on the benefits of organized charity. Gurteen spent the next several years helping other cities inaugurate their own COSs. He wrote, traveled, promoted, lectured, and corresponded with parties from all over the country, as though the single authority on the subject. Cities were intrigued by the concept of organized charity, Gurteen its most ardent champion. COSs proliferated throughout the U.S. between 1877 and the 1890s. At least 130 cities, virtually all communities with at least 10,000 in population, formed a COS by the turn of the century. Most adopted the Buffalo approach: individual intervention and registration to eliminate the duplication of aid from multiple charities.

Yet COSs did not represent the departure from legacy benevolent societies, as much of the historiography presumes. Paul Boyer notes that Gurteen’s COS was not

---

a new discovery but that the “moment was ripe” for existing ideas to take hold. Boyer’s overall treatment of COSs as instruments of explicit social control, however, overshadows this point. The shift in Indianapolis from benevolent society to COS exemplifies the “moment.” Voluntarism, the district system, door-to-door visitation, moral instruction, centralization, informal coordination with churches and other charities, and cooperation with municipal officials had been in place for some time in the Indianapolis Benevolent Society. The society indeed stood at a crossroads in 1879. As it struggled for survival in the 1870s, its members had been ruminating over what was then a novel departure for charities: gathering statistical information in order to understand the causes of the poverty which it had long struggled to relieve. The complexity of poverty, the crisis within the Indianapolis Benevolent Society, and the outcry for efficiency led to the logical and obvious solution: the scientific, systematic, city-wide approach soon to be known as organized charity. The scientific philanthropy movement swept across the country and into the Mile Square.

Reverend Oscar Carleton McCulloch: “A Most Effective and Influential Exponent”

On November 30, 1879, Reverend Gurteen spoke to a large audience gathered for the Indianapolis Benevolent Society’s annual meeting. Gurteen’s invitation came from Reverend Oscar Carleton McCulloch, minister of Plymouth Church, the first Congregational church in Indianapolis. McCulloch (1843-1891), an evangelical Protestant reformer, had taken the reins as the IBS’s president in 1878.
and was breathing new life into the society. Understanding Reverend McCulloch, his religious ideology, and his philanthropic vision allows for a deeper appreciation of the scientific apparatus already introduced into the IBS and the momentum for change leading to the formation of the Indianapolis COS.

Those who knew McCulloch described him as energetic, inquisitive, charismatic, intellectual, and ambitious. He lived in Indianapolis for only fourteen years, from 1877 until his death in 1891 at age forty-eight. Yet he has become a fascinating firebrand, a controversial historical figure whose legacy scholars still find difficult to reconcile. McCulloch left little trace of his personal life; even his diary largely contains newspaper clippings. Many of his sermons, speeches, and papers on social welfare, however, survive, as well as the considerable newspaper coverage he received during his tenure in Indianapolis. Most scholarship therefore focuses on McCulloch the public figure more than McCulloch the man.

Oscar Carleton McCulloch grew up in Ohio and Wisconsin, the son of a successful merchant. After dabbling in a few trades, including a stint as a traveling drug salesman, in 1870 he entered the Congregationalist Chicago Theological Seminary. He first served as minister of the largely immigrant First Congregational Church in Sheboygan, Wisconsin. During his seven years in Sheboygan, McCulloch established himself as a liberal thinker who would tackle political and social issues in his sermons. He founded secular programs including a church library, reading room, and philharmonic society. McCulloch’s actions, somewhat controversial for the time, foreshadowed his ministry in Indianapolis, where he would spend the rest of his life.
The young minister arrived in 1877 at Indianapolis’ Plymouth Church and immediately embarked upon programs to “extend the usefulness” of the church in the community.\textsuperscript{50} Plymouth Church, organized in 1859, stood in a prominent location on the northwest corner of Monument Circle. The American Home Missionary Society had founded Indiana’s Congregational denomination with enthusiasm, but by 1877 Congregationalists numbered only about 2,000 across the state and maintained just two churches in Indianapolis.\textsuperscript{51} Plymouth Church had the unfortunate combination of a small congregation and considerable debt. McCulloch envisioned Plymouth as an “institutional church” that would offer social programs in addition to sermons. He believed in holistic, proactive systems of philanthropy that could address all the needs of congregants, not just the spiritual.

Reverend McCulloch arrived in Indianapolis as Protestant ministers across the country wrestled with how to reorient faith to respond to the new industrial, urban, and increasingly scientific society. Progressive religious leaders sought to counteract an emerging materialistic culture, a growing unchurched working class, and social unrest that threatened the Christian ethic. By the end of the 1870s, the emerging theology that became known as the Social Gospel considered how to apply Christianity to questions of economics, business ethics, labor organizing, and the

\footnote{51} The other Congregational church was Mayflower Church, organized in 1869 from a Sunday school formed by the YMCA, located at St. Clair and East Streets. Plymouth Institute moved in 1903 and the two churches merged in 1908 to form First Congregational Church. The church’s institutional programs ended after the merger. Deborah B. Markisohn, “Plymouth Church,” in \textit{The Encyclopedia of Indianapolis}, ed. Bodenhamer and Barrows, 1120; Phillips, \textit{Indiana in Transition}, 442; Berry R. Sulgrove, \textit{History of Indianapolis and Marion County, Indiana} (Philadelphia: L.H. Everts & Co., 1884), 413; Thornbrough, \textit{Indiana in the Civil War Era}, 607-608.
myriad of other problems in cities. McCulloch embraced the liberal theology with zeal and came to Indianapolis with the momentum of his Sheboygan ministry behind him. He sought to become the minister to the entire city of Indianapolis, not just the minister of his denomination. If the whole city were his parish, then it followed logically that civic and charitable work must be intertwined with religion. Presiding over his church, therefore, naturally aligned with presiding over the Indianapolis Benevolent Society and later the COS. His leadership of this trio of organizations was unusual for his time. While many ministers supported the COS movement, they did not necessarily lead the COSs in their cities. Relief societies and COSs, moreover, did not usually have the same president. When Harvard’s Francis Greenwood Peabody, a prominent Social Gospel leader, observed in 1886 that the “modern minister” was in more and more demand as “the natural leader of the charities and temperance work, as a mediator between social classes, and as an adviser of community philanthropies,” McCulloch had already blazed this trail several years before.

McCulloch’s greatest Social Gospel influence was Reverend Washington Gladden, whom historians refer to as the father of the movement and one of its leading writers and thinkers. Gladden’s description of the Social Gospel remains succinct and elegant when read today. In his inaugural issue of Sunday Afternoon, he

promised that questions of “practical philanthropy” would dominate the magazine’s pages and examine “how to mix Christianity with human affairs; how to bring salvation to the people that need it most; how to make peace between the employer and the workman.”

The two men apparently had little personal contact, but McCulloch’s diary often refers to Gladden’s publications and he regularly quoted Gladden in his sermons and speeches.

McCulloch’s sermons naturally focused on traditional religious instruction but also ran the gamut of social advocacy topics such as public health, child labor, organized labor, the treatment of criminals and mentally ill, and even the work of the National Conference on Charities and Correction (NCCC).

Like other Social Gospel ministers, he called for structural solutions, social justice, and equal employment opportunity, not merely palliative charity that only alleviated symptoms of social inequities. Each year his sermon in conjunction with the IBS annual meeting particularly emphasized social questions. This excerpt from the December 15, 1879 sermon, for example, exuded both the expressive purpose of philanthropy and the intersection of religion and social issues:

Here [in the U.S.] there is no man who is born poor who may not become rich, and if he lives worthily he may become a distinguished or useful man …. The first thing to do is to ask what justice means. We

---

57 The National Conference of Charities and Correction (NCCC) operated as the exclusive umbrella debating society for charity organization societies between 1874 and 1917. In 1917 the conference became the National Conference of Social Work.
have talked too much about Christian love and benevolence. Christian justice is of much more importance. Love grows out of justice.

McCulloch attempted to create instruments of social justice. The “open door” became the church’s motto as McCulloch vowed the church doors would always be open. Like Gurteen, McCulloch saw only two classes that he called “the well-to-do and the poor-to-do.” He accordingly worked to reach members of both social classes. But unlike Gurteen, who lived in terror of the poor, McCulloch hoped to embrace the unchurched so-called poor-to-do. McCulloch convinced his congregation to abrogate the requirement of belief in a rigid creed, hoping to lure people who might have been intimidated to join the church. Plymouth Church’s membership rose markedly. He specially designed Sunday morning and evening services to reach his two audiences. Morning services remained geared to the traditional audience with religious themes. Evening services catered to the working class, addressed social topics in addition to religious services, and even featured stereopticon pictures and music. Both services became immensely popular and church membership grew multifold, with average attendance of 500 in the morning and 1,000 in the evening by the mid-1880s.

Plymouth Church expanded widely as McCulloch believed that education, literature, art, music, and charity were “parts of the whole” person which the church

59 “Pulpit Utterances,” Indianapolis Journal, December 15, 1879, p. 3
60 Junius B. Roberts, “Plymouth Church, Indianapolis, Indiana Quarterly Magazine of History 7, no. 2 (June 1911): 57.
61 This sermon also ominously described the two social classes as the well-born and the ill-born. “Pulpit Utterances,” Indianapolis Journal, p. 3.
63 Markisohn, “Plymouth Church,” 1120.
must steward. “Religion is not a thing,” he preached, “but it is an attitude” that
does not stand by itself and includes the heart and the intellect. The church,
therefore, must adopt a holistic approach to its role in the community. The
congregation thus formed charitable programs, a literary society, a lecture series,
library, travel club, youth programs, and even a savings and loan. He organized the
ladies’ church society to raise money, extend relief to needy congregants, call on
members and non-members at home, and run social events. The minister’s wife,
Alice McCulloch, led the ladies who visited “strangers.” The lecture series featured
well-known guests, including former Second Presbyterian minister Henry Ward
Beecher (McCulloch’s model for his preaching style), Booker T. Washington,
Charles Dickens, Oscar Wilde, Mark Twain, and Lew Wallace.

Growth in the church’s ministry required a physical space that could
accommodate its new identity and programming. McCulloch orchestrated the
construction of a new church and in 1884 moved his congregation two blocks away
just north of Monument Circle. The new church blazoned the inscription “The gates
of it shall not be shut by day” over its entrance, informing all citizens who passed by
that this was a place of “weekly renewal of sympathies and affections.” The new
church differed from the old in both form and substance. It appeared more like a
community center or meeting house, devoid of a towering Gothic steeple, and
included a 1,200 seat auditorium plus a library, gymnasium, classrooms, and
meeting rooms.

64 McCulloch, The Open Door, xiv.
65 Ibid., 123.
66 Year Book of Plymouth Church for the Year Ending December 31, 1887 (Indianapolis: Plymouth Church, 1888), 14.
67 McCulloch, The Open Door, 8.
The line between Plymouth Church, the Indianapolis Benevolent Society, and the Charity Organization Society became blurred during McCulloch’s tenure as he led – perhaps embodied – all three institutions with remarkable energy. The IBS, COS, and several other clubs and charities promptly moved their headquarters into the new Plymouth Church. Soon the city’s charities occupied half the church’s administrative space. The proximity of all the headquarters under one roof allowed McCulloch to navigate among the interdependent organizations with relative ease.

McCulloch’s first sermon in the new building promised to make the church into a “people’s college.”68 He would have been gratified to know that one citizen’s reminiscence of 1880s Indianapolis described Plymouth Church as just that: “the splendid combination of church, school and club … where the welcome to everyone was cordial and genuine.”69 Indianapolis teacher Charity Dye similarly recalled Plymouth Church as one that embodied practical Christianity, including education.70 The people’s college became known as the Plymouth Institute, offering classes in traditional liberal arts subjects such as literature, mathematics, civics, history, philosophy, French, and German. McCulloch also intended the “people’s college” to supply what the poor were “missing” because of limited access to education, an example of philanthropy filling perceived gaps in services available from the public or business sectors.71 The institute included a free reading room. Poor children who had had to leave school at a young age could study reading, spelling, writing, and arithmetic. Practical classes such as mechanical drawing, woodworking, shorthand,

---

sewing, bookkeeping, and etiquette targeted working-class men and women with the hope of improving their employability through improved skills and manners – as settlements would do in a few short years. These classes were offered at night and at $1 per term, just enough to compensate the instructors, to attract as many people as possible.72

The civically engaged men in Indianapolis shared many social, professional, and church links, which facilitated philanthropic connections and governance. McCulloch recognized this network upon moving to the city and used such carefully cultivated social connections to build his own legitimacy and recruit future COS members and major donors. He courted members of Indianapolis’ social and business elite while he used Plymouth Church to promote spirituality, literacy, and culture. He served as a trustee of Indianapolis Public Schools and as an advisor to the Indianapolis Public Library and joined the city’s newly created prestigious male Literary Club, whose prominent founders included Colonel Eli Lilly, writer James Whitcomb Riley, and artist T. C. Steele.73 McCulloch’s first three Literary Club papers exposed his intellectual pursuits to an influential circle: Contributions of Darwinism to Religion, The Future of the Republic by R.W. Emerson, and Certain Dangerous Tendencies in American Life.74 Eleven of the thirty charter members of the Charity Organization Society also belonged to the Literary Club. In addition, six COS charter members served with McCulloch as Indianapolis School Board trustees

72 Year Book of Plymouth, 22-27.
74 Stephen C. Noland, comp., Indianapolis Literary Club Summarized Record, 1877-1934 (Indianapolis: Indianapolis Literary Club, 1934), 22-23.
(see Appendix 2). Hoping to be seen as a literary destination, Plymouth Church attracted the Literary Club as a tenant beginning in 1884 and hosted the Western Association of Writers in 1886.\(^{75}\)

Local accounts of McCulloch’s tenure at Plymouth Church credit him for beginning church-based social programs of applied philanthropy in Indianapolis. McCulloch’s biographer has called him Indiana’s “most effective and influential exponent” of the Social Gospel movement.\(^{76}\) Oscar McCulloch did not live long enough, however, for historians of the Social Gospel to consider him one of the movement’s leaders.\(^{77}\) C. Howard Hopkins’ study casts the Social Gospel of the 1880s as still “youthful,” when analysis and debate took place before action, organization, or technique.\(^{78}\) Scholars including Hopkins describe Richard Ely, Washington Gladden, Francis Greenwood Peabody, and Walter Rauschenbusch as the most influential leaders, and the period from 1890 to 1915 as the time in which the movement reached maturity and focus. The most significant books authored by Social Gospel leaders did not begin to appear until the late 1880s.\(^{79}\) McCulloch’s untimely death in 1891 truncated his opportunity to think, speak, write, and advocate about the application of Christian principles to social problems.

Perhaps historians should reconsider McCulloch’s legacy as a Social Gospel leader. As the first Indianapolis minister to apply Social Gospel principles, he not
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\(^{76}\) Weeks, *Oscar Carleton McCulloch*, xv.

\(^{77}\) Jacob Dorn comments in a book review that McCulloch likely would have received national recognition had he lived long enough for the Social Gospel to reach its peak. Jacob H. Dorn, review of Genevieve C. Weeks, *Oscar Carleton McCulloch* (1976), *American Historical Review* 82, no. 3 (June 1977): 752.


only transformed his church, he also set an example for others and created a ripple effect around the country. He worked with other ministers who served as COS founding trustees. When three of them moved out of Indianapolis, they each took the Social Gospel model of applied philanthropy with them: Reverend Myron Reed (First Presbyterian Church), H.D. Stevens (Unitarian Church), and William Charles Webb (Wesley Chapel). Reed moved to Denver fully intending to carry on the work done in Indianapolis. He laid out a similar work plan for the Denver COS, which Watson’s COS history described as a “child of the Indianapolis Society.” Stevens moved to several other cities and supported the church’s involvement in all “economic, civil, social, and moral relations of society.” He promoted the institutional church to be freely used for all “practicable” purposes: libraries, lectures, concerts, and classes. After Webb went on to Philadelphia, he advocated for organized charity, house-to-house visitation, and tenement and sweatshop reform. McCulloch of course worked closely with several other ministers who remained in the city, but these three men were notable for spreading the Social Gospel after having served with him in Indianapolis.

Tributes poured in when Reverend Oscar McCulloch died in 1891. The Indianapolis Sun mourned that mankind lost the cherished humanitarian “at the very heighth [sic] of his power for good.” The city considered renaming New York Street to McCulloch Street. Speakers at the 1892 NCCC Annual Conference
memorialized him as both “the American Philanthropist” and “the typical American minister” who exemplified a unique mix of two very different worldviews: practicality and idealism. 84 Indianapolis minister Mattias Loring Haines, a colleague and friend, believed McCulloch “created a unity and enthusiasm of spirit … not excelled by that of any city of equal size in our land.” 85

Indiana historians and social work leaders around the country remembered McCulloch as larger than life for many decades. Indianapolis historian Frederick Kershner described him as the “enlightened leader” who brought organization and systematic charity to rescue the poor from the “utter depths of wretchedness.” 86 Watson grouped him with Boston’s Robert Treat Paine and New York’s Josephine Shaw Lowell as three nationally known charity organizers from the beginning of the COS movement who would be “long remembered by all.” 87 Thirty-five years later, the NCCC’s published history, Frank Bruno’s Trends in Social Work, 1874-1946, similarly included McCulloch as one of outstanding “creators of charity organization method and molders of public opinion.” 88 To the NCCC, McCulloch still enjoyed fine company with national reputations: Boston’s Robert Treat Paine and Zilpha Smith, New York’s Josephine Shaw Lowell, and Baltimore’s Amos G. Warner. Bruno moreover cast McCulloch as the proverbial solitary man on a desert island, “all alone, a thousand miles from his nearest exemplars,” who was nevertheless able

85 Mattias Loring Haines, “Memories of Rev. Oscar C. McCulloch” Box 3, Folder 5, FSA Records.
87 Watson, The Charity Organization Movement, 7.
to lead the COS in establishing the latest principles. Dr. Thurman B. Rice, a full sixty years after McCulloch’s death, lauded the “pioneer social worker” who singlehandedly organized philanthropy in the city and brought “light to the bewildered, comfort to the sorrowing, and energy to the eager.” Finally, a 1966 Indianapolis News series on famous Hoosiers profiled him as “one of the most famous ministers Indianapolis ever had.” This assortment of testimonials attests to the strength of McCulloch’s personality, vitality, creativity, and ambition.

The unanimity of praise and its staying power, however, belie the complexity of Oscar McCulloch’s legacy as a charity organizer as scholars have come to understand it today. With the advent of eugenics studies, the 2007 Indiana Eugenics Project in particular, historians in the last twenty years remember McCulloch more for his role in the Indiana eugenics movement than as a benevolent social worker. McCulloch’s leadership set the tone for the Indianapolis COS to screen the unlucky or ill from the chronically poor who did not deserve assistance. His in-person investigations of poor clients led to the hypothesis that case work could lead to the identification of the hereditary roots of poverty. Scholars Nathaniel Deutsch, Steven Ray Hall, Brent Ruswick, Brian Siegel, and Alexandra Minna Stern have each written that McCulloch’s polemical “Tribe of Ishmael” (1888), and its suggested eugenic solutions to hereditary poverty, foregrounded the future Indiana eugenics movement.
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92 Indiana passed the first compulsory sterilization law in the country (and the world) in 1907. Much scholarly ink has been spilled over McCulloch, Center Township trustee investigator J.F. Wright, and
Historians Deutsch, Hall, and Ruswick acknowledge that McCulloch maintained the best of intentions for the common good and that over time he moved away from biological determinism toward economic and structural explanations of poverty.\(^93\) This conclusion, however, remains lost in their overall harsh judgment of McCulloch. Just as with his role in the Social Gospel movement, McCulloch’s untimely death cut short his opportunity to fully develop his theory and practice of poverty relief. How does McCulloch’s legacy, therefore, contribute to our understanding of the central phenomenon, how the men and women of Indianapolis responded during the organized charity movement? Reverend McCulloch sought to improve the overall socioeconomic conditions in the city. He maintained a holistic vision of an ideal community, one that necessarily minimized poverty and suffering. To achieve such a vision required long-term, systemic, sustainable, strategic philanthropy, rather than individual compassionate relief or charity. With this broad goal in mind, McCulloch helped to guide the city’s leaders in shifting from charity toward philanthropy.


The Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis: “Light Was Breaking All Around”

The leap from the reorganized IBS to the new organized charity model was not as great as previously understood. The IBS of 1879 had represented a blend of neighborhood benevolence and scientific charity that bridged the two eras. The IBS work plan contained traditional elements: cooperation with churches, other charities, and the township trustee; neighborhood districts; volunteer members; involvement of prominent men and women; and home visitation to investigate families and give advice. It also incorporated tenets of scientific philanthropy that would become hallmarks of the COS movement: centralization, the prevention of begging and pauperism, paid staff, and the sharing of the results of investigation among potential donors and city officials.94 The IBS established an employment bureau and systematically helped the able-bodied to obtain work through newspaper advertisements, such as, “Man just out of hospital; wants light work; can take care of horses and work about the house.”95 The IBS did not adopt worthy/unworthy criteria per se, but, as before, lauded those applicants who were trying to help themselves.

By the end of 1879, IBS volunteers exuded a sense of satisfaction and optimism that had been completely absent only one year before. Yet the Indianapolis People, advocate for the working class, did not miss the opportunity to comment on the society’s putative preferential treatment of some poor versus others. The paper cited an IBS plea to the public to refuse aid to “chronic paupers in order to force

---

94 “Benevolence,” Indianapolis Journal, January 17, 1879, p. 8; COS Historical Sketch ca. 1910, Box 3, Folder 5, FSA Records.
95 “The Benevolent Society,” Indianapolis Journal, December 5, 1879, p. 1,
them into lives of self dependence,” but cried out in anguish on behalf of the unemployed:  “In God’s name how can one help from being a ‘chronic poor’ person when he can get no work to put bread into his mouth?” Historians often cite this dichotomy of zealous volunteers and miserable clients to illustrate COS’s shortcomings, yet we will see that much middle ground actually existed.

Reverend Gurteen’s presentation to the IBS’s 1879 annual meeting provided the final impetus that propelled Indianapolis’ leaders firmly into scientific philanthropy. After Gurteen’s address, IBS members would recall, the society “added an intelligent mind to the existing charitable heart” as philanthropy in Indianapolis organized. Gurteen’s talk was passionate, as his “whole heart and soul” were devoted to the work, yet businesslike and absolutely convincing. He regaled the audience with the tale of woe that had been poverty in Buffalo:  “The evil had grown to such proportions that a large class had grown up entirely devoid of any feeling of independence, and who claimed charitable relief as a right.”  Gurteen described a transformation nothing short of miraculous. Everyone in need received help, the city saved $60,000 in two years, and – most importantly – every poor man became “a self-supporting and independent being, as God intended him to be.” He relayed what he called the lesson Buffalo would never forget that surely piqued everyone’s interest, the stunning realization that only central registration could unearth. Some applicants for aid were receiving assistance from three or four relief

96 “But the Greatest of These is Charity,” Indianapolis People, March 8, 1879, p. 5.
97 See for example Boyer, Urban Masses and Moral Order in America; Katz, In the Shadow of the Poorhouse.
100 “Helping the Poor,” Indianapolis Journal, December 1, 1879, p. 7.
societies, a dozen individuals, multiple churches, and the city government.101 After Gurteen convinced the assembly that organized charity would be a similar blessing for Indianapolis, a tutorial followed on how to begin.

Plans moved swiftly. Only three days passed before Oscar McCulloch’s authority over the city’s charitable missions broadened. McCulloch, Mayor Caven, and four prominent businessmen, meeting in the offices of future U.S. President Benjamin Harrison, founded the Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis (COS) and elected McCulloch as president.102 The new entity blanketed the city with two thousand copies of Gurteen’s speech. The IBS became what the founders called a co-operating agency of the COS and the merger created the largest private, nonprofit, social service organization in Indianapolis.103

Indianapolis formed one of the first COSs in the U.S., exactly two years after the Buffalo COS organized.104 McCulloch briefly, but intensely, researched the organized charity concept by visiting existing COSs in Buffalo and Boston. The newly formed Indianapolis COS fully embraced scientific philanthropic principles that the Benevolent Society had introduced earlier in 1879. By February, 1880 the Indianapolis COS had thirty founding donors and a well-developed constitution detailing “the objects of the society:”

102 The other four men also served as founding COS members: O’Connor, Walker, Wallace, and Yandes. “Charity Organization,” Indianapolis Journal, December 4, 1879, p. 3.
103 COS Historical Sketch ca. 1910, Box 3, Folder 5, FSA Records.
104 Indianapolis COS records repeatedly claimed it was the fifth COS in the country. Indianapolis, New York City, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, and Cincinnati formed their COSs nearly simultaneously after the Buffalo COS was founded. Edward T. Devine, The Principles of Relief (New York: Macmillan Company, 1910), 343. Gurteen’s records indicate Indianapolis was eleventh: New Haven, CT; Philadelphia, Brooklyn, and Syracuse in 1878; Newport, RI; Boston, Poughkeepsie, NY; Cincinnati, Portland, ME, and Indianapolis in 1879. Gurteen, A Handbook of Charity Organization, 19.
1. To see that all deserving cases of destitution are properly relieved.
2. To prevent indiscriminate and duplicate giving.
3. To make employment the basis of relief.
4. To secure the community from imposture.
5. To reduce vagrancy and pauperism and ascertain their true causes.  

McCulloch ran the COS and IBS from Plymouth Church, which became a magnet for much of the charity work in the city. As the expanded Plymouth Church housed several other charities’ offices, it became the command central of charities and public agencies. The church took on a strikingly secular name in this capacity, listed as the “Plymouth Building” for the COS, IBS, Flower Mission, and Maternity Society.

McCulloch met a kindred spirit in Smith King, the Center Township trustee (1876-1878), and their relationship informed COS theory and practice during its founding phase. Both men aspired to aid the truly needy while systematically improving the condition of the poor. If met, these goals translated into lower costs for taxpayers and private donors and would drive out poverty over the long run. Recall that municipal poor relief expenses had almost doubled during the 1873 depression until King virtually cut off aid to needy citizens when he took office in 1876. McCulloch and King began to go everywhere together, even to aid applicants’ homes for investigation. In 1877, King turned the trustee’s poor relief records, histories of 7,000 families, and the entire investigative function over to McCulloch as the latter pushed the IBS toward scientific methods.

The 1879 IBS case records and the 1880s COS case records, formatted in what became known as statistical blanks, include lengthy transcriptions of King’s
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106 Programme, COS Annual Meeting, December 1883, Box 4, Folder 6, FSA Records.
files. King used colorful language, hardly the records of a dispassionate bureaucrat or social scientist, which laid bare his opinions of applicants. His records ran the gamut from “this party needs help” to “he is untruthful, begging and unreliable, too lazy to work.” Occasionally he emphasized comments, such as “wanted for horse stealing,” by drawing a pointing hand in the margin.

While the COS spun the partnership with the trustee as a valuable, public/private collaboration, not everyone in the city was comfortable with the cozy relationship between government and philanthropy. The Indianapolis People, quite perceptively, noted the charity was:

in league with the township trustee and his sweet-scented detectives. They have formed a coalition, offensive and defensive, against the poor of the city. They work in harness most beautifully together.

To solidify the symbiotic, public/private relationship between the COS, other charities, and the trustee’s office, the undaunted COS immediately established the Confidential Exchange, at times known as the charity clearing house or the central registry. The exchange model began in Boston in 1876 and formed an integral element of the Buffalo plan. In Indianapolis, case records formed the nucleus of the exchange, the central registry of poor relief applicants for the entire city, tied to a dual card catalog sorted both by applicant’s name and by street. The exchange
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108 The “statistical blank” was an application format largely copied from the Buffalo COS. It captured: applicant’s name, address, time in the city, family names, ages, occupations, employer, assistance requested, physician, number of rooms occupied, monthly rent, rent due (if any), landlord, relations in the city or elsewhere able to assist, other sources of relief, references, and statement of applicant. The COS staff and volunteers completed these fields in case records as best they could, but data are often missing or incomplete. Indianapolis COS 1880 Case Book, BV 1198, FSA Records; Gurteen, A Handbook of Charity Organization, 164-165.
109 IBS 1879 Application Book, BV 1196, FSA Records.
110 “But the Greatest of These is Charity,” Indianapolis People, March 8, 1879, p. 4.
consolidated applications received by any charitable agency or the trustee’s office
and in turn was open to those agencies, the trustee, and the Police Department for
examination at any time. The exchange created a tool to meet multiple COS goals:
it facilitated communication among agencies, eliminated the inefficiency of multiple
investigations, and exposed multiple aid requests. The exchange promised to build
over time the most effective weapon in the struggle to end pauperism, never before
available to charities: the power to uncover the root causes of poverty. The
exchange allowed COSs to accumulate data, analyze them, and link cause and effect
in a truly scientific manner. Here lay the greatest leap from neighborhood
benevolence to scientific philanthropy. Aid applicants became specimens in a
massive social experiment to improve the quality of life in all communities that
organized charity.

COSs’ exchanges evolved quickly around the country into what Watson
called an engine for social cooperation, the “sine qua non” of all effective organized
charity for decades. The diagram he included in The Charity Organization Movement
bore the label Cleveland, Ohio, but it accurately represented the Indianapolis
Confidential Exchange: 

---

112 Watson, The Charity Organization Movement, 409.
113 Ibid., 129.
McCulloch made certain that the Plymouth Building maintained and controlled the central registry, which was not a fait accompli in every city with a COS.\textsuperscript{114} The COS hired three full-time staff in its first year: Henry D. Stevens, executive secretary; Kate F. Parker, agent; and Susie K. Rohrer, investigator. It added four more women to the investigative staff by 1882.\textsuperscript{115} The team of paid staff and volunteers meticulously compiled data through a variety of means. Paid staff case workers and volunteers complemented one another’s roles in working with the poor. Staff conducted initial investigations and gathered a variety of demographic data; volunteers followed up with counseling visits and conducted supplementary investigations.

\textsuperscript{114} As late as 1940, the successor to the Confidential Exchange, known as the Social Service Exchange, was operated by the nonprofit Council of Social Agencies. Of forty cities with over 250,000 in population that still ran exchanges, Indianapolis was the only major city in which a single nonprofit agency operated one. “The Social Service Exchange,” \textit{News Bulletin of the Council of Social Agencies} 42 (November 1941): 1, (ISL Clipping File: Indianapolis - Social Work). In some cities, an independent committee representing multiple charities ran exchanges. In other cities, the exchange operated as an independent nonprofit agency. Watson, \textit{The Charity Organization Movement}, 125.

\textsuperscript{115} The other investigators were single women: Mary F. Algire, Belle S. Ford, and Fannie M. Parker. Algire and the Parkers belonged to Plymouth Church. Kate Parker transcribed the initial case record books, drawing data from the IBS, Flower Mission, Orphan Asylum, City Dispensary, City Hospital, and Township Trustee. Executive Committee Minutes, BV 1170, FSA Records.
The COS offices in the Plymouth Building remained open twenty-four hours a day.\textsuperscript{116} Energy charged the premises as charity workers and volunteers moved in and around their offices with a sense of purpose, but they were not alone. Prospective clients often applied in person to the IBS or COS, so a steady stream of needy people filed into the Plymouth Building each day. As Oscar McCulloch’s daughter Ruth recalled, “hither came … the weary poor driven to the limit by their deprivations and troubles.”\textsuperscript{117} Both the privileged and unfortunate, putative giver and receiver, converged on the central office where at times the case investigation began. Whether applicants self-reported or were referred by others, interviews occurred in the offices, applicants’ homes, and chance meetings on the street. COS staff and volunteers – acting as both case workers and detectives – consulted with applicants’ neighbors, landlords, clergy, doctors, teachers, policemen, and patrons who referred the applicants, to round out application data. The registrar combed local newspapers for stories about applicants, such as arrests, deaths of family members, or cases of need, and pasted clippings into the permanent record. The exchange captured anyone in penal and reformatory institutions and passing through the court system.\textsuperscript{118} Staff and volunteers recorded their comments in one- to two-page entries per applicant; an index of names allowed the COS to chart impoverished family groups.

This nature of data gathered adumbrates the essence of social work practice today, to promote the well-being of people and social justice. The social work

\textsuperscript{117} McCulloch, “Plymouth Church-II,” 97.
profession is built upon the cornerstones of interviewing, intervention, and connecting people to resources.\textsuperscript{119} Indianapolis COS records reflected each of these three key elements, a full twenty years before Mary Richmond codified these principles in \textit{Friendly Visiting among the Poor} (1899) or her well-known NCCC address, “Charitable Cooperation” (1901). In her 1901 NCCC address, Richmond described ideal relief in terms of six circles: family at the center; surrounded by friends and relatives; neighborhood forces such as neighbors, fellow church members, and fraternal organizations; civic forces including police and health officers; private charitable forces including COSs, churches, philanthropists, and charities; and public relief as the last resort. Richmond described the first four forces – family, personal, neighborhood, and civic – as “natural resources.” If someone came to the COS for aid, the natural resources must all have failed thereby sending the family “crashing down through circles” until it reached private charity.\textsuperscript{120}


The investigation process undertaken in Indianapolis and ranking of resources worked hand in glove, although Indianapolis charity workers did not yet possess the professional lexicon with which to express their relationship. Investigation aimed to create a complete picture of each individual’s situation and what resources may be available to them far beyond the usual requests for clothing, shoes, groceries, coal, and the occasional loan for rent. COS workers attempted to make connections to a broad array of resources, and did so in this loose priority order, in hopes of resolving the client’s predicament. While they could not have articulated the goal precisely, COS workers aimed to get families as close to the center of the circles – family – as possible by engaging the other forces, as Richmond later would prescribe.

Circumstances of chronic illness, unemployment, substance abuse, transience, or criminal behavior frustrated case workers. At times they felt there was little they could do outside of institutionalization; at other times families and individuals resisted anything less than the short-term handouts they sought. Individuals often
had no resources other than charity, so connection to other resources was nearly impossible. Denial of assistance resulted in part because the COS didn't have the tools to help everyone and in part because case workers could not relate to applicants with addictive or criminal histories and the specter of “unworthiness” that appeared before them.

By the time she published *Social Diagnosis* (1917), Richmond significantly expanded her data, theory, and prioritization of resources into lengthy chapters. In the interim years, the circle diagram was widely reprinted in social work publications including Amos Warner’s influential *American Charities.* When we view organized charity workers’ early efforts to collect case histories and connect clients to resources at the innermost circles, even given their inchoate conception of resource prioritization at the time, a deliberate strategy to encourage self-sufficiency emerges – not a sinister agenda.

Indianapolis COS employees and volunteers painstakingly worked to assess families’ needs, determine the extent of existing available resources, and plan a course of action. The “district committee,” again a feature of the Buffalo plan, wielded the COS’s power as it diagnosed applicants’ domestic problems and set the course for possible public or private response. The first district committee met within ninety days of the COS’ founding. The committee met weekly, with McCulloch presiding, and considered up to twenty cases. Delegates from as many as

---


122 Gurteen, *A Handbook of Charity Organization,* 134-135; Watson, *The Charity Organization Movement,* 134. The Indianapolis COS began operations under the assumption that one district committee, essentially encompassing the Mile Square, could manage all relief applications. As the organization matured and the city’s population climbed, the COS expanded to three district committees in tandem with police precincts.
eighteen churches and charities comprised the committee, with men and women represented in equal measure. Watson’s history granted that men “as well as women” could sit on district committees, as though women were included out of courtesy but were largely ornamental. In Indianapolis, women attended on behalf of the IBS, Flower Mission, and trustee’s office. Women were active and engaged participants, exercising some of their most powerful influence within the new COS framework.

Decisions rendered covered the wide range of possible outcomes from no relief needed, relief denied, or connections to a multitude of public or private resources (trustee, hospital, dispensary, employers, soldiers’ pensions, churches, charities, friends and relatives), at times in combination. The gray area between relief and no relief could be addressed through advertising for work, helping to find other housing, publicly exposing the applicant as a fraud, and warning to stop street begging. The COS followed some cases for many years and notes tracked employment, health, and family status after relief or work had been furnished.

Evidence contradicts COSs’ reputation for hardheartedness and their sole application of moral criteria when handling cases. The COS movement’s presumed legacy, with the worthy/unworthy construct in its heyday, belies the complexity of organized charities’ practices. The Indianapolis District Committee labeled fewer

---

123 Watson, *The Charity Organization Movement*, 134. Ruswick cites only secondary literature to conclude that Indianapolis women only served as visitors and investigators, then reported their findings to men who made decisions on worthiness. Ruswick, *Almost Worthy*, 76. Author’s review of COS District Committee meeting minutes contradicts his conclusion as they reflect women’s significant involvement.

124 District Committee Meetings Minute Book, 1880-1883, BV 1177 and 1883-1884, Box 1, Folder 6, FSA Records.
than 4 percent of cases as unworthy, undeserving, fraudulent, or transient. The committee denied assistance for reasons having nothing to do with so-called worthiness: the applicant moved, died, or could not be located; the family breadwinner reappeared or was able to work again; or someone had referred the applicants when they did not want help from the COS in the first place.

As the Indianapolis COS began formal investigation and record keeping, it classed applicants into one of three groups: worthy of relief, in need of work, or unworthy of relief (see Appendix 4). Each class contained sub-categories which attempted to capture the causes of dependence. The COS granted temporary assistance to the truly dependent, including orphans, widows, the elderly, the ill, and injured. Between 1879 and 1890, it granted relief for approximately 60 percent of applicants, representing 19,000 individuals. It denied relief to those it labeled “not requiring or unworthy” of relief. At first glance, to deny one-third of applicants as unworthy appears unreasonable. But about half of the individuals in this broad category had other resources such as property or extended family. In addition, as noted above, COS investigators determined that many cases did not require relief. The COS turned away criminals, transients, or those who would not consider working to support themselves.

---

126 Author reviewed decisions rendered for approximately 2,000 cases over four years. Decisions related to unworthiness included unworthy/undeserving 55, tramp/gypsy/transient 9, and fraud 11 – totaling 75 cases. District Committee Meetings Minute Book, 1880-1883, BV 1177 and 1883-1884, Box 1, Folder 6, FSA Records.
127 Annual Report 1884-85, Box 4, Folder 7 FSA Records; Minute Book 1879-1916, BV 1170, FSA Records.
Gurteen never returned to Indianapolis, but McCulloch read his essays and purchased his *Handbook of Charity Organization* (1882). McCulloch’s handwritten notes, left inside his copy of Gurteen’s manual, reflected the points he felt most critical to guide the Indianapolis COS: “How to help the poor ‘right not good,’ Benevolence, Biblical poor always with us, Beggars, Worthy, Investigation, Causes of Poverty.”

McCulloch studied the London system and quoted Octavia Hill regularly. The tenets of investigation, root cause analysis, and aid which could be interpreted as “right not good,” cornerstones of scientific philanthropy, indeed became the hallmark of the Indianapolis COS, which simultaneously led and supported the national movement.

Indianapolis COS leaders, McCulloch in particular, gained national recognition. McCulloch and his COS staff attended NCCC annual meetings, at which he spoke regularly. In 1891, McCulloch served as the Conference’s president and brought the annual convention to Indianapolis. Throughout the 1880s, Indianapolis entertained visitors from Cincinnati, Louisville, Minneapolis, Pittsburgh, and Terre Haute to share expertise on the organized charity model.

Less than one year after the Indianapolis COS formed, McCulloch presented the speech “Associated Charities” at the 1880 NCCC annual meeting. His cogent talk, the first report on charity organization for a national audience, provided a comprehensive blueprint for anyone to create a COS. Thereafter, he received numerous speaking invitations as an authority on organized charity. He spoke at the

---

128 Handwritten notes inserted into McCulloch’s copy of Gurteen, *Handbook of Charity Organization* (1882), Box 3, Folder 5, FSA Records.
129 1885 Annual Report, Box 4, Folder 7, FSA Records.
1880 annual meeting of the American Social Science Association and at regional conferences in Cincinnati, Denver, and Milwaukee. Organized charity leaders cited McCulloch’s “Associated Charities” regularly for the next twenty years. In 1899, after the widespread development and expansion of COSs across the U.S., the New York COS’s Edward T. Devine researched the movement’s history, expecting to find considerable change in COS principles since the 1879 founding. Devine described McCulloch’s 1880 address: “I find none … more complete, more convincing, more inspiring, than that exceptionally compact and lucid statement.” A full twenty years after the movement had launched in Buffalo, Devine had not expected to find McCulloch’s primer, and its methods, not only valid but still the best tutorial available.

Those involved in organizing charity in Indianapolis exhibited optimism and enthusiasm for the possibility of the new system to eradicate poverty, well beyond the relief of human suffering left in its wake. In his 1880 address, for example, McCulloch wrote the new strategy was “full of promise of a time when ‘the day breaks and the shadows flee away.’” Alexander Johnson, who spent much of his career in Indiana, remembered the 1880s in Indianapolis as a period of hopefulness when “light was breaking all around.” The city’s men and women, with their charismatic leader, immersed themselves in the work, experimented, and took risks.

133 Weeks, Oscar Carleton McCulloch, 213.
These attributes, as well as Indiana’s relatively large population during this time, made the COS an organization to imitate rather than dismiss.

Gaining Community Consensus and Legitimacy: “The Circle of Charities”

The Indianapolis COS knit together a “circle of charities” to unite “in a common effort to strengthen that which is weak and lift up that which is fallen down.” The circle of charities linked philanthropy, government, and business as all three sectors acted as providers designed to form a seamless unit. The highly visual “circle” image appeared early in COS literature and prevailed for many years. Its genesis is unclear, but the circle does not appear to have emanated from Gurteen or the Buffalo COS. The circle had multiple interpretations. Several speeches at the charity’s annual meetings likened the COS to Indianapolis’ Union Station:

Now all roads run into the Union Depot. The thousands of passengers buy tickets at the central office and are directed to the train they wish to take. There is no confusion. No one misses a train. No time is lost by transfer or by mistake, and much money is saved. The various charities of this city are associated in the same way.

As all roads converged in Union Station, all charitable efforts should converge in the Plymouth Building and the Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis. Civic boosters in the 1880s similarly employed the circle image to promote the city’s centrality as a railroad center, with Union Station as the hub, as though all roads led to Indianapolis. The hub-and-spoke image that represented the thriving, industrial city of Indianapolis simultaneously represented bustling, enthusiastic, modern,
scientific philanthropy with charitable resources connected to the COS hub as spokes of a wheel.

The COS used data to reinforce its centrality in the circle of charity work. Because the COS immediately captured statistics, it could report how many people the entire circle of charities aided. It used the circle image at its 1886 annual meeting, for example, to convey the number of clients whom the public and private providers in its orbit had served over the first six years of organized charity. The resemblance between the two drawings is remarkable. Although the COS did not record that it borrowed the circle idea from the city diagram, it is reasonable to assume that it did so.139

139 Indianapolis Benevolent Society, Year-Book of Charities: Work of 1885-86 (Indianapolis: Carlon & Hollenbeck, 1886), 49.
Methodist Minister H.A. Cleveland delivered another interpretation, that of the client at the center of a circle surrounded by charitable resources that share a common goal: "This is the true idea and object of the COS – to draw around the poor, the miserable, the neglected, forsaken, and the evil, a circle of sympathy,
affection, intelligent through resolute will.”\textsuperscript{140} The two circle images connoted very different priorities. One placed the COS as undoubtedly in control of poor relief in the city, the other focused on the client as though he could control his own destiny with a stable of resources at his disposal. Mary Richmond, as we have seen, would use the circle imagery in the future to reflect the proper prioritization of resource consumption and dependence. Richmond’s use of circle imagery stands in contrast to the Indianapolis images of either the COS or the client at the center of the circle, reflecting multiple perspectives and priorities depending on the message being conveyed and the intended audience. Most of the time, the Indianapolis COS referred to the circle as the continuous network of resource providers that it coordinated and managed from the literal and figurative center of the city.

The circle of charities encompassed the IBS, the COS’s own employment agency, workhouse, and shelter; churches; voluntary asylums and aid societies; public entities including the township trustee, City Hospital, and City Dispensary; and businesses as potential employers for those actively seeking work or compelled to work as a condition of receiving aid. Aid societies reflected specialization by religion, ethnicity, and race, as they catered to Jewish, Catholic, German, and African-American clientele.\textsuperscript{141} The COS granted numerous city officials ex-officio seats on its board: the mayor, Board of Health president, City Dispensary superintendent, chief of police, city physician, and township trustee.\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{140} Ten Minute Talks on Phases of Charity delivered at the Fifty-Third Anniversary of the IBS, Dec 1, 1889, Box 5, Folder 6, FSA Records.
\textsuperscript{141} Programme, COS Annual Meeting, December 1883, Box 4, Folder 6, FSA Records.
\textsuperscript{142} COSs’ government collaboration and ex-officio board seats varied in other cities according to local conditions. Henderson, \textit{Introduction to the Study of the Dependent}, 155.
McCulloch knew he needed the support of philanthropic women and the clergy for centralized charity to be effective. Just after the COS formed, he met with forty women from the Flower Mission and the Southside Aid Society who he felt were most interested in relief work and amenable to joining the circle. He convinced them, after considerable persuading, to share their statistics in his preferred format and provide weekly reports “in order to have a general statistical record of all benevolent work kept at some one place in the city for reference and use by all.” While McCulloch recorded that the meeting was harmonious, the ladies had strong opinions and did not readily surrender their authority. He also convened nine ministers for the same purpose; McCulloch’s notes indicate less resistance from the clergy to participate in the COS circle.¹⁴³ We may conclude that women were more protective of their benevolent agenda as charity work was an important part of their identities. It is also plausible that the clergy considered social service work secondary to their primary responsibilities, the spiritual well-being of their congregations, so they willingly cooperated with the COS.

Thirty men bought annual or lifetime subscriptions as COS charter members. Local businesses made significant and annually recurring donations. These founding members directed the COS and, as today, brought significant financial resources both as individuals and on behalf of their corporations and proprietorships. The meatpacker Kingan and Co., the largest corporate donor for twenty-five consecutive years, joined as a corporate member. No Kingan executive joined the COS in the founding years, but the plant employed hundreds of workers whose families may

¹⁴³ The ministers represented African American, Catholic, Congregational, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Quaker churches. Minute Book 1879-1918, BV 1178, FSA Records.
have needed charitable relief from time to time. Occasionally employees of major employers donated through organized workplace campaigns, a federated fundraising practice decades ahead of the War Chest or Community Chest. Prominent business and religious leaders governed the COS, and several charities in the circle, from its 1879 inception. COS members were a relatively homogenous group: white, upper-middle class, well educated, mid-career, well established in their professions, at least second-generation Indianapolis residents, civically active, generous, and often pillars of their churches. Most men were Protestant, although St. John’s Catholic priest August Bessonies and the Jewish lawyer Nathaniel Morris joined the COS. Father Bessonies and Bishop Chatard expressed delight that the city had “at last found a platform of charity large enough for us all to stand upon.” Bessonies appears to have virtually leaped into the circle of charities, as he told COS members that he had more poor residents in his parish than all other churches in the city combined.

COS founding members’ socioeconomic status rose, and their homes began to concentrate in several beautiful tree-lined neighborhoods and along prominent streets. Indianapolis in this decade was still what Kenneth Jackson calls a “walking city,” with the tendency of fashionable addresses to be located close to the center of town. Neighbors knew one another and routinely strolled by each others’ residences. Extended families lived together or in adjacent properties, almost in compounds, even after adult children married. Many men participated in the same

144 1880-1905 Society Subscription Books, BV 1172 and Box 4, Folder 8, FSA Records.
social clubs, all located within the Mile Square, at a time when club membership provided loci for making and deepening connections (see Appendix 2). COS members’ wives knew each other through the formal institution of visiting, women’s social clubs, church membership, or philanthropy. All these conditions created many opportunities for interactions and intermarriage among this tightly knit group was not uncommon. When the *Red Book of Indianapolis* (1895), Indianapolis’ first installment of its social register, appeared, the names of COS members filled its pages.  

Recall the diagram from Chapter Two that portrays the rationale for the creation and sustainability of nonprofit organizations. The COS of the 1880s uniquely embodied all four quadrants: philanthropy’s instrumental role, expressive role, demand-side orientation, and supply-side orientation. The COS delivered poor relief services amid a changing landscape ripe for a new approach that harnessed McCulloch’s entrepreneurial talents. The new organization provided a vehicle for the local tradition of voluntary association to coalesce into significant social capital building and highly visible expressions of community engagement through their COS work. As the dominant nonprofit in the city, the COS served a role that some scholars describe as a mediating structure, an institution that

147 The institution of visitation, not to be confused with charitable friendly visitation, involved calling on one another at home for social purposes, usually on designated days of the week. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, “The Female World of Love and Ritual: Relations between Women in Nineteenth-Century America,” *Signs* 1, no. 1 (Autumn 1975): 10.


connected individuals’ private and public lives.\textsuperscript{150} Other mediating structures had developed in Indianapolis since 1820: families, neighborhoods, congregations, and other clubs and benevolent organizations. Now these entities worked together in a unified fashion as charity organization provided a pathway to civic participation for both men and women through leadership and governance, donating, and volunteering. Participation in the COS furthermore created new spaces for interaction among citizens as they strove to address a local problem – the essence of social capital creation.\textsuperscript{151} Men and women, already connected to one another in the community through interrelated networks, now mobilized behind the organized charity concept to act on their own value systems and pursue their own visions of the civic ideal.

Because the high-profile charter members signed on to the COS concept so quickly, their support lent credibility to the organization that could not be matched by any other single philanthropic entity. Business leaders readily embraced COS principles, as business and organized charity shared a common value system. The COS encouraged middle-class virtues of “thrift, self-dependence, industry, and ... good conduct.”\textsuperscript{152} McCulloch argued that addressing poverty was also smart


\textsuperscript{151} Many definitions of social capital exist, for example sociologist James Coleman’s enduring definition: the value embodied in relations among persons, particularly the change in relations among persons that facilitate actions formed through ongoing association. Coleman identified three forms of social capital at the individual level of analysis: obligations and expectations, based on the trustworthiness of the social environment, information-flow capability of the social structure, and norms accompanied by sanction. James S. Coleman, “Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital,” \textit{American Journal of Sociology} 94 Supplement (1988): S118-S119.

\textsuperscript{152} 1882 Report of the Committee, BV 1170, FSA Records.
business: “It is true of cities as of individuals, that consideration for the poor is the foundation-stone of prosperity.”\footnote{McCulloch, “Fifty Years’ Work,” 12.} The COS’s 1889 report to the community stated explicitly that it adopted “scientific principles and business methods,” which allowed it to “strike at the very root of evil” in a business-like way.\footnote{Indianapolis Benevolent Society, \textit{Year-Book of Charities: Work of 1888-89}, 7, 21.} The appeal for financial support was two-pronged, based on genuine sympathy for fellow men and a “business investment” to prevent poverty.\footnote{Ibid., 32.} Internal and external reports are shot through with the lexicon of business: machinery, study, classification, ascertain causes, effectiveness, and cost savings.

Organized charity found ready supporters from businessmen who felt they were the most conspicuous targets of requests for alms. Founding COS member Silas Bowen explained the appeal of organization: “The merchants, the bankers, all are very easy of access, and when we permit begging they are easily found. Some of us remember when it was almost a necessity to give a dime to provide a person with a meal … you could hardly refuse.”\footnote{Silas T. Bowen, “The Financial Method,” Indianapolis Benevolent Society, \textit{Year-Book of Charities: Work of 1888-89}, 21.} After charity had been organized for several years, he continued, street begging almost disappeared and helping the poor help themselves was done in an economical and businesslike manner. In another annual meeting address, banker John P. Frenzel stressed the ideal of a self-reliant and independent city. “Morality and economy,” he said, “are twin companions. A community having for its chief characteristics, economy and frugality, guarantees the greatest safety to life and property; more joy and comfort in the homes of its

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item McCulloch, “Fifty Years’ Work,” 12.
  \item Ibid., 32.
\end{itemize}
people.” Frenzel thus reinforced traditional pillars of industry and thrift as directly linked to improved quality of life for both givers and receivers within the COS system.

Much of the Indianapolis community supported the organized charity concept, but not everyone unilaterally accepted COS principles or joined the circle of charities. The YMCA secretary objected to a church and a charity board housed under the same roof, “so long as the pastor was president.” Dr. McLeod, minister of the Second Presbyterian Church, also dissented. At an Indianapolis Ministers’ Association meeting, McLeod attacked McCulloch for deceptive fundraising and called the methods outright espionage. He accused that donors did not know where their donations went. In fact, he alleged that donations remained with the COS and did not go toward relief. McLeod further objected to any pastor presiding over any charity and felt the IBS and COS offices should be removed from Plymouth Church. The purpose of the meeting, to update the ministerial community on the COS work, erupted in shouting. The Indianapolis Journal noted dryly that “a spirit of harmony” did not prevail.

Most of the criticism, not surprisingly, came from the working class, whose members represented a large share of the COS’s clientele. The pro-labor Indianapolis People, horrified at charity workers who “spied” on the poor to ascertain their

---

159 “Methods of Charity Work,” Indianapolis Journal, April 13, 1886, p. ? As Appendix 2 demonstrates, many COS leaders (as well as Benjamin Harrison) belonged to First Presbyterian. McLeod’s position possibly reflects an institutional division within the Presbyterian Church. The “new school” Second Presbyterian was still known as “Beecher’s church,” and had grown to approximately 800 congregants by 1885. The “old school” First Presbyterian Church had approximately 400 congregants at that time. Sulgrove, History of Indianapolis and Marion County, 394-395.
putative morality, harkened, “Who made Oscar C. McCulloch a judge of his fellows?” and felt he did not pattern his ministry after his Savior.\textsuperscript{160} The \textit{Indianapolis People} had begun lambasting the IBS since it reorganized in 1879 and continued to upbraid the COS for its treatment of the poor:

> What the devil is the meaning of the sign … on the corner of Meridian Street and the Circle – “Charity Organization School, No Relief Given Here.” The charity that does not give relief seems rather a nuisance, we should think, and ought to be cut down.\textsuperscript{161}

The COS faced another obstacle in convincing the public that it had the best interest of the poor in mind. COS founding member John H. Holliday noted it took hard work “to overcome the prejudices” of ministers, laymen, and officials in that the organization did not distribute 100 percent of its donations in relief.\textsuperscript{162} The COS had to justify that it spent a portion of its revenue on general and administrative overhead. The public today expects nonprofits to pay for staff, overhead, and programs, although fundraising expenses often come under fire. The COS did not face this sort of allocation question, but had to defend its hiring of paid staff to conduct investigation and registration as the predecessor IBS had been an all-volunteer organization.

Despite the rumbling of dissent, the COS expanded the circle of charities and its programs every year through the 1880s. Each annual meeting showcased speeches from a variety of agencies and programs displayed the ever-widening circle. By 1884, the COS believed it had overcome most objections and earned public confidence. “The work,” it announced, “is now seen in its positive rather than its

\textsuperscript{160} “Editorial Etchings,” \textit{Indianapolis People}, October 25, 1879, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{161} “Editorial Etchings,” \textit{Indianapolis People}, May 21, 1881, p. 4.
negative light. Its refusals to aid are seen to rest on an intelligent and sympathetic study of each case.”

The same year, it reported that a feeling of solidarity developed among the men and women fighting the common enemy of poverty. By 1889, the circle expanded from a handful to thirty-two private and public agencies and the COS boasted that it had something for everyone who wished to participate in its work: “We have all freely received, let all freely give. Take the list and give to each something that shall represent your interest in the work that is being done. You can not go amiss” (see Appendix 5). By 1893 the COS boasted thirty-six agencies in its published list, but claimed fifty societies “actually at work” because it had so many churches “in actual affiliation” with the circle.

During the 1880s the Indianapolis COS expanded aggressively with the core staff of five employees and a cadre of volunteers. The organization founded several agencies and programs under its auspices: Friendly Inn and Wood Yard, Maternity Society, Free Kindergarten and Children’s Aid Society, Dime Savings & Loan, Summer Mission for Sick Children, and, together with the Flower Mission, a nurse training program at City Hospital. It took years for the COS to balance expected donations with fluctuating case loads, so the organization borrowed money regularly. Donations supported most of the organization’s budget, although the Friendly Inn charged nominal fees for service to defray some of the cost of

163 Annual Report of the IBS and COS 1884-1885, Box 4, Folder 7, FSA Records.
164 Names of agencies appear in the order in which they are listed in the program. Program, IBS Annual Meeting, December 1890, Box 5, Folder 7, FSA Records.
166 Little, “History of the Family Service Association,” 34.
In addition to increased instrumental service delivery, the COS voiced concern for the disadvantaged through advocacy. It lobbied across all sectors for social change such as improvements in public asylums, creation of the Board of Children’s Guardians and a State Board of Charities, and closure of wine rooms and public lotteries.\footnote{Indianapolis Benevolent Society, \textit{Year-Book of Charities: Work of 1890-91} (Indianapolis: Baker Randolph Co., 1892), 31.}

The COS worked hard to build its coalition of stakeholders by educating the public on the merits of organized charity theory and practice. It promised to “aid in the diffusion of knowledge” on matters of poor relief, a phrase that soon would be known worldwide as part of the Carnegie Corporation’s mission statement.\footnote{Executive Committee Report, February 1882, BV 1170, FSA Records.} An early annual report declared how much the COS itself, its supporters, and the public had already come to learn: “Humanity is neither Hebrew nor Christian. So much is learned in these days of broad and sunny philanthropy.”\footnote{1884 Annual Report, BV 1170, FSA Records.} It supplied a monthly column to the \textit{Indianapolis Journal}, provided regular features to the \textit{Indianapolis Sentinel} and \textit{Indianapolis News}, published annual reports, and packed the fashionable English Opera House on Monument Circle for annual reporting and fundraising meetings. Men and women shared the dais to regale the mixed-gender crowd with heartwarming stories of its work of the preceding year. Annual meetings filled English’s hall to its 2,500 seat capacity, required audience members to stand in the back of the house, and even turned some people away.

The COS continually reinforced the power of solidarity that organized charity, unlike individual almsgiving, could create. At an annual meeting it lauded

\footnote{Little, “History of the Family Service Association,” 29.}

\footnote{Little, “History of the Family Service Association,” 29.}
the collective efforts of the circle charities, the possibility to end poverty, and the 
social capital the COS created: “By association of charitable effort the *causes* of ill 
may be stopped. Then the number of men and women associated can do together 
what they could not do separately – they can mass their forces, concentrate their 
energies, enlist their friends.”171 The COS also counseled caring citizens on the inner 
turmoil they might feel over altruistic and egoistic motivations of giving. 
Investigation was not simply spying on poor applicants, it led to the proper solutions 
for all concerned. The COS upbraided donors through print and speeches if they 
unwittingly gave handouts to beggars. “We must know the facts in every case and 
not give blindly,” it advised. “Blind giving is selfish giving. It is self-satisfaction.”172 
“When you have fed a beggar … you congratulate yourself that you have done a 
charitable act,” the COS didactically wrote, “but you have really done the worst 
thing for that person that you possibly could.”173 By working through the 
intermediary of organized charity, thus engaging the professional expertise it brought 
to social problems, donors could give more intelligently and beneficially. 

Quotations from American and British leaders in philanthropy ran through 
COS literature to add credibility to its educational messages. It regularly cited 
Gurteen, Robert Treat Paine, Washington Gladden, and Octavia Hill. Absent, 
however, were lessons from founders of the early modern benevolent trusts. The 
COS clearly had a different function than a trust, but they all shared much of the 
philosophy on proper giving. Steel magnate turned philanthropist Andrew Carnegie, 
for example, authored one of the most famous essays on the burden of wealth and

173 *Indianapolis Sentinel*, January 12, 1890, COS Scrapbook, BV 1190, FSA Records.
responsible beneficence, “Wealth,” commonly referred to as “The Gospel of Wealth.” Scholars have cited “Wealth” hundreds of times and it is known to every student of philanthropy. When he followed “Wealth” with “The Best Fields for Philanthropy,” Carnegie recommended seven instruments that were pragmatic and utilitarian, “calculated to do the masses lasting good.” He believed in donating “ladders upon which the aspiring can rise,” such as the ubiquitous Carnegie libraries, to help those who would help themselves.\(^{174}\) Carnegie feared that almsgiving would weaken not only individuals but the human race. He solemnly warned of the dangers of indiscriminate charity: “It were better for mankind that the millions of the rich were thrown into the sea than so spent as to encourage the slothful, the drunken, the unworthy.”\(^{175}\) This well-known phrase has been interpreted many times and may be considered one of the harshest sentiments of scientific philanthropy.

“Wealth” appeared in *North American Review* in June 1889. The identical sentiment was expressed by the unknown Kate F. Parker of Indianapolis several months before. The young widow was the second full-time COS employee, hired in 1880 as agent and later promoted to registrar. A tireless worker, and an organized charity and Oscar McCulloch disciple, Parker was usually invisible in public meetings or press coverage of COS work. But Kate Parker was everywhere. She attended every district committee meeting and friendly visitors meeting, and served on boards of related charities. In a rare interview, she described to the *Indianapolis*


two sides of the same coin, the dangers of improper giving and the importance of work and self-sufficiency:

These people make a great mistake in giving to these [able-bodied] men. It is simply money thrown away. If the beggars did not find it an easy way of obtaining money they would look for work instead. Were that money placed in a way to furnish work to those men, it would be much better.  

Parker was one of many women who worked or volunteered for the COS and the circle of charities, often unrecognized and invisible to scholars today, but no less crucial to the benevolent work in Indianapolis. These women, usually married to successful middle-class men, met face-to-face with the poor and unfortunate women who applied for charitable relief. Benevolent work brought together women of leisure and women who had fallen on hard times and may have committed crimes. Their interactions present another dimension of organized charity.

Women Encounter Organized Charity: “To Lighten the Burdens Which Poverty Brings”

The moral foundation in Indianapolis provided a platform from which women launched benevolent initiatives. Faith and values, as discussed in Chapter Two, had for many years integrated Christian duty, humanitarian compassion, and charity. The days of outdoor religious revival meetings had long since given way to brick and stone. By 1884, Indianapolis boasted eighty-eight churches representing sixteen major denominations. Church networks had fostered the development of the Indianapolis Orphan Asylum, Home for Friendless Women, and Indianapolis Asylum for Friendless Colored Children. The social capital created within churches

---

177 Sulgrove, History of Indianapolis and Marion County, 389.
led women to organize for other purposes. Now the organized charity movement presented new roles for women as paid agents and volunteer friendly visitors.

Early on, the Indianapolis COS stated its primary object as the “social and moral elevation of the poor,” language lifted directly from the Buffalo constitution. This it would achieve “by bringing the richer and poorer classes into closer relations with each other by means of a thorough system of house-to-house visitation.” The erstwhile IBS volunteer and Elberfeld poor guardian merged into the role of the COS volunteer friendly visitor. Gurteen acknowledged the importance of personal relationships embedded into the Elberfeld model and believed the “moral support of true friendship” to be “the chief need of the poor today.” The social, moral, and intellectual support extended in Elberfeld had proven to be effective; the poor lived in better conditions and begging was no longer necessary. McCulloch noted the integral role of the Elberfeld poor guardian, commenting that the German system administered relief “intelligently, through an intimate knowledge of the poor person’s life.” Visitation thus became integral to the Indianapolis COS’s mission, as it hoped one-on-one counseling would completely obviate the need for material relief. It bombarded the public with the message “not alms, but a friend,” a phrase coined by Boston’s Robert Treat Paine that came to signify scientific philanthropy and which the visitor was to personally embody.

180 Hall, “Oscar McCulloch,” 120.  
The transition from the IBS male-female pairs to the COS investigator and visitor formalized data-gathering and individual instruction, but did not represent a giant leap in the function of house-to-house calls. As we observed with the Buffalo COS, Gurteen believed women were uniquely qualified to spread virtue, love, cheer, and happiness throughout the city to make charity work successful.\textsuperscript{182} As we have seen, philanthropy in the city already blended personal commitment, home visitation, and women's involvement. Indianapolis accordingly transferred, virtually wholesale, visitation from the Elberfeld men and IBS men and women to COS women.

Why did the Indianapolis so readily engage women as visitors? Scholars have charted a hierarchical pattern over time in multiple philanthropic subsectors (religion, education, health, arts) with a male elite holding power and a massive female staff and volunteers doing the day-to-day work.\textsuperscript{183} In the nineteenth century, even if women served in mixed-gender organizations or ran auxiliaries in parallel to men's associations, they did not wield power equal to their male counterparts.\textsuperscript{184} As late as the early twentieth century, women tended to concern themselves with issues of women and children and use their domestic skills to their greatest advantage.\textsuperscript{185} The predominant view, historically and today, is that women and other underrepresented groups express social creativity through philanthropy when

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{182} Gurteen, \textit{A Handbook of Charity Organization}, 116.
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excluded from power in government and business. In so doing, women have found creative and productive outlets, in what Kathleen McCarthy calls “parallel power structures,” that did not threaten whatever gender boundaries prevailed during their lifetimes.  

Friendly visiting, often described as an extension of feminine *noblesse oblige*, would bring women’s value as households’ moral guardians into their communities. But because visitors were merely well-intended amateurs, their function easily gave way to trained charity workers. On the surface, these traditional interpretations appear consistent with the COS’s gender stratification. This division of labor and subordination of men over women, however, does not mesh with the crucial nature imputed to visitation work. We should use caution, moreover, when we apply the stereotypical images of powerful, professional, businesslike men and gentle, empathetic, caregiving women to the Indianapolis COS.

In May 1880, six months after the COS apparatus was in place, active recruitment of friendly visitors began with this announcement:

> We can not [sic] relieve the great need by gifts of money. Money touches but the surface needs of life. There can be no permanent helping of the poor until we give ourselves …. We wish now to develop this personal work, to have visitors who shall go among the poor as friends go, with delicate consideration, kindness, courtesy.
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186 McCarthy, “Parallel Power Structures,” 1.
We need _hundreds_ of such visitors …. Will you unite with us in this work? 188

An influential trio signed the recruiting flyer: Mrs. T. P. Haughey, Reverend Myron W. Reed, and Reverend Oscar C. McCulloch. Hannah Haughey must have been a strategic choice. She was married to Theodore P. Haughey, the Indianapolis National Bank President and early COS member. Both wife and husband were active in their church and philanthropy (see Appendix 2 and 3). 189 Both women and men, including McCulloch, belonged to the state-wide Social Science Association of Indiana (SSA) devoted to the study of philanthropy, domestic sciences, education, art and literature. Hannah Haughey chaired the philanthropy department. 190

Hannah Haughey was also an active member of the Indianapolis Flower Mission, a women’s charity established in 1876 to deliver flowers to the sick poor in their homes and in City Hospital. Not surprisingly, other Flower Mission members were married to men on the COS board, including Harriett Foster, Jane Hendricks, Evaline Holliday, and Mary Jameson Judah. Women governed and operated the
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189 Hannah Haughey’s tragic retreat from public life came after her husband resigned amid the 1893 Indianapolis National Bank failure scandal. He served a six-year prison term for embezzlement and fraud (charities were among those defrauded). Hannah moved away from Indianapolis but after the humiliation, financial collapse, and ruined reputations, her life was never the same. Jacob Piatt Dunn, _Greater Indianapolis: The History, the Industries, the Institutions, and the People of a City of Homes_ (Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1910), v. 1: 353; “Indianapolis National Bank Scandal,” [http://wallacestudy.blogspot.com/2012/07/indianapolis-national-bank-scandal.html](http://wallacestudy.blogspot.com/2012/07/indianapolis-national-bank-scandal.html); “Three Prominent Women Die,” _Indianapolis Star_, May 28, 1911, p. 10.
190 The Social Science Association of Indiana formed in 1878 with 130 members. The philanthropy committee hosted lecturers from the Midwest in Plymouth Church and First Presbyterian Church. Eva Draegert, “Cultural History of Indianapolis: Literature, 1875-1890 [II],” _Indiana Magazine of History_ 52, no. 3 (September 1956): 234; “Social Science Association,” _Indianapolis Journal_, January 14, 1880, p. 8; “Guilty, or Not Guilty,” _Indianapolis Journal_, January 17, 1880, p. 3; “Social Science Association,” _Indianapolis Journal_, September 15, 1880, p. 8; Social Science Association of Indiana, _Proceedings and Papers of the Social Science Association of Indiana_ (Indianapolis: Carlon & Hollenbeck, 1882), 3-5. The Indianapolis association does not appear to have been related to the American Social Science Association, formed in 1865 for the professional development of the academic social sciences (economics, political science, and sociology). Thomas L. Haskell, _The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority_ (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000).
Flower Mission, including fundraising through lawn fêtes, dolls’ fairs, authors’ carnivals, and railroad excursions around the city.\textsuperscript{191} Indianapolis artist Julia Graydon Sharpe, an active Flower Mission member and officer, later recalled it as “the Junior League of those days.”\textsuperscript{192} Women instilled the service ethic into their daughters, and they, in turn, to their daughters, just as women of privilege learned social and domestic skills in a sort of apprenticeship system.\textsuperscript{193} The Flower Mission capitalized on women’s social and management skills to pursue their own civic ideal in the community.

Literary clubs provided another integrated network of women from which the COS could attract visitors. In addition to the men’s Literary Club, eight women’s and six mixed clubs formed between 1870 and 1900 throughout the city, part of a national movement (the women’s club movement will be covered in depth in Chapter Four).\textsuperscript{194} The Indianapolis Woman’s Club, established in 1875, recognized the connection between literate citizens and improved social conditions for their city that was “in the making.”\textsuperscript{195} Women all over the U.S. were reading a popular genre of stories and novels, known as benevolence literature, which stressed generosity and

\textsuperscript{192} Biographical Sketch, Box 2, Folder 2, Julia Graydon Sharpe Papers, 1878 – 1935, Collection #M0673, Indiana Historical Society (hereafter: JGS Papers).
\textsuperscript{193} Biographical Sketch, Box 2, Folder 2, JGS Papers; Smith-Rosenberg, “The Female World of Love and Ritual,” 16-17.
\textsuperscript{194} Martha Nicholson McKay, Literary Clubs of Indiana (Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill Co., 1894), 55, 60.
\textsuperscript{195} Literary clubs expanded on the traditions of lyceums and public addresses from early in the century and predated the public library movement. Draegert, “Cultural History of Indianapolis: Literature, 1875-1890 [I],” 225.
women’s agency in social welfare improvement.\textsuperscript{196} Philanthropic women in these stories felt paradoxically empowered to aid the poor yet restricted by their lack of property ownership, suffrage, and business opportunities.

Indianapolis women likely read works by Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, a popular author of benevolence literature who sold hundreds of thousands of volumes of fiction, poetry, and essays.\textsuperscript{197} Consider the leading character in Phelps’ \textit{The Silent Partner} (1871), Perley Kelso, who as a woman must remain “silent” in her family textile business. After a visit to a poor mill-worker’s home, Perley experiences an awakening. She champions relief societies, schools, soup-kitchens, lectures, reading-rooms, and “a dozen better things” for the mill, but her brothers squelch them all as they can ill afford any “experiments in philanthropy.” The women of Perley’s social circle shun her for being morbid with her “fanatical benevolence” and accuse her of neglecting her duties to society. Yet the heroine never abandons her Christian calling to aid the poor with her “talent, wealth, and time” and the story resolves happily.\textsuperscript{198} \textit{The Silent Partner} represents benevolent literature that touched on many themes that resonated with female readership: the role of women in philanthropy, the wealth/poverty divide, equity for wage laborers, institutional relief versus outdoor relief, egoism versus altruism in giving and receiving, and friendly visiting. Women like Hannah Haughey, therefore, were at the ready: informed, engaged,
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experienced, and connected. McCulloch tapped into these existing networks of women for the COS recruiting drive.

When the COS called, women answered. By the very next month, visitors had their case assignments, were making calls, and participated in weekly Visitors Committee and District Committee meetings. McCulloch and Reed compiled a Hand-Book for the Friendly Visitors (ca. 1881) that outlined the rationale for visitors, reasons for poverty the visitors may encounter, and suggestions for counseling and courses of action. Visitors were to seek healthcare, better housing, and employment for clients plus offer guidance in thrift, temperance, and child-rearing – all the tenets of middle-class life. Taken together, visitors had the power to “graduate them [the poor] from the rolls of relief” into lives of self-sufficiency and self-respect.199 At the first COS public annual meeting, Hannah Haughey proudly reported the contributions of volunteer “ladies of the city” to be “of far greater value and service than if the same work was performed by an appointed district visitor.”200

Few studies have constructed an accurate picture of the friendly visitor. We tend to see Lady Bountiful only as a composite and through a blurry, usually unflattering, lens. She often comes across as well-intended but patronizing, sanctimonious, and out of touch with the realities of poverty. Ruswick, for example, notes that “most friendly visitors cannot be identified with confidence” and that understanding their experiences is elusive.201 While that may hold true in many

201 Almost Worthy paints an indistinct picture of the average friendly visitor that focuses on her adherence to or deviation from charity leaders’ changing philosophies. Ruswick, Almost Worthy, 70-74, 100.
cities, in Indianapolis the COS literature allows us to understand a great deal about its volunteers. The COS selected women to serve as visitors not only for their willingness to serve, but for their education, character, and intelligence. Hannah Haughey chaired the first Friendly Visitor Committee, and Julia Goodhart did so for the next several years. Goodhart went on to direct the Board of Children’s Guardians and later became active in the NCCC. COS volunteers shared church, family, neighborhood, philanthropic, and social connections and therefore had much in common with one another.

What we can disentangle from the limited friendly visitor meeting minutes that have survived reveals commitment, hard work, and genuine concern. One exchange between friendly visitors Julia Goodhart and Pauline Merritt, with no motive to paint a veneer of kindness over social control, demonstrates sincerity. Mrs. Merritt described to the visitors her belief in “kindly interest and counsel to help to lighten the burdens which poverty brings upon heart and home.” Mrs. Goodhart concurred, sharing that “her experience has been that such visits are cordially received and appreciated and the visitor’s motive never questioned.” More important is whether they delivered what they promised. Visitors located homes for women in trouble, found suitable employment, and referred women and children to other charities as appropriate, rarely attaching the worthy/unworthy labels. Ruswick’s conclusion, “the difference between relief and rejection often might depend on which visitor knocked at the door,” is not evident in friendly visitor
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202 Friendly Visitor meeting minutes for 1882-1883, 1896-1899, 1914-1915 are extant. BV 1182 and BV 1183, FSA Records.
203 December 6, 1882, Society of Friendly Visitors Secretary’s Book, BV 1183, FSA Records.
meeting minutes. Visitors appeared collegial and as consistent as possible in their approaches, which is reasonable to conclude as the visitors came to the work via existing networks. Interestingly, a positive investigation did not necessarily translate to assistance, nor did an unfavorable report negate it. The process involved too many variables and was being developed in real time.

Investigative notes by the five full-time COS female staff and those of friendly visitors in the case records were intertwined, but there is no question that women visiting other women occurred more often than any other scenario between 1879 and 1891. The COS received applications from 4,253 two-parent families, 4,180 single women, 1,224 single men, and 44 orphans. While slightly more applicants were classified as two-parent families, review of case records indicates many situations in which the husband was ill, injured, alcoholic, unemployable, unwilling to work, or not functional in some other way such as living with a mistress. Women in these cases acted as the family’s head of household although technically not considered single. Lack of an income-earning spouse often predicted women and children devolving into poverty, so COS visitors encountered this home situation frequently.

Women clients presented vexing situations for COS visitors. Women needed income in addition to the supplies they usually requested, but had few income-
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204 Ruswick, “Just Poor Enough,” 280.
206 Single women (43 percent of applicants) included widows 2,365; divorced 126; deserted 1,307; single women with illegitimate children 106; and other single women 276. Indianapolis Benevolent Society, Year-Book of Charities: Work of 1890-91, 32.
earning possibilities. While industrialization increased the number of women working outside the home, 90 percent of Indianapolis wage-earning women lived at home with their families. Domestic servants, often black, Irish, or German, earned miniscule wages plus room and board.208 But these were not the women who generally applied to the COS for help. Those who requested help often had children or dependent family members to care for, few skills that could generate income, and negligible options for childcare. Societal norms still circumscribed married women to home life for the most part and the attitude of privileged women that it was not ladylike to earn money was not uncommon.209 Formal systems to support working women such as childcare services were still years away.

Of aid applicants’ forty-seven occupations in 1879, only eleven could conceivably apply to women and most paid paltry wages for piece work: quilting, washing, ironing, fancy work, house work, nursing, millinery, basket weaving, wax flower making, domestic, and teacher.210 COS visitors routinely sought laundry and sewing work for women to do in their homes, but this work was inconsistent at best, and aid applicants rarely had skills to do anything else. Wage-earning jobs outside the home were not considered in the hundreds of case records reviewed.

210 Review of all 500 cases in 1879 IBS Application Book, BV 1196, FSA Records. Visitors noted occasionally if applicants were fortune-tellers or prostitutes, but did not consider such activities as “employment” so they did not record them as such. Employment categories for both men and women remained consistent throughout 1880s. It is likely that working women sold their piece work on consignment through the Indianapolis Woman’s Exchange, which operated downtown in the 1880s and 1890s. Woman’s Exchanges were nonprofit consignment shops managed by benevolent women to provide working woman an outlet for their handmade goods. “The Woman’s Exchange,” Indianapolis Journal, December 7, 1882, p. 3; Kathleen Waters Sander, The Business of Charity: The Woman’s Exchange Movement, 1832-1900 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 2-3, 79-81.
The other options open to Indianapolis women during this time involved taking in boarders and having their children seek employment.\textsuperscript{211} Most aid applicants already rented so they rarely owned homes that they could open to boarders. Children at times went to work or already worked for meager wages. Some destitute women and their children pursued the income generation of last resort, begging. COS women expressed nothing short of disdain for street begging or “begging like a dog.”\textsuperscript{212} Children learned a script by rote so that they begged in a “familiar automotive way” devoid of emotion.\textsuperscript{213} Visitors continually warned applicants to stop and equated begging behavior with a lifestyle choice as chronic or constitutional. Begging evinced refusal to work and virtual child abuse.

Visitors always noted the cleanliness of applicants and their homes and had difficulty disassociating disorder from poverty: “dirt and disorder were inextricably mingled.”\textsuperscript{214} They described homes as clean and neat on the one hand, but filthy, dark, and wretched on the other. A visitor described one case as “the dirtiest place have ever found. Told them would not ask anybody to give them anything until they had cleaned up the house and themselves, and visitor would come again in a few days to see what they had done.”\textsuperscript{215} To visitors, disarray in the home equaled lack of work ethic, skill, ambition, and self-sufficiency in the applicant. Case records do not indicate that the COS made aid decisions based on dirt and disorder, but filthy

\textsuperscript{212} COS Case Book 1882-1883, BV 1209, FSA Records.
\textsuperscript{213} IBS 1879 Application Book, BV 1196, FSA Records.
\textsuperscript{214} COS Case Book 1883-1884, BV 1210, FSA Records.
\textsuperscript{215} COS Case Book 1884-1886, BV 1221, FSA Records.
homes often coexisted with other problems, such as disease, that had brought applicants to its doorstep.

Because the COS operated during asylums’ heyday, visitors frequently recommended that one or more family members consider institutional care. They tried to convince gravely ill people to go to City Hospital, where length of stay could extend for months. At times clients feared the specter and high mortality rate of the hospital; other times they conceded to admission. Several clients appreciated suggestions to consult the City Dispensary, which appeared far more accessible than a hospital stay, as many did not seem to know it existed. Notes of regular collaboration with the hospital and dispensary doctors appear throughout case records with little, if any, discussions of worthiness, only clients’ health.

More complex were the recommendations for children to be placed in orphanages, which obviously entailed separating families. Some poor families already had relinquished children to orphanages, others grudgingly conceded that it would be the best answer for the child. A few flatly refused, such as the woman who insisted she would not “put the brats to no home.” One mother asked the visitor for help controlling her “saucy and headstrong” daughter using the threat of an institution. The visitor, brandishing her authority, wrote a letter “that she must obey her mother or possibly we might find it necessary to take her to the Reformatory.”

217 COS Case Book 1883-1884, BV 1210, FSA Records.
218 IBS 1879 Application Book, BV 1196, FSA Records.
The most difficult scenario was the chronically poor, often elderly, single woman. The COS intended to grant temporary assistance to give people the tools to weather a difficult time, but not to house or aid them permanently. Even when the COS followed clients for as many as ten years, aid consisted of short-term solutions. At times the only permanent option was the dreaded poorhouse or county asylum. The COS criticized the poorhouse as a “dumping ground.” 

Visitors viewed it as a destination of last resort but had no other resources at their disposal. People reacted with indignation and outrage at what they called the “disgrace” of the poorhouse, and refused in different ways. One woman said she would sooner “starve to death on the streets,” another was too proud and would “get along by the help of the Lord,” and the trustee had sent another woman several times but she always ran away. Once the COS recommended the poorhouse and referred applicants to the trustee for admission, the records do not indicate whether people actually resided there or for how long.

Visitors encountered the gamut of attitudes from gratitude to entitlement when they called on applicants. Women in need or want of help rarely held back their emotions. Some sobbed, even howled, and poured out their hearts with stories of neglect, abuse, or abandonment, usually motivating visitors to try to connect them with someone who could help. Others promised to pay back whatever they borrowed, as in, “Please do this for me as I need help so badly and God will bless you.” Sometimes visitors wanted mothers to receive aid, but women did not want their older children to know they accepted charity. Occasionally applicants
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convincing visitors that charity truly was a last resort and that they would rather be working if they were physically able or could find something to do.

A sense of entitlement contrasted sharply with expressions of humility and gratitude. Applicants became angry if visitors asked too many questions or did not immediately offer precisely what they asked for. One woman “got mad and said we only helped whores and tramps,” another said she never got much help from “the Societies.” Applicants did not appreciate the investigative process, such as Viola who “rather objected to being visited – said if the Society could not give the shoes cheerfully they need not take so much trouble about it.” Another woman said she only asked for help because she thought it would please the society. People learned of available aid so expected it for themselves: “money was there for poor people, why shouldn’t they get some of it,” and “she would not listen to a word from visitor – talked very fast and loud about others getting help and she would go to the head mister.”222 Visitors bristled with frustration at anger hurled at them, expecting politeness and deference instead, but did not appear to refuse aid because of it.

Visitors developed a healthy sense of skepticism as they worked to distinguish tall tales from sincerity and their resolve to learn the truth seemed to strengthen over time. They described applicants as sly, slippery, quarrelsome, and fraudulent, and used different strategies to learn the truth. If suspicious, they questioned women closely and made multiple calls. “Many ladies have visited” one woman, for example, “and sought to ‘worm’ her story out of her.” One woman pretended to be

blind but turned out to have full vision. The COS ran newspaper stories warning the
public of people they perceived as frauds to protect the public from solicitation.

Visitors talked to other parties to round out their investigations, which they found
rewarding: “Mrs T. tells a very plausible story but her landlady lets in a flood of
light.” Historians criticize COSs’ zeal to obtain corroborating information as
spying or snooping, but visitors felt investigation was essential to their work so that
they could protect COS donors from dishonest applicants. Visitors, moreover, felt
disappointed, even personally betrayed, when they determined that applicants had
lied to them.

The COS did deny aid for unworthiness based on value systems of the time.
Nineteenth-century doctors and charity workers possessed no understanding of drug
addiction, so opium addicts received no assistance. The district committee did not
hesitate to deny aid outright, for example, to the woman who “sold things given her
and invested the proceeds in opium – voted no aid.” Visitors saw prostitution as a
scourge on society and rarely recommended assistance “to live the kind of life they
do.” Prostitution threatened public health, the traditional family unit, religious
teaching, and middle-class morality. In one case the COS continued aid for a
woman who ran “a house of prostitution and not worthy of help. This is a coarse ill-
bred woman, had help past four years.” This case appears exceptional but it is not
clear why the visitor handled this woman so generously. More often, the visitors
partnered with the police. They reported to the police an elusive woman with
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multiple aliases and name spellings who was “keeping a house of prostitution, which she has kept for years.” Other times, visitors learned from the police that the applicant was a prostitute, such as Sarah who was “a well-known character to the police. Has been a keeper of a house of ill-fame for years.”

COS visitors often acted as board members of the women’s and children’s homes that had begun before COS was founded. Referrals back and forth among the women of influence were common and collegial. Not surprisingly, then, these asylums’ approaches to poor women’s predicaments remained consistent with the COS’s philosophy. Echoes of the disdain for prostitution, for example, rang out in the “Manual of the Home for Friendless Women,” printed with a feminine soft pink cover but carrying a stern message:

“The Home” is intended as a refuge for young girls who have been deceived and betrayed. Here they find an open door, and sympathizing friends ready to help them to a better life. “The Home” is not a hiding place for vice. Nor a permanent stopping place for women who are able to support themselves. Tramps and women too lazy or proud to help themselves, and there are many such, need not apply, for such it has no open door.

For all its data capture of applicants and aid granted, the COS did not track how many friendly visitors were engaged at any point in time. In 1882, the COS boasted a large cadre of fifty-six visitors. But by 1885, McCulloch bemoaned that it was difficult to organize and interest visitors. The ranks ebbed and flowed over the years for reasons that remain unclear. The work likely was frustrating, time
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consuming, and not always emotionally or spiritually rewarding. It is also plausible
that women sought more control over how, and on whose behalf, to spend their
volunteer time based on what they learned in their first year or two of friendly
visiting, because women’s charities thrived after 1880.

Women expanded the Flower Mission’s reach significantly after they
recognized how much illness contributed to poverty. Illness almost instantly
threatened families paying rent by the week and buying groceries by the day. The
women’s experiences visiting the poor at home compelled them to expand their
charity to provide housing for young homeless boys and deliver not just flowers but
food, medicine, and reading material. The Flower Mission sent a visitor daily to the
Union Depot to rescue and assist single girls and women. Members made weekly
visits to poor families, systematically visited the County Asylum, City Hospital, and
Friendly Inn, and followed up after visits.230

Indianapolis launched the Training School for Nurses at City Hospital in
1883 under the joint leadership of the Flower Mission, McCulloch, and Dr. William
Niles Wishard. Wishard later proudly recalled that Indianapolis was only the second
midwestern city to institute formal nurse training. Nursing students lived in the
hospital and created their own professional registry, housed at Plymouth Church. In
1884 the Flower Mission launched a visiting nurse program and employed district
visiting nurses to care for poor patients in their homes.231 As all these initiatives

230 Indianapolis Benevolent Society, Year-Book of Charities: Work of 1888-89, Appendix, VIII, XXXV-
XXXVIII.
231 The Indiana State Board of Registration and Examination for Nurses assumed all nursing school
registries in 1905. Thurman B. Rice, “History of the Medical Campus,” Indiana State Board of Health
Monthly Bulletin (July 1948): 164. It is impossible to determine the relative influence of Flower
Mission members, McCulloch, and Wishard on launching the nursing school. All three parties
developed, the Flower Mission was the third largest provider through the 1880s in the COS circle of charities, delivering aid to 13 percent of cases.232

Women also championed education of poor children. Reverend McCulloch in 1881 encouraged Indianapolis women to form a local auxiliary of Indiana’s Social Science Association to undertake “some practical work that should cover a field not already taken by the various charitable organizations of the city.”233 Seventy-five women agreed.

More complex was determining just what that practical work should be. McCulloch suggested the women could aid children who already depended on charity or supply reading materials to public institutions. Over the next year, the minister and the ladies debated the specifics of the work plan. McCulloch wanted the women’s work to remain within the confines he envisioned: no material aid to children, no overlap with existing charities, and no increase in families’ dependence on charity.

The SSA women’s agenda appears to have been hotly contested. Women began weekly visits to four to six families whom the IBS was serving, witnessing poverty, children working, and child abuse. While primary and secondary public schools existed in the city, poverty could deter some children from attending school. At meetings when McCulloch was conspicuously absent, the SSA women decided

---

232 FM aid went to 733 cases out of a total of 5,621 cases. The IBS and Township Trustee provided relief in 48 percent (2,672 of 5,621) and 35 percent (1,988 of 5,621) of cases respectively. Indianapolis Benevolent Society, *Year-Book of Charities: Work of 1890-91*, 32.

they would use their own judgment in granting aid and addressing both child labor and child abuse. The women studied the census of working children in the city and all families receiving IBS aid and decided on their course of action.  

In 1882 five women resurrected a dormant free kindergarten and the Indianapolis SSA reorganized as the Indianapolis Free Kindergarten and Children’s Aid Society (IFK). While McCulloch had encouraged their initiative and considered the IFK part of the circle of charities, women directed and operated the charity. IFK women personally visited poor children in their homes and developed their own system of friendly visiting to assess children’s needs – independent of the COS. As the IFK added free kindergartens, they added visitors accordingly. The increasing number of IFK visitors offers a possible explanation for the 1882 peak and 1885 valley of COS friendly visitors. The COS expected the SSA women to shoulder the burden of its friendly visiting, but the women chose to volunteer for the IFK which they directed themselves.

Much like COS investigators, IFK visitors assessed children’s home situations and parents’ employment. Visitors served as a conduit between IFK members and the children in two ways. Visitors captured and reported information about

---

234 In another gesture to signal their independence, the SSA moved meetings from Plymouth Church to members’ homes beginning in June 1882. Indianapolis SSA November 1881 – June 1882 meeting minutes, Secretary’s Report 1881-1888, BV 1545, IFK Records; Social Science Association of Indiana. *Proceedings and Papers*, 37.

235 The first IFK president, Arabella Peelle, was married to COS member Stanton Peelle. She served as president until 1892 when the couple moved to Washington, DC. Lois G. Hufford, “Free Kindergarten Work in Indianapolis: Twenty Years of Character Building,” *Kindergarten Magazine* 11, no. 5 (January 1899): 305-307; *Indianapolis Free Kindergarten Society, 1882-1942* (Indianapolis: Indianapolis Free Kindergarten and Children’s Aid Society, 1942), 3-5. Genevieve Weeks credits McCulloch with the idea and initial direction for the free kindergarten program but does not capture the debate between McCulloch and the SSA. Weeks, *Oscar Carleton McCulloch*, 195.

236 The news alludes to the recruitment of SSA women and their organization as the IFK, but stops short of concluding that COS visitors subsequently declined. “Work of Home Charities,” untitled Indianapolis newspaper, November 8, 1889, COS Scrapbook, BV 1190, FSA Records.
children’s circumstances, school attendance, and physical needs, and also distributed
donated clothing and shoes to poor families, at times in cooperation with the IBS.
IFK women raised funds to provide free hot breakfasts and lunches in the
kindergartens. By 1890, the IFK operated seventeen kindergartens and two
domestic training schools for teen-aged girls.

The complex encounters between middle-class women of privilege with poor
women in trouble led to a wide variety of outcomes, from the denial of aid to years
of support provided by multiple agencies. Poor women navigated the COS system
with an array of approaches, often wearing their emotions on their sleeves. Women
visitors worked to maintain a professional demeanor, yet still expressed sympathy
and suspicion, sometimes in the same case. They served as the front-line workers to
execute the COS agenda of encouraging self-sufficiency, work, thrift, and order.
This they attempted as the COS directors were still shaping that agenda in the
foundering decade, redefining the civic leaders’ notion of philanthropy as the 1880s
unfolded.

Redefining Philanthropy: “Every Authentic Word of Science as News from God”

The scientific philanthropy movement was born when charity organizers
attempted to integrate a third ideological strand, science, into the two origins of
philanthropy, compassion and duty to community. COSs’ critics have found

237 Erin J. Gobel, “Three Necessary Things: The Indianapolis Free Kindergarten and Children’s Aid
238 One domestic training school admitted white girls, the other African-American girls. Lois G.
Hufford, “Free Kindergarten Work in Indianapolis,” Indianapolis Benevolent Society, Year-Book of
Charities: Work of 1888-89, 22-28, Appendix, XXXIX.
239 Compassion, or charity, stems from Biblical times, and thus the church maintained purview over
humanitarian assistance for centuries. Duty to community dates back to classical Greek and Roman
origins, in which philanthropy’s purpose was to enhance the general quality of life through gifts to
science and philanthropy to be irreconcilable and oxymoronic at best, and cruel at worst. Yet charitable leaders believed personal relationships among givers and receivers, data gathering and interpretation, and elimination of misery’s root causes were indeed compatible and allowed them to shape their cities into ideal communities. The Philadelphia COS’s Reverend Kellogg exemplified this belief: “The true impulse of love cannot rest until it has found its science” as benevolence was mere “quackery” without a systematic approach.  

Richard Dugdale, author of the criminological study *The Jukes* (1877), described the study of human behavior to eradicate social problems:

> The subject has great attractions: as science, because it links phenomena to phenomena, and reveals their [natural] laws; as philanthropy, because the knowledge of these laws may be used as a weapon to conquer the vice, the crime, the misery which the science investigates.

The Indianapolis COS rode the scientific wave of the day seeking to reconcile science with the natural human inclination toward generosity. At the 1886 annual meeting, McCulloch recalled the humanitarian tradition in Indianapolis: “The very foundations of this city were thus laid on charity.” The city’s most enthusiastic champion of the scientific investigation of poverty never abandoned the personal element in charity, what he called “the touch of soul to soul.” He justified the

---


COS’s structure, investigation, and control of causes as essential not to detect fraud but to reach and restore every individual person who needed help, thereby protecting society as a whole. Amos Warner, of Baltimore’s COS, justified the application of science, including the social science of economics, to philanthropy. If personal service through the church coupled with material wealth had been enough, he wrote, destitution would have been eradicated long ago.\textsuperscript{244}

The COS similarly clung to the religious roots that undergirded philanthropy even as it worked under the banner of science. While McCulloch remained at the helm, he attempted to integrate religious compassion, science, social Darwinism, and the practical philanthropy of the Social Gospel. He believed the Sermon on the Mount was to be lived in every arena of life where people encountered one another: home, office, shop, field, and by the side of the road.\textsuperscript{245} He wrestled with new ideas from the pulpit, as though working out issues for sermons helped him make sense of his own intellectual pursuits. When reconciling faith and science, for example, he wrote that, “Science gives us our deep, unalterable conviction that the laws of God will not fail us.”\textsuperscript{246} One of his contemporaries explained that “he welcomed every authentic word of science as news from God.”\textsuperscript{247} Religion, science, and society were thus symbiotically enmeshed in his mind.

Religion undergirded the charitable impulses of COS board, donors, staff, and volunteers, as faith and values continue to animate philanthropic organizations today. References to scripture run through COS literature and speeches; clergy and

\textsuperscript{244} Warner, \textit{American Charities}, 7.
\textsuperscript{245} Dye, \textit{Some Torch Bearers in Indiana}, 72.
\textsuperscript{246} McCulloch, \textit{The Open Door}, 132.
\textsuperscript{247} Dye, \textit{Some Torch Bearers in Indiana}, 73.
congregations were integral to the circle of charities. The COS, more significantly, enlisted the word of God to compel its clients to become self-sufficient. Typical was the front page of the 1883 COS and IBS annual meeting program: “Men, like God, must help those who help themselves …. What is more vital still, they must go back of this and TEACH them HOW to help themselves. Here we strike the key-note of charity.” COS practices could appear hard-hearted on the surface, but the men and women who drove the organization believed that the entire community would benefit if their dictums were followed.

McCulloch read voraciously and applied new ideas as they emerged and were interpreted in American culture. He studied sociologist Herbert Spencer, one of the first to adapt Darwinism to social structures. Spencer believed in voluntary charity to the “unfit” because it promoted altruism, but deplored compulsory poor laws which artificially sustained the unfit without benefiting society as a whole.

Concomitant with the tension between religion and science, therefore, was the debate over the relative merits of private and public assistance. During the COS’s founding phase, it unabashedly tested the boundaries of the public/private partnership that the IBS had developed long ago.

As Indianapolis’ circle of charities grew ever wider, so too did staff and volunteers’ understanding of the myriad of problems that could bring applicants to the COS’s doorstep. Thus, the investigation and referral processes grew increasingly complex. Organized charity’s obsession with individual visitation compelled staff and volunteers to understand applicants’ unique personal histories and imbued COS

---

248 Programme, COS Annual Meeting, December 1883, Box 4, Folder 6, FSA Records. Emphasis in original.
workers with a feeling of personal responsibility for poor citizens. The following diagram illustrates the COS’s approach to connect clients to resources.250

![Diagram of COS approach](image)

No Two Cases of Need Alike

- Widow with Children
- Breadwinner Sick
- Homeless Man
- Deserted Wife with Children
- Numerous Other Family Problems
- Visiting Nurse
- Friendly Visitor
- Psychiatrist
- Church
- Visiting Teacher
- Doctor
- Clubs
- Employment

It is the function of a COS to find the right combination in each instance.

Why would public assistance not appear in a diagram intended to illustrate the quintessential COS praxis? We have seen that the trustee provided assistance in 35 percent of COS cases between 1879 and 1891, but not without debate. More charitable agencies entered the circle while the public demanded that the township trustee’s budget decline every year as a natural consequence of greater and holistic private charity. After all, one of the arguments in favor of organized charity was the reduction of both private and public poor relief.

---

250 Diagram by the author based on narrative and sketch in Watson, *The Charity Organization Movement*, 141.
The theory that the COS approach taught self-sufficiency, rather than doling out aid that simply perpetuated poverty, gained currency during the 1880s. Charity leaders across the country increasingly viewed outdoor relief with suspicion, either because political agendas could influence outdoor relief or because poor recipients did not earn the income. They preferred indoor relief, or aid under the close watch of the COS, so that the poor could learn ways out of poverty while receiving assistance.\textsuperscript{251} Municipal and charity officials debated the proper balance of indoor and outdoor relief and some major cities, including Brooklyn and Philadelphia, abolished outdoor trustee relief altogether.\textsuperscript{252}

Amos G. Warner’s influential social work text \textit{American Charities} (1894) articulated as clearly as any publication at the time the relative merits of private and public assistance. Many of the arguments remain relevant today, even as the philanthropy/government relationship and the welfare state have evolved significantly over the last century. Warner’s commentary synthesized the powerful arguments in favor of organized charity as momentum rolled across the country through the 1880s. Warner’s arguments in favor of private charities are more similar to than different from David Horton Smith’s contemporary elucidation of the major benefits of the nonprofit sector on society.\textsuperscript{253}

\textsuperscript{252} “Helpers of the City’s Poor,” \textit{Indianapolis Journal}, November 21, 1886.
### Advantages of Private Philanthropy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious influence allowed</td>
<td>Faith and religious expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater personal connections with and sympathy for clients</td>
<td>Expression of values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimentation encouraged</td>
<td>Experimentation and social innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages philanthropic citizens in communities</td>
<td>Moral innovation and leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages social cohesion among donors and volunteers</td>
<td>Social capital, integration, affiliation, and association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid executive enhances businesslike approaches</td>
<td>Professionalism through nonprofit associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less stigma than public charity for recipients</td>
<td>Empowerment of disenfranchised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not burden citizens with taxation; greater efficiency than public charities</td>
<td>Challenge and correct government and market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smith does not comment on efficiency, although government today increasingly contracts with nonprofit organizations to achieve economic efficiency. Warner also recognized philanthropy’s significant limitation, lack of scale vis-à-vis government, still a significant shortcoming today.

The national debate over the ideal private/public balance loomed over the Indianapolis COS and trustee’s office through the 1880s. After Smith King’s tenure as the Center Township trustee, A.D. Harvey (1880-1881) maintained the minimal level of aid under $8,000 annually. Under Trustee Ernest Kitz (1882-1886), however, annual expenses tripled in three years to over $21,000 in 1885. The

---


Indianapolis Journal accused Kitz of “inexcusable profligacy,” somehow concluding that $7,000 had been the appropriate level of aid and “not less than $13,000 has been wasted or worse.” Kitz left office amid charges of fraudulent spending. The COS structure was now in place, and outdoor relief was climbing at an alarming rate in Indianapolis. Cities including Brooklyn and Philadelphia had abolished outdoor relief altogether. McCulloch made another bold move.

The COS formally proposed in 1883 to abolish outdoor relief completely, which would curtail the Center Township trustee’s responsibilities, apparently with Kitz’s endorsement. Such a move would place poor relief squarely in the hands of the COS and save taxpayers an estimated $10,000 annually in aid and administrative expenses. The trustee’s office did not dissolve, but trustees during the 1880s displayed no particular interest in wresting control of either records or investigative role from the COS. In three short years, COS leadership deftly assumed the quasi-public role of controlling city-wide relief applications in its Confidential Exchange, a function the township trustee seemed quite content to abdicate.

The successor township trustee retained the colorful character James Frank Wright as Chief Investigator in 1888. The Indianapolis Press referred to Wright as an “attaché” of the trustee, a peculiar term usually reserved for diplomatic circles. During his reporting days with the Indiana State Sentinel, he compiled reams of vivid colloquialisms and lists of slum names, shanties, and dive bars, and captured them

257 COS Annual Meeting Minutes, November 1883, BV 1170, FSA Records.
258 Deutsch, Inventing America’s “Worst” Family, 72.

Wright composed sketches of individuals and families, which he used to prepare the diagram contained in the infamous “Tribe of Ishmael.” His years of reporting and investigating led him to conclude that poor laws should not interfere with nature’s intent for the poor or disabled to die young, a Malthusian philosophy not easily reconciled with the implicit humanitarian role of the township trustee. To the contrary, Wright viewed the poor with voyeuristic curiosity.

Wright and other occupants of the trustee’s office proved to be McCulloch’s allies. The COS partnered with the township trustee in several ways. The COS assumed the poor relief investigative function from the trustee in 1883 and held it for the next twenty years. While McCulloch would have gladly assumed the trustee function altogether, the COS’s public communications stated benignly that it “supplements the official relief given by the Township Trustee.”

The trustee, in fact, remained one of the main relief sources within the circle of charities, as outdoor relief comprised 35 percent of total COS aid between 1879 and 1891. The COS referred an additional fifty-one people, via the trustee for approval, to the County Asylum over the period. COS case records reflect open and regular communication with the trustee’s office and trustee’s visitors’ notes appear sporadically in COS case

---

262 Indianapolis Benevolent Society, Year-Book of Charities: Work of 1888-89, Appendix, I.
records. The two offices routinely conferred on cases as they delicately carved out their respective territories.

The trustee granted outdoor relief for longer-term needs, in which the applicant’s situation was unlikely to reverse quickly through employment or connection to other institutions. The COS received a number of transient poor, usually single men, traveling from one point to another who stopped in Indianapolis simply because they ran out of money. When the men arrived at the Plymouth Building in 1879 or 1880, the COS referred them to one of a handful of cooperative boarding houses for one night, then the township trustee sent them to their next stop with a complimentary rail pass in hand.\textsuperscript{263} Just as trustees from Indiana’s ninety-one other counties passed their so-called “tramps” to Indianapolis, the Center Township trustee was glad to help the poor move on to another destination.

The COS created permanent work programs, the Friendly Inn and Wood Yard and an employment agency, to address the steady stream of transients and unemployed and relieve the pressure on cooperative boarding houses. Organized charity receives harsh criticism for its work programs and virtual coercion of the able-bodied poor into employment. Yet COSs inherited a long and deep tradition of the merits of work and the value of independence remains embedded in welfare-to-work programs to this day. We have seen that momentum had been building for philanthropy to instill work ethic and enforce work programs since the Hamburg Poor Relief. At mid-century, hybrid organizations arose to link antebellum benevolence and scientific philanthropy, with religious foundations yet increasingly

\textsuperscript{263} IBS 1879 Application Book, BV 1196, FSA Records; Indianapolis COS 1880 Case Book, BV 1198, FSA Records; Indianapolis COS 1881-1882 Case Book, BV 1203, FSA Records; Indianapolis COS 1882-1883 Case Book, BV 1209, FSA Records.
secular and centralized approaches to maintaining social stability. New York’s Children’s Aid Society (CAS), for example, proudly “sought to encourage the principle of self-help in its beneficiaries, and has aimed much more at promoting this than merely relieving suffering.” As discussed in Chapter Two, paternalism remains one of the classic aspects of volunteer or philanthropic failure, so were the COSs' work requirements well-intended but too harshly imposed? How can a charity that works to help the poor find work still be characterized as hard-hearted and condescending? COSs’ legacy bears further exploration.

The notions of self-help, hard work, and independence dominated public opinion in nineteenth-century Indiana, regardless of social Darwinism’s interpretation of survival of the fittest. Merle Curti argued that the historic American character “equated successful achievement with individual freedom, individual effort, individual responsibility.” Curti reminded us that American philanthropy emphasized the idea of self-help, as “related to our creed of individual responsibility and achievement.” The COS movement thus mirrored its environment and attempted to reinforce existing societal norms through its programs.

---

264 Boyer considers the New York Association for Improving the Conditions of the Poor, the Young Men’s Christian Association, and Children’s Aid Society as exemplary of the mid-century shift in approaches toward urban poverty. Boyer, Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 85-86.
265 Brace, The Dangerous Classes of New York, 440.
267 Trattner, From Poor Law to Welfare State, 95.
Literature reinforced individual self-help, self-sufficiency, and self-worth. Women in benevolent circles cited a phrase attributed to Ralph Waldo Emerson: “If a man give me aught, he has done me a low benefit; if he enable me to do aught of myself, he has done me a high benefit.”

Emerson’s essay *Self-Reliance* (1841) advocated for the potential self-worth and genius of the individual versus popular opinion and social pressure. He criticized charitable donations unless one had a wholehearted affinity for the cause, especially the “wicked cause” of uplifting certain poor people espoused by many relief societies. “Do not tell me,” Emerson warned, “of my obligation to put all poor men in good situations. Are they my poor?”

McCulloch avidly read Emerson and other theorists of the time, so it is not surprising that the ethic of individual self-reliance showed through in COS policy.

COSs’ period of expansion and Horatio Alger’s peak popularity were one and the same, so it was no coincidence that the Indianapolis COS worked to inculcate self-reliance in its clients virtually from the moment the organization formed. Alger (1832-1899) produced one hundred rags-to-riches tales, or at least rags-to-respectability tales. Alger’s formulaic sagas of young men escaping life on the city streets always required them to possess wits, honesty, industry, and a bit of luck. Even luck, it seemed, came most often to the deserving boys who displayed character.

Far lesser known, but residing in the Mile Square, Indiana poet Sarah T. Bolton (1814-1893) captured these aspirations in her best-known poem, “Paddle
Your Own Canoe” (1850). These four words punctuate each stanza to capture the triumph of perseverance over adversity:

Nothing great is lightly won  
Nothing won is lost  
Every good deed, nobly done,  
Will repay the cost.  
Leave to Heaven, in humble trust,  
All you will to do:  
But if you succeed you must  
Paddle your own canoe.\(^{274}\)

The sentiment of individual responsibility was so pervasive that Horatio Alger incorporated Bolton’s phrase for the third volume in his “Luck and Pluck” series, titled *Strong and Steady; or, Paddle Your Own Canoe* (1871).

Social science and literature reinforced one another. Richard Dugdale’s *The Jukes*, for example, supported conventional wisdom with scientific evidence. In a study of 233 criminals, he found that 79 percent had never learned a trade at all; most who had worked did so intermittently and with minimal education or training.\(^{275}\) Charity leaders, including McCulloch, occasionally mentioned the importance of favorable macroeconomic conditions such as low unemployment and living wages, but they did not conceive of altering economic systems as a matter of public welfare. So charity leaders hammered relentlessly on individual work, applying what became known as “the work test,” because they believed they could affect individual achievement. Work programs of this era had different goals than those of the workhouses embedded in German poor relief programs, which had


failed in short order.\textsuperscript{276} The work test was meant to be a work program, not “make work,” that helped case workers evaluate whether or not an individual could hold gainful employment.\textsuperscript{277} The Friendly Inn and Wood Yard received 7 percent of the COS’s applicants between 1880 and 1891, where the homeless unemployed could work in exchange for meals and lodging. The men who stayed at the inn did not learn trades, but split or sawed wood; women washed or sewed. The COS referred far more men than women to the inn, which accommodated about one hundred people at any one time.\textsuperscript{278} Visitors followed up with applicants at the inn to make sure people in fact were working and prod them to take advantage of the employment bureau. They recorded little feedback from lodgers at the inn, other than the occasional remark that the work was too physically hard.

The Friendly Inn lodged hundreds of wayfarers in the 1880s, but did not achieve its goals any more than predecessor workhouses had. The work test did not allow the COS to distinguish among people who sought employment, would not work in any case, or wanted only easy work. The work program in reality was “make work” thinly veiled as a work test which inspired no feelings of a job well done, training for anything other than hard labor, or any feeling of stability. COS workers, moreover, couldn’t fathom the chosen lifestyle of the transient men (and a few women) they encountered, much less accept that they were never going to change it. The transient subculture of men satisfied to work temporarily, with

\textsuperscript{278} Seven percent equals 398 of 5,621 cases. To encourage public support of the inn, the COS sold bound books of ten tickets for $1.00 to citizens so that they could distribute tickets for one night’s free lodging when approached for a handout on the street. Indianapolis Benevolent Society, \textit{Year-Book of Charities: Work of 1890-91}, 32.
regular intervals of unemployment, represented all the perils of industrialization: single men, without direction, unwilling or unable to adapt to the wage economy. Those citizens who supported the COS expected everyone to want to rise to respectability à la Horatio Alger characters, work hard, and settle down in a traditional family unit. Transients threatened that entire ethos. Absent a universal belief in individual responsibility, the work test was doomed before it started.

Robert Wiebe extended the notion of individual responsibility to the community, demonstrating that the desire for self-determination encouraged organizations that reinforced and expressed the spirit of community autonomy. Andrew Cayton and Susan Gray argue that the midwestern ideology included a “particularly strong commitment to the development of the public good, to the maintenance and expansion of a place for people to think and act.” These two notions appeared in the Indiana capital, an ideal incubator in which civic leaders tested organized charity. The Indianapolis COS initially applied the Buffalo template, but rarely sought Gurteen’s or the Buffalo COS’s counsel after McCulloch visited them. Instead, other civic leaders and social workers looked to Indianapolis to study what this city had accomplished. The Indianapolis COS exemplified an autonomous association that established the model for the entire state of Indiana and attained national prominence for its progressive expansion of the Buffalo model,

---

while the Midwest emerged as the most prosperous and dynamic region in the
nation.\textsuperscript{282}

No one knew in 1891 that the Indianapolis COS had reached its high water
mark of national prominence. For six nights that May, English’s Opera House was
standing room only. Prominent social work leaders overflowed the Plymouth
Building, gaily festooned with flags and streamers.\textsuperscript{283} The NCCC annual conference
proved to be Oscar McCulloch’s swan song. Hosting the conference in his home
city, he evoked the circle image of Indianapolis and the COS once again: “You are
met at the exact centre of the industrial and railroad interests of the country” from
which influences for good radiated widely.\textsuperscript{284} His presidential address called for the
\textit{national} capture of data on those citizens dependent on public or private aid, decades
ahead of his time in advocating the use of large-scale systems to evaluate and
monitor welfare programs. Yet throughout the conference, McCulloch spoke of
science and love in the same breath. A few months later, he summoned his friend
Mattias Haines to his deathbed. As McCulloch begged him to carry on the work of
organized charity, he implored, “Haines, don’t let them take the heart out of it.”\textsuperscript{285}

The Indianapolis COS would not abandon the heart, but it would evolve in
the coming years. The organized charity movement had reenergized civically
engaged men and women, expanded rapidly, and integrated the moral foundation of
the city with emerging scientific concepts. The COS exuded unbridled enthusiasm

\textsuperscript{282} Andrew R.L. Cayton and Peter S. Onuf, \textit{The Midwest and the Nation: Rethinking the History of an
American Region} (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 23.
\textsuperscript{284} Oscar C. McCulloch, “President’s Address,” \textit{Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and
Correction} 19 (1892): 10.
\textsuperscript{285} Mattias Loring Haines, “Memories of Rev. Oscar C. McCulloch,” Box 3, Folder 5, FSA Records.
for identifying the causes of poverty and stopping it in its tracks. Although criticized in some quarters for its heartlessness in denying aid, it gained legitimacy throughout most of the community as the preeminent charity in the city. Since its inception in 1879, the COS wielded virtual control over poor relief, making it one of the most progressive, powerful, and successful charity organizations in the country.286

The trusteeship culture of federationism would come to the forefront as the Indianapolis COS, along with the national organized charity movement, matured and the Reverend Oscar Carleton McCulloch era drew to a close.

Chapter Four: Maturing Phase, 1891-1911
“In the Silken Arms of the Aristocracy”

The Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis came into its own as Indianapolis grew and modernized around it. The city’s population more than doubled in twenty years, from 105,000 in 1890 to 234,000 in 1910. Around the turn of the century, during what some residents called Indiana’s Golden Age, the state was an influential force in American manufacturing, culture, and politics. Manufacturing dominated the city and state economies. Michigan led the nation from the moment automobile production began, but Indiana shared in the economic boom. Indiana ranked fourth in automobile manufacturing by 1909 and related industries appeared throughout the state. Between 1899 and 1909 alone, Indiana manufacturers’ sales and capital doubled, with Indianapolis producing over 20 percent of the state’s value in manufactured products.

The city occupied a central place in American literary culture during the Golden Age. As poet John Boyle O’Reilly commented, “A man can rise in Indianapolis a thousand miles from Boston, and strike a literary note that the whole country turns its ear to hear.” Indiana writers James Whitcomb Riley, Meredith Nicholson, and Booth Tarkington became bestselling authors who formed a prestigious literary salon. They remained in Indianapolis throughout most of their lives, forever associated with tales of a romantic, nostalgic longing for halcyon days.

---

of a city in the midst of immense change. During the same time a so-called “Hoosier Group” of artists that included William Forsyth, Otto Stark, and T.C. Steele achieved national status.\(^5\)

The Midwest was the geographic center of the country’s population when the 1890 U.S. Census declared that the American frontier had closed. Political contests that played out in the Midwest, especially in Indiana, closely mirrored the country’s debates. Indiana was the key to winning the Midwest, and therefore essential to winning the nation. A battleground state in national politics, Indiana was almost evenly divided between the Democratic and Republican parties. Races were hotly contested and covered in the national press. Political parties chose Indiana vice-presidential candidates to balance presidential tickets in terms of geography, experience, age, and their positions on key issues. Meredith Nicholson set *Zelda Dameron* in Indianapolis (called Mariona in the novel) and referred to its political centrality: “the capital of an Ohio Valley state whose vote in national elections … has long been essential to the winner in the electoral college.”\(^6\) Indiana was such an important swing state that the country elected one U.S. President and four Vice Presidents from the state to serve during the Golden Age.\(^7\)

Prominent citizens recorded their impressions of the charmed existence of life in Indianapolis. After President Benjamin Harrison returned to Indianapolis, he

---


\(^7\) President Benjamin Harrison (R) 1889-1893 (elected 1888), VP Schuyler Colfax (R) 1869 to 1873 (elected 1868), VP Thomas Hendricks (D) 1885 (elected 1884), VP Charles Fairbanks (R) 1905-1909 (elected 1904), VP Thomas R. Marshall (D) 1913-1921 (elected 1912).
famously remarked that he was “a citizen of no mean city …. where charity is broad and wise …. pre-eminently a city of homes.”

Meredith Nicholson’s essay “Indianapolis: A City of Homes” furthered the city’s enduring reputation as “a place of industry, thrift, and comfort, and not of luxury …. neighborly and cosy [sic].”

Zelda Dameron’s Mariona was also a “city of homes – a city in which every man, no matter how humble, may have his own fireside.” Booth Tarkington similarly described the Middle West as “almost wholly without snobbishness” in which citizens live on “terms of singular intimacy with one another, almost as in a village.”

Prominent women’s impressions corroborated these statements. Mary Merrill Graydon wrote of the city’s friendliness, hospitality, patriotism, and public spirit. Margaret Malott White described Indianapolis in the 1890s as a beautiful city with an air of prosperity and well-being. She proudly recalled English novelist Arnold Bennett’s visit, when he proclaimed that Indianapolis was “our most American city.”

No matter how pleasant these musings, Indianapolis experienced the complications that come with urbanization. Nicholson had to admit that growth had wrought a new Indianapolis from the old, meaning that “a town is at last a city.”

During the COS’s maturing phase, some residents of “our most American city” did

---

8 “No Mean City” was the title of Harrison’s speech at which he was the guest of honor at a Commercial Club dinner, April 21, 1897. Mary Lord Harrison, comp., Views of an Ex-president by Benjamin Harrison (Indianapolis: The Bowen-Merrill Co., 1901), 466-471.
10 Nicholson, Zelda Dameron, 113.
12 Mary Merrill Graydon, “Early Indianapolis,” ca. 1902, ISL Pamphlet Collection.
not enjoy uninterrupted or uniform comfort. People continued to approach the COS and the circle of charities for assistance. But economic, cultural, and political success allowed a coterie of civic leaders to coalesce in Indianapolis, many of whom gravitated to philanthropy. Civic men and women expressed and acted on concerns for social and moral matters of their day and made those concerns matters of public policy. Unlike larger cities, Indianapolis had a single close-knit, relatively unified group of elite citizens that supported the COS’s agenda over the next two decades.\footnote{See, for example, David C. Hammack, \textit{Power and Society: Greater New York at the Turn of the Century} (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1982). Hammack argues that New York City’s economic and social elites were concentrated in several smaller interest groups that competed with one another in matters of public interest.}

John H. and Evaline Holliday: “The Swirl of Society”

It took some time for the COS to come to grips with Oscar McCulloch’s untimely death in 1891. The business sector had provided substantial leadership and financial support to the COS since its 1879 founding; now business leaders assumed full control of the organization. Three COS members, all prominent businessmen, rose to the occasion: Hugh Henry Hanna, Colonel Eli Lilly, and John Hampden Holliday. Hugh Hanna (1848-1920) was president of Atlas Engine Works, a manufacture of steam engines and boilers with several hundred employees. He had joined the COS during the 1880s and was active as a Board of Trade member, Literary Club member, elder in the First Presbyterian Church, and president of the Art Association. While Hanna remained a major COS donor for the rest of his life, his public service took a turn away from charity in Indianapolis. During the late 1890s he championed the gold standard during the free silver movement, chaired the Indiana Monetary Convention, and worked with the U.S. Congress on legislation to
affirm the gold standard. Hanna achieved national recognition for his contribution to monetary policy.¹⁶

As interim president during 1892, Hanna guided the COS through a series of special meetings while members evaluated the organization’s mission and viability. At the 1892 annual meeting, Lilly powerfully reaffirmed the organization’s value to the city. “Its importance can not [sic] be exaggerated,” he proclaimed, as the COS had systematized relief, eliminated waste, saved taxpayers thousands of dollars, and successfully drawn a circle of sympathy around the poor. Lilly proposed that the COS not merely continue its work but “extend its sphere of usefulness” and urged “every society, church or relieving agency of whatever nature” in the city to participate. Members voted unanimously in favor of Lilly’s resolution.¹⁷ Hanna served as COS president for three more years. John Hampden Holliday assumed the presidency in 1895 and governed the COS, except for a one-year hiatus, for the next twenty-four years. His financial acumen, leadership experience, extensive business and social networks, and commitment to public service defined the organization’s maturing phase. John Holliday left his imprint on the COS between 1891 and 1911 just as clearly as Oscar McCulloch had during the founding phase.

John Holliday (1846-1921) came from an old-stock American family of English and Scottish descent with deep roots in the church and community service.

¹⁶ Hanna also belonged to the Columbia Club, Contemporary Club, Country Club of Indianapolis, and University Club. His national recognition included honorary membership in the New York Chamber of Commerce, an MA from Harvard University, an LL.D. from his alma mater Wabash College, and trustee positions with both the Tuskegee Institute and Southern Education Board. Centennial Memorial First Presbyterian Church Indianapolis, Ind., 1823-1923 (Greenfield, IN: First Presbyterian Church, 1925), 156-159; Charles Elmer Rice, A History of the Hanna Family (Damascus, OH: Aden Pim & Sons, 1905), 150-156.

¹⁷ COS Annual meeting minutes November 23, 1892, BV 1170, FSA Records.
His devout Presbyterian ancestors immigrated to Massachusetts in the seventeenth century. Great-great-grandfather Reverend William Shaw and great-grandfather (also named) Reverend William Shaw both graduated from Harvard. Holliday’s parents, William Adair and Lucia Shaw Cruft Holliday, arrived in Indiana in 1816, coincident with statehood. Reverend William A. Holliday served as minister of the First Presbyterian Church in Indianapolis and served small start-up congregations around the state through his ministry and teaching. Neighbors recalled William and Lucia’s Indianapolis home as warm and inviting, yet with a reserved air of gentility. Neighborhood children flocked to Lucia’s to explore the garden, take Sunday tea, and listen to her tell Bible stories. One child later described the Holliday tradition of charitable giving:

The little girls were often present during visits from the Bible Society man, the Orphan Asylum visitor, the Freedman’s Aid man or woman, and other peripatetic collectors of dollars. They saw the money that had been cheerfully hoarded for this or that purpose given to its lawful collector. It may have been laid aside weeks before; it was always ready, and represented careful husbanding of funds and sometimes sacrifice.

This home environment nurtured John and instilled a service ethic that would endure throughout his life. He wrote affectionately of his childhood, remembering Indianapolis as the ideal mix of city and country life, “just the best place” to have

---

19 Elizabeth Ray Huntington, “And the Name of the Chamber was Peace,” unpublished short story, Evaline Hitz Rhodehamel Private Collection. The story’s title is a line from John Bunyan’s allegory The Pilgrim’s Progress (1678).
grown up.\textsuperscript{20} Citizens revered ministers, churches provided an intellectual force, and education and hard work determined one’s future.

John Holliday attended Northwestern Christian College (Butler University) and earned a BA and an MA from Hanover College in 1864. He enlisted for one hundred days in the 137\textsuperscript{th} Indiana Infantry late in the Civil War. After the war, Holliday apprenticed as a bookkeeper, reporter, and editor for the \textit{Indianapolis Journal}. Within a short time, full of ambition and the presumption of youth, he thought that he knew a “considerable” amount about the newspaper business and conceived a new paper for Indianapolis.\textsuperscript{21} He was twenty-three years old.

Most nineteenth-century newspapers were political party organs. In Indianapolis the daily \textit{Sentinel} supported the Democratic Party. The other daily, the \textit{Journal}, carried the opposing (Whig or Republican) platform. Religious, agricultural, and German papers, often short lived, catered to specific constituencies. By 1865, it had never been easier to start a newspaper: the war was over, the price of newsprint had fallen by half since 1830, literacy rates were rising, and technology improved printing and papermaking. As a result, a new paper required only modest capital.\textsuperscript{22} Holliday’s timing for a new paper was providential.

In 1869 Holliday founded the \textit{Indianapolis News}. The \textit{News} represented a departure from the popular dailies already in the city. It cost two cents (half the price of any other daily in Indiana), ran in the evening, and was written to appeal to

\textsuperscript{20} “John H. Holliday Dies at his Home,” \textit{Indianapolis News}, October 21, 1921, p. ?
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
women as well as men. His daring business model was doomed to failure according to the journalism conventions of the day: no one read the paper in the evening, its editorials refused to take on a partisan slant, and it eschewed a circulation alliance with either political party. News from the East Coast came in via telegraph, which cost more during the day than overnight – driving up operating costs. With higher costs and lower prices, plus no political allegiance, competitors felt Holliday’s concept was fatally flawed from the outset.\textsuperscript{23}

Holliday proved the skeptics wrong. The first issue of the \textit{News} was an “extra” edition that covered President Grant’s first Congressional address. Holliday scooped the other papers and the \textit{News} was off and running. He hired top quality reporters, he wrote and edited well, and citizens bought the paper for its reasonable price and lack of political bias. The paper thrived and had to invest in new printing presses twice to keep up with demand. Circulation rose to 4,000 within two years and 25,000 by 1892.\textsuperscript{24}

Because the \textit{News} was not beholden to a political party, it would be natural to think of it as politically neutral. Holliday, however, ran the \textit{News} to serve his vision of the public good, and thus was never neutral on matters of public welfare. The paper instead was “independent” and always battled for what the editors believed was in the best interest of all citizens. Holliday championed Indianapolis as an ideal city, but still led crusades for continuous improvement.\textsuperscript{25} The \textit{News} tackled any


\textsuperscript{25}Harry J. Sievers, “First Editor Mouthpiece for People,” \textit{Indianapolis News}, December 7, 1959, p. 4.
topic: political term limits, political graft, a proposed new city charter, spending tax dollars on public parks, increased public school building, and government welfare for disaster relief. News executive Hilton U. Brown, whom Holliday hired as a cub reporter, recalled that the paper made “lots of enemies” who cancelled their home delivery in protest but “sheepishly bought it on the street to find out what the editor said about them.”26 The paper’s willingness to confront any issue, however, earned Holliday more allies than enemies.

The success of the Indianapolis News translated into tremendous personal and professional rewards for John Holliday. Already fortunate to be born into a well-regarded family, his business acumen and willingness to take a stand on difficult matters brought financial security and access to virtually all the social networks in the city (see Appendix 2). In 1892 doctors warned Holliday that his strenuous work pace threatened his health. With a heavy heart, he sold the News so that he could retire – which lasted less than one year. Only forty-seven years old, with his health restored, in 1893 Holliday founded the Union Trust Company and ramped up his public service activities, including his responsibilities with the COS.

Despite his new foray into Union Trust, John Holliday missed the newspaper business. In 1899 he returned to journalism by founding the Indianapolis Press, another two-cent afternoon paper. He and co-founder Major Richards authored the Press’ inaugural editorial, articulating clearly their rationale for another paper in the city. More importantly they reinforced their notion of journalism as a means to

26 Hilton Ultimus Brown (1859-1958) worked for the News for 77 years, from 1881 until his death. His positions included reporter, city editor, managing editor, secretary-treasurer, vice president, and board member. Brown served as a trustee of his alma mater, Butler University, for 52 years and as board member of the American Newspaper Publishers Association for 32 years. Hilton U. Brown, A Book of Memories (Indianapolis: Butler University, 1951), 120.
uphold the public good and their renewed commitment to providing another
journalistic moral voice in Indianapolis:

The State [has made] such gigantic strides, not only in the
accumulation of material wealth, but in art, literature, education, civic
pride, good government and all the accessories of a high type of
civilization .... We are no longer an agricultural people of the West,
but a powerful commonwealth, armed with all the forces and beset by
all the evils of a complex civilization .... We are in a state of transition
and there are many problems to solve, many difficulties to meet and
overcome, if we are to bring this fair land of Indiana to its highest
fruition and leave it to coming generations as a heritage of happy
homes and of smiling piety. Intelligence must be aroused, patriotism
must be developed, morality must be fostered, the sanctity of law must
be enforced and government by the people for the people must be
maintained in ever increasing purity and power.27

The city did not embrace the Press as it had the News. After sixteen months, Holliday
and Richards concluded Indianapolis did not need two such similar papers and sold
their interest in the Press to the News. Holliday returned full time to Union Trust,
where he served as president and chairman for the rest of his life.28

Although the Press did not enjoy commercial success, it is of value today if
only for the above editorial. This passage illuminates John Holliday’s strong
convictions about Indiana’s stature in the country, its threats and opportunities, and
citizens’ obligations to minimize those threats while seizing the opportunities.
He backed his words with action. Despite the illness that temporarily sidelined him
from his newspaper business, he remained involved in his church, the COS, and a
multitude of clubs and civic activities. Holliday’s philanthropic curriculum vita
demonstrates his devotion to his community and willingness to put his time, talent,

27 John Hampden Holliday and Major Richards, “The Indianapolis Press,” Indianapolis Press,
December 13, 1899, p.6.
28 The News also acquired the Sentinel in 1901. In 1902 the Journal folded, succeeded by the Star. The
Democratic evening News and Republican morning Star operated as the two dominant newspapers in
and treasure into many pursuits. His name was ubiquitous in Indianapolis newspapers and charity board rosters for most of his adult life.

John Holliday married a woman who became his full partner in family, church, and community service. Holliday met Evaline MacFarlane Rieman (1853-1924) while vacationing at the exclusive White Sulphur Springs spa resort in 1874. Like John, Evaline descended from a successful, old-stock American family. Her great-grandfather, Daniel Rieman (1755-1829), had immigrated from Germany to Baltimore and opened a sugar refinery. The family business prospered and expanded over the next three generations. When her father, Alexander Rieman (1814-1888), joined as a partner in 1845, Rieman & Sons operated as wholesale grocers and commission merchants. By the 1870s the Riemans shipped pork from Indiana and Ohio to Baltimore for curing. Alexander Rieman also served as both vice-president and president of the Western Maryland Railway Company from 1873-84. John and Alexander struck up a friendship at the spa. John and Evaline began courting and married the following year.

Evaline Holliday immediately found a home in Indianapolis. Struck by the city's charm, she wrote her cousin just after her arrival:

The city is beautiful, no two houses alike and all surrounded by yards or grounds. Our house is on a corner of the streets and it is so pretty to look from the windows and see so much green. The way of

29 The White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia spa is now known as the Greenbrier, a popular summer destination for wealthy mid-Atlantic residents. White Sulphur Springs was one of a dozen mineral springs resorts known as “the Springs of Virginia;” it was the largest and most centrally located of the springs resorts. Robert S. Conte, The History of the Greenbrier: America’s Resort (Charleston, WV: Pictorial Histories Publishing, 1989), 36-37; Catherine G. Palmer, Holliday Park History (Indianapolis: Friends of Holliday Park, 2007), 6.
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building is much as in villages and many of the houses are very beautiful, large and handsome.\textsuperscript{31}

The new Mrs. John Holliday embraced her life with aplomb. Evaline proved to be the ideal life partner for John Holliday, in the private sphere as the couple raised seven children and in the public sphere as two of Indianapolis' most influential civic leaders. Evaline devoted her time to their church and her own clubs and charities. She inherited wealth from the Riemans’ businesses, and made at least some of her own financial decisions, as her name often appeared separately from her husband’s on charities’ donor lists.\textsuperscript{32} Her eldest daughter Lucia believed Evaline “had a man’s grasp of business affairs and liking for them …. All her life she had command of money. She used it well, spending judiciously, saving reasonably, and giving widely, freely and kindly.”\textsuperscript{33} Evaline wielded her financial independence for the benefit of Indianapolis.

Evaline served as a trustee of the Flower Mission, Orphan Asylum, and numerous other charities (see Appendix 3). Her major work was as president of the Indianapolis Free Kindergarten (IFK) for twenty-one years, by far the longest tenure as president in the IFK’s history.\textsuperscript{34} Lucia explained her varied IFK responsibilities as “raising, begging or borrowing money” and continuously planning, renting, and

\textsuperscript{31} The Hollidays rented briefly before moving into their home at 1121 N. Meridian St. Evaline Holliday letter to her cousin Ella MacFarlane, January 30, 1876, Evaline Hitz Rhodehamel Private Collection.
\textsuperscript{32} See for example COS annual reports 1895-1896, 1897-1898, 1899-1900, 1900-1901, 1901-1902, 1902-1903, 1903-1904, 1905-1906, 1907-1908, 1908-1909, 1910-1911, and 1912-1913. Evaline was the largest individual female donor to the COS in each of these years. COS Subscription Books, BV 1172 and COS Annual Reports, Box 4, Folder 8, FSA Records. John and Evaline made individual $1,000 gifts to the Senate Avenue YMCA for blacks in 1910. Madame C.J. Walker was the only other woman to give $1,000. A’Lelia Bundles, \textit{On Her Own Ground: The Life and Times of Madam C.J. Walker} (New York: Scribner, 2001), 118.
\textsuperscript{34} Evaline was IFK president from 1899 to 1920. \textit{Indianapolis Free Kindergarten Society, 1882-1942} (Indianapolis: Indianapolis Free Kindergarten and Children’s Aid Society, 1942), 26.
building new kindergartens. Evaline drove neither horse nor automobile so Lucia often drove her to her volunteer commitments, from fundraising events to board meetings to taking meals to poor families. Evaline involved herself in all aspects of the IFK. For example, she coordinated donations and logistics for Play Fest, a signature IFK fundraising event, at which kindergarten students played a musical program at the Coliseum.

Play Fest alone would have taken considerable time and energy, but it represented only one element of Evaline’s volunteer commitments. Together the Hollidays became embedded in virtually every aspect of the philanthropic fabric of the city. The community service ethic ran deep in both families and they acted upon a shared value system. Lucia recalled that John and Evaline “had the same ideals and standards and an equal willingness to work toward their realization.” Their shared value systems included Christian duty, child welfare, education, and care of the poor.

Psychologists who have studied volunteer motivation have consistently demonstrated that an individual’s value system is the strongest predictor of volunteer engagement. Volunteers most often cite value systems as expressions of altruism, caring, compassion, and religious motivation. For people motivated by values, volunteering acts on their internalized values and allows them to remain true to an

35 Macbeth, “Evaline MacFarlane Rieman Holliday 1853-1929,” Evaline Hitz Rhodehamel Private Collection. The number of free kindergartens grew from 1 in 1882 to 54 by 1915. Play Fest Program, June 6, 1915, Box 3, Folder 11, Eliza Blaker Collection, Special Collections and Rare Books, Irwin Library, Butler University (hereafter: Blaker Records).
37 Play Fest Notes, May 1915, Box 3, Folder 11, Blaker Records.
ideal conception of themselves. The Hollidays’ value systems were evident in word and deed. Evaline wrote of obligation to God to engage in benevolence when she addressed the 400 IFK members: “We should never forget that this is the Master’s work; that we are honored by being chosen as His instruments.”40 While the Hollidays participated in different organizations, their philanthropic pursuits had much in common.

John and Evaline both spoke of intergenerational loyalty and responsibility, a motivation that volunteers infrequently articulate. Psychologists describe this as generativity, or the concern people display for the welfare of the next generation and the wider community. Those who feel they have made a unique contribution to society and are needed by other people exhibit an especially compelling inner drive to volunteer.41 The Hollidays participated in the Indiana (1916) and Indianapolis (1920) centennial celebrations, unique anniversaries that perhaps fueled powerful feelings of intergenerational connection. By then both John and Evaline had been philanthropic leaders for most of their adult lives, could look back with pride at their accomplishments, and felt they were leaving a legacy for the future. In 1916 the Hollidays together founded the Society of Indiana Pioneers, an enduring organization that continues to honor the memory and work of early Indiana citizens – including the Holliday family.42

---

40 Evaline M. Holliday, “President’s Report,” The Kindergarten Monthly IV, no. 9 (May 1900), 1, Box 3, Folder 4, IFK Records.
41 Musick and Wilson, Volunteers, 66-68.
42 Many sources credit only John Holliday for founding the society. The original suggestion, however, came from Evaline. Yearbook of the Society of Indiana Pioneers (1934): 22.
When John Holliday addressed the Indianapolis Centennial Celebration, he honored the pioneer men and women who “acted in unison with toleration and charity … As a community Indianapolis has stood and still stands for the best things of life,” he continued, including “self-sacrifice, helpfulness for the poor and unfortunate and the abiding idea of leaving the world better than they found it.”

Evaline echoed similar sentiments at a 1923 First Presbyterian Church address. She recognized prominent women in the church’s history who should never be forgotten. “I rejoice to believe in the immortality of influence. Think of that phrase,” she exclaimed. “Are we not in this church indebted to these, our predecessors, and our exemplars! ‘They rest from their labors, and their works do follow them.’”

The Hollidays’ philanthropic motivations thus appear to be a complex mixture of duty to community and quest for immortality, however veiled, in their relatively small world of Indianapolis. They did not possess the massive resources of John D. Rockefeller or Andrew Carnegie, but clearly thought deeply about their civic responsibilities and goals. No evidence suggests that John Holliday aimed, as did Rockefeller, to “cure evils at their source” in a global, scalable fashion. The Hollidays donated generously during their lifetimes, but did not insist on giving away all their resources as Carnegie suggested in “Wealth.” We therefore should not consider John and Evaline Holliday as thoroughly scientific in their philanthropy,

---

44 Evaline M. Holliday, “Some Women of the First Church in the Eighties,” in Centennial Memorial First Presbyterian Church Indianapolis, Ind., 1823-1923 (Greenfield, IN: First Presbyterian Church, 1925), 67.
yet they wholeheartedly supported the organization of charity and a systematic, long-term approach to improving the lives of those in their midst.

Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Holliday all viewed personal resources as a public trust, as though they should steward a civic ideal larger than any single individual. Holliday stated just one year before his death: “He who holds talents, or wealth, or power holds them not for selfish gratification but in trust for others, that he may promote their happiness and well being.” He continued, in somewhat social Darwinian fashion, that “upon those who have superior training and greater knowledge devolves the duty of maintaining the saving forces of society, of upholding the laws enacted for the good of all.” Evaline similarly wrote of the obligation to “live up to our opportunities and privileges,” a classic articulation of noblesse oblige.

The Hollidays lived at the center of the social scene, which became intertwined with philanthropy in Indianapolis. The Holliday family name appeared in the Red Book (1895) and Blue Books annually thereafter. Turn-of-the-century Indianapolis observed formal social protocol, with a designated social season and cotillions to present young debutantes to formal society. One friend of Evaline’s remembered the elaborate 1890s social life among the upper-middle class: “There seemed at this period a distaste for blank dates in the social calendar,” she noted.

48 “Report of Officers of Indianapolis Free Kindergarten and Children’s Aid Society, 1903-1904” (Special Collections and Rare Books, Irwin Library, Butler University).
“Parties were very many and very elegant. Luncheons, receptions, dinners and dances [were] almost daily social affairs.”

John and Evaline often graced the society pages of the city’s daily newspapers in regular features such as the “Swirl of Society,” “Social Side of Life,” and “Social Side of City.” The Indianapolis Star called the Hollidays’ staging of their daughter Mary’s cotillion debut “a notable social event … long to be remembered.” The IBS had held modest church suppers and musical programs to raise funds. Elaborate fundraising galas now brought “society out in throngs.” On December 31, 1901 the IFK districts united for a single fundraising gala. Evaline noted the ball was artistically and financially successful and made it an annual event. The IFK gala became the charity ball of the social season. No other social events took place on New Year’s Eve so that everyone could attend the IFK ball. By 1910 most of “the society women” were IFK members and the ball served as the climax of the holiday season. Young men and women waited until January 2nd to return to their universities and boarding schools so that entire extended families could attend the ball. The Indianapolis Star’s coverage of the 1909 event devoted seven full columns to women’s “gorgeous gowns and sparkling jewels” and a half-page drawing of couples dancing the night away “for sweet charities’ sake.”

53 “President’s Address, Report of Officers of Indianapolis Free Kindergarten and Children’s Aid Society, 1901-1902” (Special Collections and Rare Books, Irwin Library, Butler University).
54 “Social Side of Life,” Indianapolis Sun, January 2, 1906, p. 6.
Both John and Evaline gave generously to many of the charitable causes in the city for the remainder of their lives. John Holliday gave his last major gift in 1920, one year before his death. He left $25,000 to Emmerich Manual Training High School, one of the first in the country to embrace manual training in a public school.56 (Chapter Five will discuss John and Evaline's best known gift, their eighty acres and country home for a park site.) Colleagues, peers, and friends paid heartfelt tribute to John and Evaline when they died. Eulogies and memorials to John Holliday ran for several days in central Indiana papers. He was remembered as a courageous businessmen, a dedicated charity worker and philanthropist whose public work was far-reaching. The COS recorded its sense of “deep loss” and recognized its long-time chairman as a man of “the finest civic virtue, the best benevolence and human sympathy.” The organization believed its leader was Indianapolis' “foremost citizen” who guided public welfare for the entire city as “every association for ‘Good Deeds’ sought his counsel.”57 Former U.S. Vice President Thomas R. Marshall called Holliday simply, “greatness defined.”58

Reverend M. L. Haines returned from New York to conduct his service.

Tributes to Evaline may not have run in the newspapers for days, but they were no less significant. The Indianapolis News remembered Evaline as “a woman of rare strength and charm of character. Prominent and devoted in her religious life, amongst the foremost in the benevolent and missionary work which falls peculiarly

---

57 Reports of the General Secretary 1921-1922, Box 1, Folder 5, FSA Records.
to the hand of woman.” The Society of Indiana Pioneers remembered her character, public service ethic, and influence as a permanent part of the history of Indianapolis. Church Women United wrote in its centennial history that the organization “reached a high point” of significance during her presidency. Her friend Margaret Malott White wrote her tribute, to be read and recorded in the annals of the Indianapolis Woman’s Club, in keeping with club tradition. White stated, “The entire community mourns her death and cannot easily be reconciled …. No other woman of our time has had such an influence for good in the life of our city. She was consciously alive to the duties of citizenship.” The loss of Evaline Holliday, White mourned, left a void in home, church, philanthropic, and social life. Reverend Myron Reed returned from Denver to conduct her service.

The Hollidays embodied social prominence, civic engagement, and Christian duty to care for the poor. Philanthropy provided a unique, highly visible platform for civic leaders to demonstrate their commitment to the public good while reinforcing their position in an exclusive social circle. But as the IFK gala grew increasingly elaborate, the ballroom decorated so profusely in gold and silver that it “seemed like a veritable fairy land,” did society lose sight of the purpose of philanthropy? Evaline used to say that because she and John were both so busy, she went to prayer meetings with him on Thursday evenings just to get a chance to talk with him as they

---

59 No title, date, or page number included in the 1929 Indianapolis News clipping, Evaline Hitz Rhodehamel Private Collection.
walked to church. What should we infer from such a comment, boundless dedication or self-aggrandizement?

John Holliday’s friends would tell us that recognition did not motivate his philanthropy. A Union Trust colleague told the *Indianapolis News* that it would be impossible to know the extent of Holliday’s annual donations. “Mr. Holliday gave to countless individuals as well as organizations,” he said. “It was always with a kindly regard for the man who was down and out that his great, big heart went out in an unostentatious way. Mr. Holliday did not mention even to his closest associates much of the extent of his charity.” A lifelong friend similarly wrote that “he had no desire to shine in any way as a charitable giver. He was true to the principle of the Bible in giving charity – ‘Let not thy right hand know what thy left hand doeth.’”

Few public criticisms of Holliday have survived beyond editorials that disagreed with the *News*’ stance on particular issues. An interesting commentary, Holliday’s caricature, appeared in the Newspaper Cartoonists’ Association’s collection *Indianapolitans “As We See ‘Em”* (1904). The collection is “made up of those men who perform their shares of the world’s work in such a manner as to bring them into public notice.” Caricature, by definition, exaggerates features in order to create a comic effect. The cartoonists lampooned 216 of the city’s prominent men: bankers, lawyers, industrialists, and politicians. Each man appears in similar fashion: pompously posed, larger than life, his figure dwarfing his business,

---

67 Newspaper Cartoonists’ Association of Indianapolis, *Indianapolitans “As We See ‘Em”*: Cartoons and Caricatures (Indianapolis: Wm. B. Burford, 1904).
employees, and customers. The Holliday cartoon naturally pokes fun at him, surrounded by money, but is no more or less flattering than those of his successful peers.\(^6^8\)

We can never know the full extent of the Hollidays’ sacrifices for the public good. Some may judge that they gave too much of their time, at the expense of their family, or gave for the wrong reasons. Did John Holliday give to charity to assuage an uneasy conscience or to counteract the public image of one of Indianapolis’ robber barons? Did John and Evaline’s dedication reflect egoism and need for recognition? Did their drive for status in the community eclipse the altruistic motivations that fuel philanthropy?

Every person considers how to respond to the needs of others at some point in their lives. The Hollidays exemplified people who spent their lives balancing the human continuum of egoism and altruism. We can critique the Hollidays’ choices because they possessed the resources, newspaper outlets, service ethic, Christian calling, business and social networks to leave a philanthropic legacy. It is hasty to conclude that their actions were not well-intended or beneficial to those they aimed to serve. Instead, as Payton and Moody counsel, we must accept the tension between egoism and altruism as a reality for each of us – not simply wish that it were not so.\(^6^9\)

Critiques of elite philanthropy, furthermore, remain bound up with criticism of charity organization societies. Philanthropic paternalism, the assertion that influential community leaders controlled voluntary organizations through money

\(^6^8\) Newspaper Cartoonists’ Association of Indianapolis, *Indianapolis As We See ’Em,* 13.

and service, has already surfaced in this analysis of the IBS and COS. The Hollidays, as well as their peers, shared common traits with the philanthropic elite of their time and the present day. As Teresa Odendahl has shown in her anthropological study, people in circles of privilege encourage social responsibility, believe they have a special obligation to society, and often support worthwhile causes in the public interest. Elite families incubate philanthropic culture in a lifelong generational process.\(^70\) A consequence of *noblesse oblige*, moreover, is that boards of trustees of charitable organizations become self-enclosed, self-referencing, and self-affirming.\(^71\) The Indianapolis COS board indeed remained self-affirming during Holliday’s tenure. The characteristics of the trustees changed little over twenty years from the founding membership.

Historians for decades have censured COSs’ engaged elites exercising social control to placate the lower classes, maintain community stability, and consolidate power.\(^72\) COSs have remained a relatively easy target for accusations of hard-hearted, patrician philanthropy as they created new processes, turned applicants away, stood between giver and receiver, and did not anticipate the need for structural societal change soon enough. It is time to reconsider James Leiby’s more balanced

---


\(^71\) Odendahl, *Charity Begins at Home*, 34.

view, that COS leaders aimed to amplify their religious ideal of community, animate personal and social responsibility, and minimize abuse.\textsuperscript{73}

John and Evaline Holliday embodied Leiby’s interpretation. They were fortunate people living in a time of immense change in their city. Such social change triggered a commensurate shift in the philanthropic response, from neighborhood benevolence to organized charity. They believed in Indianapolis as a moral community bound by responsibility and duty. They worked tirelessly, gave generously, and provided leadership for their family, their peers, and a multitude of organizations. The Hollidays’ work illustrates the complex balance of egoism and altruism that undergirds philanthropy, both then and now.

\textit{The Club Movement: “Just Get a Woman’s Club behind It”}

The Hollidays lived during the peak of the club movement that made an indelible imprint on philanthropy in Indianapolis. The club movement built upon trends already in motion. Chapter Two described the affinity of Americans toward voluntary association and the related public/private model of civic trusteeship that developed in Indianapolis. As Chapter Three mentioned, the (men’s) Literary Club, the Indianapolis Woman’s Club, and more than a dozen other men’s, women’s, or mixed gender literary clubs formed in Indiana between 1875 and 1900. The voluntary associations of the nineteenth century, with churches and neighborhoods at the core, formalized into clubs of all sorts by 1900. Indiana historian Edward Leary wrote matter-of-factly, “Almost everyone in Indianapolis belonged to a club”\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{73} James Leiby, “Charity Organization Reconsidered,” \textit{Social Service Review} 58, no. 4 (December 1984): 527-528.
during Indiana’s Golden Age. Mary Merrill Graydon recorded over one hundred literary and social clubs by 1900 in a city of 169,000 people. Many men and women, moreover, belonged to multiple clubs. The *Red Book* (1895) and annual *Blue Books* cross-referenced club memberships with households as club participation signaled socioeconomic status, character, and willingness to participate in a common endeavor.

Indianapolis newspapers devoted considerable space to the club scene and covered in detail the weekly club programs and social calendar (parties, receptions, and engagement and wedding announcements). Those within the exclusive social circle always had information on important events at their fingertips. Club men and women commented over and over that they felt a sense of belonging, bonding, and camaraderie with other members. Those on the outside looking in could only wonder what that sort of sophisticated and leisurely life must be like.

The veritable explosion of clubs produced a tremendous cache of social capital in the city. Social capital arises out of three related sources: opportunity and networks, motivation and trust, and ability. People, logically, must be in situations for interaction with others for relationships to create value. The frequency, intensity, and complexity of network ties determine the extent of social capital that may be mobilized in the future. Motivation and trust add value to the ties once they are created, then allow ties to transcend transactions and allow people to become

---

75 Mary Merrill Graydon, “Early Indianapolis,” ca. 1902, ISL Pamphlet Collection.
members of shared communities with a commitment to the public good. Scholars agree that social capital builds communities. If people work together and trust each other, social capital facilitates information access, enhances individuals' influence, and creates solidarity that reinforces cultural norms.77

In Indianapolis, scientific philanthropy was one such cultural norm that social capital reinforced. Club membership solidified and intensified existing networks into even denser, interrelated associations that linked gender, religion, business, and philanthropy. Club life built what Robert Putnam calls bonding social capital. Bonding social capital connects members within a group, is exclusive in nature, and reinforces cultural homogeneity. Clubs created strong in-group loyalty and solidarity, more than they built bridging social capital that connects different groups to one another.78 Prominent men and women already supported the COS through donations and service to pursue their own visions of the civic ideal. These same men and women simultaneously participated in and led the club movement, with the Hollidays at the vanguard. As a result, the organized charity model became firmly entrenched. As literary and cultural associations flourished, the COS enjoyed two decades of stability, confidence, and legitimacy in the city.

The trend to organize charity coincided with organization in other arenas and reinforced the COS's validity. As Indiana's Ida Harper observed, “The spirit of combination, of federation, has seized upon the people …. Every profession, every

trade, has its organization.”  Mary Jameson Judah, married to COS charter member John M. Judah, echoed that “the key of our time is the value of organization.”  Men’s public lives naturally centered around business, so many early Indianapolis voluntary associations were business-related, such as the Board of Trade, Bar Association, State Medical Society, and Indiana Manufacturers’ Association. New clubs built upon business connections but did not have to be professional associations, such as the Century Club, Columbia Club, and Country Club. Men turned to their clubs as comfortable social refuges. Clubs could be noisy or sedate, political or neutral, but always “undefiled by lace and linen” – that is, the presence of women.

Wealth alone did not qualify men for club membership. Meredith Nicholson observed, “it was still bad form to display wealth if you had it” and established citizens regarded nouveau riche warily. To the men’s Literary Club, for example, education and passion for the pursuit of truth and knowledge surpassed other criteria. Lawyers, ministers, teachers, doctors, and businessmen were the majority of members during the club’s founding decades. The Literary Club unapologetically turned away candidates whose character, intellect, or social standing did not pass

80 Indianapolis Woman’s Club, Indianapolis Woman’s Club, 1875-1940 (Greenfield, IN: Wm. Mitchell Printing Co., 1944), 76.
83 Nicholson, Zelda Dameron, 206.
muster. Most importantly, it welcomed men who could “write a good paper” and participate effectively.  

Co-educational university literary societies, such as those at Northwestern Christian University, lyceums, and the Plymouth Church lecture series helped to pave the way for literary clubs. One citizen described Indianapolis as a “city of readers,” playing on the “city of homes” phrase. Another wrote that the “city of homes” had created a “city of readers” because even the poorest families subscribed to a daily newspaper. People borrowed books from the public and private libraries and bought books from the several popular booksellers in the city. On “Magazine Day” each month, eager readers lined up their carriages at storefronts to buy periodicals just as bookshops received deliveries.

Women joined clubs as self-improvement, literary, and educational pursuits in lieu of higher education that was not yet widely accessible. While literary clubs predominated, clubwomen felt their interests were so varied that each club was unique; the best generalization was “a body of women organized for mental improvement.” Women’s clubs, which Anne Firor Scott has called “organized womanhood,” provided the nucleus around which women could meet, socialize, and

---

85 Noland, *Indianapolis Literary Club Summarized Record*, 105.
88 Hester M. McClung, *Sketch of the Woman’s Sanitary Association of Indianapolis, Indiana* (Indianapolis: Indianapolis Sanitary Association, 1900), 14.
discuss a myriad of topics.\textsuperscript{91} By 1899 Harper's credited women's clubs with being “the popular custodians of literature in America.”\textsuperscript{92} In Indianapolis, the larger club movement developed around literary clubs.

The Indianapolis Woman’s Club (IWC), the earliest women’s literary club in the city, quickly became one of the largest and most prestigious clubs after it formed in 1875. Clubs across the country copied its model.\textsuperscript{93} It met fortnightly October through April, conducted formal business, then two women gave presentations agreed on in advance. The IWC served as admirer, critic, competitor, and complement to the (men’s) Literary Club, as many club members were married to one another.\textsuperscript{94} COS members whose spouses belonged to their respective clubs by 1890 included Foster, Haughey, Holliday, Judah, and McCulloch (see Appendix 2 and 3). The leading men and women in philanthropy and club life, shaping the city all the while, were one and the same.

The interconnected philanthropic, social, and intellectual circles blossomed during Indiana’s Golden Age. Many citizens fancied themselves as budding writers as well as avid readers. In 1899 five of the city’s literary clubs sponsored author William Dean Howells for the Plymouth Church lecture series. When Howells opened his talk, he invited all the authors in the packed house to sit on the platform

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{91} Anne Firor Scott, \textit{Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History} (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 111.


\textsuperscript{93} Helen Hooven Santmyer, \textit{“And Ladies of the Club”} (New York: G.P. Putnam, 1982), 51, 170, 256, 466, 494, 525, 690, 728, and 813. This thinly veiled fictional account of Xenia, Ohio's women’s literary club is remarkably close to the IWC in mission, procedures, program content, membership, and formality. Women's studies scholars have cited this source as representative of the women's club experience.

\textsuperscript{94} Indianapolis Woman’s Club, \textit{Indianapolis Woman’s Club, 1875-1940}, 68; Indianapolis Woman’s Club, \textit{Indianapolis Woman’s Club, 1875-1975} (Indianapolis: Indianapolis Woman’s Club, 1975), 13.
\end{footnotesize}
with him. The entire audience supposedly rose and started for the stage, much to Howells' surprise.\footnote{James Woodress, \textit{Booth Tarkington: Gentleman from Indiana} (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1955), 16. While the Howells visit to Indianapolis is factual, the entire audience on its feet may be apocryphal. Other versions of the story exist, such as the author and lecturer Opie Percival Read's appearance in Fort Wayne, Indiana. Read supposedly asked any author in the audience to stand, and the audience rose en masse. Howard H. Peckman, “Hoosier Authors: Who and Why,” in \textit{The Hoosier State: Readings in Indiana History}, vol. 2, ed. Ralph Gray (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980), 250.} A small group hosted the famous writer for dinner, including Booth Tarkington, Benjamin and Mary Harrison, John and Evaline Holliday, and May Wright Sewall. Howells wrote his wife that he had been “caught up in the silken arms of the aristocracy” from the moment he arrived.\footnote{Robert Rowlette, “In ‘The Silken Arms of the Aristocracy’: William Dean Howells’ Lecture in Indianapolis, 1899,” \textit{Indiana Magazine of History} 69, no. 4 (December 1973): 299.}

May Wright Sewall’s presence at Howells’ intimate dinner gathering was most deliberate. She was a nationally known suffragist and had helped found several philanthropic organizations both locally and nationally (see Appendix 3). Sewall (1844-1920) came to Indianapolis to teach at Indianapolis High School, then opened the prestigious Classical School for Girls in 1882. Also in 1882, she and Zerelda Wallace, wife of former Indiana governor David Wallace, co-founded the Equal Suffrage Society of Indianapolis. Sewall chaired the National Woman’s Suffrage Association and worked closely with Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

A devoted clubwoman, Sewall believed clubs should have a suitable and permanent home. In 1890 she and seven other women formed and invested in a stock corporation to be known as the Indianapolis Propylaeum for “literary, artistic, scientific, industrial, musical, mechanical and education purposes.” Only women held stock in the Propylaeum, from the Greek “gateway to higher culture,” one of
the few women’s clubhouses in the country at the time.  Six clubs hosted programs within days of the building’s 1891 dedication. The Propylaeum remains the home for several social and cultural clubs to this day.

May Wright Sewall exemplified women’s quintessential causes, suffrage and temperance, and how those causes informed solutions to other social issues. Indiana formed its Woman’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) in 1874, just as the national organization formed. Women lobbied vigorously for the temperance crusade, wearing white ribbon badges to symbolize their devotion. Women personally called on Indianapolis saloonkeepers, asking them to sign pledges promising to stop selling spirits. The city was sufficiently prominent in the temperance movement that an Indianapolis woman, Josephine R. Nichols, represented the national WCTU at the 1889 Paris Exposition.

Indianapolis WCTU women sought the protection of women and children from poverty and abuse in addition to temperance. The WCTU and COS, therefore, actively supported one another, as both organizations found that alcohol addiction and poverty often coexisted. In 1893, Luella McWhirter led the Meridian Union WCTU’s opening of the Door of Hope rescue mission in Indianapolis (see Appendix 3). Door of Hope housed abandoned girls referred by the City Hospital, workhouse, or police station. WCTU women raised funds and directed daily operations; COS
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98 The first six clubs were the Art Association, Dramatic Club, Indianapolis Literary Club, Indianapolis Woman’s Club, Matinee Musicale, and Portfolio Club. The original Propylaeum building was located on North Street; in 1923 the Propylaeum moved to its current location at 1410 N. Delaware St. Ray E. Boomhower, ‘But I Do Clamor’: May Wright Sewall, A Life, 1844-1920 (Zionsville: Guild Press of Indiana, 2001), 69; Indianapolis Woman’s Club, *Indianapolis Woman’s Club, 1875-1940*, 124.
members Hugh Hanna and Matthias Haines served on the board of managers. Within months, Reverend William Vincent Wheeler recommended broadening the work to include entire family units and by 1900 the mission provided the majority of rescue housing in the city.¹⁰¹

As other women’s clubs emerged, many were careful to distinguish themselves from temperance or suffrage causes, as though cultural or literary missions could provide an oasis from those emotionally charged issues. The IWC guarded against becoming “a suffrage society in sheep’s clothing.”¹⁰² Some clubs never approached potentially taboo topics such as religion, politics, temperance, or suffrage.¹⁰³ IWC members May Wright Sewall and Harriet Noble proposed a compromise. The club would devote one meeting annually, with two or three programs, to any topic to stimulate courage, the quest for truth, and ready debate.¹⁰⁴

Members agreed. Once a year, women delivered papers on a wide range of topics related to philanthropy and social science, clearly in tandem with issues relevant to the COS (see Appendix 6).¹⁰⁵ Most of the club’s discussions surrounded the members’ presentations on literary and historic topics. Program agendas

¹⁰² Indianapolis Woman’s Club, Indianapolis Woman’s Club, 1875-1940, 29.
¹⁰³ Erin Kelley’s Master’s thesis goes into more depth on the IWC’s conservatism. She focuses on the club’s reticence to discuss suffrage and temperance as these topics were unladylike and “radical.” Discussion of philanthropic topics or women’s participation in the Local Council of Women is outside the scope of her thesis. Erin K. Kelley, “‘A Worthwhile Existence’: The Conservatism and Consciousness of Indianapolis’s Clubwomen, 1875-1920” (Master’s thesis, Indiana University, 2003), Chapter 2.
¹⁰⁴ Indianapolis Woman’s Club, Indianapolis Woman’s Club, 1875-1940, 54.
¹⁰⁵ The men’s Indianapolis Literary Club rarely devoted programs to philanthropy and social science after McCulloch’s death, as the members discussed these issues in their capacities as charities’ trustees. Only eleven papers related to heredity, benevolence, race, immigration, or evolution between 1875 and 1922 other than those presented by McCulloch. Noland, Indianapolis Literary Club Summarized Record, 22-76.
regularly indicated “book reviews,” but the authors and titles of reviewed works were not documented. Popular female authors of benevolence literature that dealt with themes of charity, generosity, poverty, and women’s rights and opportunities, included Mary Eleanor Wilkins Freeman, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, and Sarah Orne Jewett. We can assume, but not confirm, that literary club women read these authors’ works.106

Two IWC guest speakers demonstrated the women’s willingness to take risks. For its twenty-fifth anniversary in 1900, the IWC retained New York’s Jacob Riis to present “The Battle with the Slums” illustrated with stereopticon views. The IWC hosted members from sixteen other clubs; the program filled Plymouth Church.107 Its 1902 guest of honor, New England author Alice French, brought yet another perspective on philanthropy. French published dozens of local-color short stories, but also tackled social and political issues. Writing under the pseudonym Octave Thanet, she authored a two-part story in the popular Atlantic Monthly, “The Indoor Pauper” (1881), after touring an Illinois almshouse. The stories described squalor and degradation and chastised every American citizen for allowing such institutions to continue.108

Not all literary clubs trod lightly around potentially controversial or unladylike topics. Cornelia Fairbanks, wife of the future U.S. Vice President Charles Fairbanks, founded the women’s Fortnightly Literary Club in 1885 to study

106 Indianapolis Woman’s Club, 1875-1925, A Gift, Box 8, Folder 3, IWC Records.
107 IWC Minutes, Box 1, Folder 7, Indianapolis Woman’s Club Records, 1875-2007, Collection M0478, Indiana Historical Society (hereafter: IWC Records).
“literature, art, and social, political, and domestic science.”

Papers in the 1890s addressed temperance, prominent women philanthropists, social science (“Heredity” and “Mental Science”), the Americanization of immigrants, and charity as taught by Moses Maimonides. The Fortnightly’s 1893-1894 season alone featured three programs related to poverty: practical philanthropy, a comparison of the English Octavia Hill and American Helen Campbell, and a conversation on Salvation Army founder William Booth’s *In Darkest England and the Way Out* (1890). The IWC’s 100 members and Fortnightly club’s seventy-five members, networked with several hundred prominent men and women in Indianapolis, clearly stayed in touch with the philanthropic matters of the day.

The spirit of organization seized upon clubs themselves as the tidal wave of club formation rolled across the country. Literary clubs corresponded with one another, within their home states and across the country, but the task soon became unwieldy. By 1890, the IWC’s Frances Ross noted with some exasperation, “The very great increase in the number of literary clubs throughout the country has made the work of corresponding secretaries a perplexing one.” All of Indiana’s 179 men’s, women’s, and mixed literary clubs created the Union of Literary Clubs in
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111 The Fortnightly Literary Club, Indianapolis, Indiana 1893/94 Programme, ISL Pamphlet Collection.
112 Annual Report of Corresponding Secretary 1890/91, Box 4, Folder 11, IWC Records.
1890. The Union served two purposes: to facilitate communication among clubs and to evaluate the state of literacy and education in Indiana.113

The Union allowed individual club members to stretch beyond the confines of their particular club’s missions. Evaline Holliday, for example, probably knew of the Fortnightly’s program on Booth’s *In Darkest England*. Mrs. Holliday was always conservative in her IWC papers, but when she chaired the Union’s executive committee in 1894, she led a discussion of “The Submerged Tenth,” the title of Booth’s second chapter. Evaline Holliday subtitled her talk “the distinction between the principles of mass charities and the elevation of the individual.” 114 This choice of topic indicates her awareness of one of the principal dilemmas the COS faced, how to deliver relief without increasing aid recipients’ dependence.

Also in 1890, women’s clubs in the U.S. united under an umbrella organization, the General Federation of Women’s Clubs (GFWC), with Indianapolis’ May Wright Sewall elected as the GFWC first vice president. Sewall made it abundantly clear that women were a force to be reckoned with. “Women who pursue serious objects,” she declared, “are…capable of earnest purpose.”115 Indianapolis clubwomen supported federation, and their colleague Mrs. Sewall, with enthusiasm, sending the third largest delegation to the first GFWC convention in New York City.

113 The Union of Literary Clubs subsequently reorganized as the Indiana State Federation of Clubs in 1906. Boruff et al., *Women of Indiana*, 21-22; undated report of the Committee of the Indianapolis Woman’s Club, Box 24, Folder 3, IWC Records; McKay, *Literary Clubs of Indiana*, 33.
The GFWC wrestled with the proper balance of club life with philanthropy. GFWC historian Jennie Croly observed that most clubwomen were engaged in as many as six charities, so perhaps the women’s club should be a haven from fundraising. The GFWC could not, however, maintain boundaries between clubs and charities. Presentations at annual conferences therefore dealt with care of dependent children, sociology, and the efficiency and effectiveness of charities. New York COS’s Josephine Shaw Lowell spoke on “Relief and Aid” at the 1896 annual conference.116 Clubs and charities were so naturally intertwined that the GFWC eventually encompassed philanthropy as one of its core purposes.

May Wright Sewall, through her extensive club participation, observed that women were most interested “in women of their own class or in the legitimate recipients of their own charities.”117 Her assessment was likely accurate. Sewall envisioned an organization that would bring together women of different traditions, wealth, social position, religion, and political opinions – albeit white and upper-middle class. Sewall cited Alexis de Tocqueville’s findings that Americans easily formed voluntary associations, noting that much of women’s collective work had taken place on a smaller scale than men’s, was usually church-related, and aimed at moral reform. The time had come for women to organize on a large scale and to address systemic social concerns. Through local, state, national, and international

organization, women could more intelligently relieve the conditions of the poor and suffering.\textsuperscript{118}

One result, the Indianapolis Local Council of Women (1892), harnessed the civic engagement of the state’s clubwomen to study a variety of social issues.\textsuperscript{119} Forty-three literary, charitable, missionary, and church societies joined immediately.\textsuperscript{120} The Local Council formed legislative committees related to urban problems far beyond the scope of suffrage and temperance for which women were well known: compulsory school attendance, a separate women’s prison and girls’ reform school, women’s and child labor, a separate juvenile court, housing, smoke abatement, industrial safety, and public health.\textsuperscript{121} It agitated for appointment of women on the boards of all state institutions in which women and girls resided.

Women’s studies literature describes a turn in women’s clubs from individual to community improvement, concluding that by 1900 many women’s clubs felt they had outgrown the self-improvement stage and migrated to social change and community action.\textsuperscript{122} Indianapolis women had expressed interest in social problems, and acted on them, at least ten years before. Literary clubs such as the IWC and Fortnightly presented at least one program annually on philanthropy and social

\textsuperscript{119} The Indianapolis Local Council of Women was patterned after the National Council of Women (1888) and the International Council of Women (1888). The first National Council officers included WCTU’s Frances Willard, Susan B. Anthony, Clara Barton, and May Wright Sewall. These women, as well as Alexandra Grippenberg who had visited Indianapolis the same year, helped to form the International Council. Sewall, \textit{Genesis of the International Council of Women}, 16.
\textsuperscript{120} \textit{The Indianapolis Local Council of Women, 1892-1924} (Indianapolis: Local Council of Women, 1924), 10, 77-78.
\textsuperscript{121} \textit{The Indianapolis Local Council of Women}, 18-28.
science, deemed taboo topics in other settings. The IWC in 1891, for example, petitioned the city to appoint a Police Matron after a club member reported on “the sad condition of women and girls in the Station House.” Martha McKay, the IWC founder, noted that women throughout Indiana had “turned toward scientific questions or social problems” by 1894. In 1897, the IWC donated funds for a summer school for poor children and publicly supported industrial training for children. Finally, throughout the 1890s the Local Council operated in full swing with a comprehensive reform agenda.

After 1900, the purely literary club no doubt was waning and reform was in the air. Women’s clubs developed such a reputation for action and effectiveness that Will Rogers reportedly advised, “If you have a hard job you want done and no one else will undertake it, just get a woman’s club behind it. It will be done with dispatch and well done.” The American Library Association credited women’s clubs with initiating 75 percent of the public libraries in the country.

123 IWC Minutes, Box 1, Folder 5, IWC Records.
125 McClung, “Women’s Work in Indianapolis:” 526.
128 Abigail A. Van Slyck, *Free to All: Carnegie Libraries & American Culture, 1890-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 125. The Indianapolis Public Library arose out of Indianapolis Public Schools. It began in Indianapolis High School and moved to its own building in 1873 upon the recommendation of the Public Library Committee of the Board of School Commissioners. COS members Brown, Browning, Hines, C.M. Martindale, E.B. Martindale, McCulloch, Shorridge, and Yandes were on the committee. The original location was not a Carnegie library; five of the twelve branches added before 1920 were funded by Carnegie grants. Lawrence J. Downey, *A Live Thing in the Whole Town: The History of the Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library, 1873-1990* (Indianapolis: Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library Foundation, 1991), 1-8, 30-32; Eva Draegert, “Cultural History of Indianapolis: Literature, 1875-1890 [I],” *Indiana Magazine of History* 52, no. 3 (September 1956): 235-236.
research chemist Harvey Wiley, one of the champions of the federal 1906 Pure Food and Drug Act, recognized clubwomen’s support as crucial to the bill’s passage.\(^{129}\)

The Indianapolis Local Council of Women provided an outlet for clubwomen who were keenly interested in reform and who were engaged already with the COS, including Hannah Haughey, Lois Hufford, Harriet Noble, and Pauline Merritt. Literary clubs, therefore, could remain abreast of reform legislation while keeping their original purposes intact: literary, social, and cultural growth, not a reform agenda in sheep’s clothing. The IWC, for example, officially endorsed the Local Council’s advocacy regarding “problems affecting women and children, resolutions regarding savings banks for the poor, age limit for child labor, industrial training in schools, and an eight-hour workday for women and children.”\(^{130}\) Within a few years, the Council believed it had proven “over and over again its value as a propaganda body.”\(^{131}\)

The Local Council hosted speakers with expertise in philanthropy whose programs reflected the changing ideals toward poverty. Speakers captured the gradually liberalizing views of charity leaders, who increasingly recognized the structural causes of poverty such as unemployment, adverse industrial conditions, and lack of adequate housing and recreation. The COS continued to work to improve individual morality, but gradually recognized that leaders should shape the urban environment to create the ideal city. Some reformers and charity workers,

\(^{129}\) Indiana was the first state to pass a statute that embodied the main principles of the national Pure Food and Drug Law. Balz, *History Indiana Federation of Clubs*, 193; Boruff et al., *Women of Indiana*, 22.

\(^{130}\) IWC Minutes, Box 1, Folder 6, IWC Records; State Board of Health of Indiana, *Annual Report of the State Board of Health of Indiana for the Fiscal Year Ending October 31, 1906* (Indianapolis: Wm. B. Burford, 1907), 11.

\(^{131}\) *The Indianapolis Local Council of Women*, 21.
therefore, hoped to create healthy moral settings rather than simply to repress evils. Sometimes called environmental strategists, they wanted cities to assume the moral role once held by families and the church and expected broad governmental programs to sanction the changes.

Two 1902 speakers to the Local Council exemplify this shifting landscape in which the COS operated. Alexander Johnson, then superintendent of Fort Wayne, Indiana’s Home for Feeble-Minded Children, spoke on “Heredity and Environment.” Johnson’s “civic ideal,” he told the Council, was that “every child born in the city shall have a chance to live a pure, wholesome life.”132 Two months later, May Wright Sewall and Luella McWhirter hosted Florence Kelley, founder and general secretary of the National Consumers’ League.133 Kelley warned of the prevalence of industrial child labor, citing the alarming statistic that 3,000 children worked in Indiana’s factories. The audience peppered her with questions about how to address child labor, sweat shops, and unsanitary tenements in their home city. Two days later, Indiana’s State Factory Inspector commenced a crusade for better working conditions.134

When Indiana State Federation of Clubs subsumed the Union of Literary Clubs in 1906, women’s advocacy for social causes found yet another institutional form. Thirteen standing committees covered a range of issues: pure food, industrial and child labor, civil service reform, and legislation. By the peak of the club

133 Florence Kelley (1859-1932), daughter of Philadelphia congressman William Kelley. She resided at Chicago’s Hull House and New York’s Henry Street settlements. Educated at Cornell University and Northwestern University, Kelley championed factory labor, child labor, and compulsory education laws.
movement in 1910, when nationwide club membership exceeded one million women, members boasted skills acquired through club participation that ranged from public speaking to problem solving to consensus building.\textsuperscript{135} Indiana women proudly claimed they had become “brilliant at parliamentary procedure” through club work and believed they demonstrated decorum, civic engagement, professionalism, expertise, and determination.\textsuperscript{136} They applied skills they had acquired in struggles for suffrage and temperance to other causes, and vice versa.\textsuperscript{137}

Indianapolis clubs segregated by ethnicity or race followed a similar trajectory as well-heeled white clubs, evolved from church-based and informal voluntary associations. Jewish synagogues and lodges largely filled the club role for Indianapolis’ Jewish population. The Workmen’s Circle branch, the Americus Club, and Agiliar Literary Society catered to different Jewish communities in the city.\textsuperscript{138} Black church-based literary associations included both women and men: the Allen Chapel Literary Society, Bethel Literary Society, Harrison Literary Society, Simpson Epworth League, and Twentieth Century Literary Society. The black, secular Atheneum Literary Society, Demia Debating Club, and Parlour Reading Club all had male and female members.\textsuperscript{139}

\begin{flushright}
\scriptsize
\textsuperscript{136} Boruff et al., \textit{Women of Indiana}, 22.
\textsuperscript{137} Barbara Springer concludes that although Indiana women had mixed legislative accomplishments, they became well respected and laid the foundation for the next generation of women to participate in civic affairs. Barbara Springer, “Ladylike Reformers: Indiana Women and Progressive Reform, 1900-1920” (Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1985), 250-256.
\end{flushright}
Black women, led by Lillian Thomas Fox, organized the Woman’s Improvement Club as a literary club in 1903 (see Appendix 3). Within only two years the club redefined its mission, shifting from self-improvement to community assistance and healthcare. African-American women’s clubs also federated. Clubs around the country merged into the National Association of Colored Women’s Clubs in 1896. Lillian Thomas Fox organized Indiana’s black women’s clubs into the Indiana State Federation of Women’s Clubs in 1904. The state federation invited all clubs working on “religious, moral, educational, or charitable lines” to affiliate; May Wright Sewall shared her organizational experience at the founding meeting.

Black women’s clubs formed for many of the same reasons as white women’s clubs: self-improvement, social cohesion, and forums to address community needs outside of churches. But black and white citizens faced very different problems. Indianapolis was generally segregated, so blacks had fewer educational, employment, and political opportunities. Although the COS assisted a large percentage of black applicants, charities often expected black citizens to take care of one another. Unlike white clubs, black women’s clubs had to inform the white community of problems faced by blacks, coupled with missions of self-help to adopt
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142 The COS did not regularly track the number of black applicants. Review of case records for the 1880s and 1890s indicates frequent intake of black applicants, and the COS did not turn away black families on the basis of race. Its census for three particular years recorded black applicants: 1897, 111 or 15 percent; 1898, 284 or 30 percent, and 1899, 146 or 20 percent. COS Annual Reports, Box 4, Folder 8, FSA Records. For information on segregation and lack of access to social services, see Darlene Clark Hine, *When the Truth is Told: A History of Black Women’s Culture and Community in Indiana, 1875-1950* (Indianapolis: National Council of Negro Women Indianapolis Section, 1981), 12, 42-43.
white norms of thrift and industry. Black clubwomen, moreover, viewed clubs as sites of racial solidarity that could serve as vital forces for ending discrimination.

The club movement thus undergirded COS leaders’ goal of preserving values of industry, thrift, and self-reliance. Mary Jameson Judah’s short stories alluded to class divisions. Her characters, prominent club women, always reflected intelligence, cleverness, quality, and high breeding. When one of the gentlewoman characters delivered a Christmas basket to the poor, she contrasted the hush of “tidy poverty” of the row of workingmen’s cottages in the shadow of the great factory with her own lively home aglitter with elaborate decorations. Martha McKay’s interpretation rested on her civic ideal: education may prevent Indianapolis from having to deal “with the ignorant and criminal classes.” Literature, she hoped, would grow “these poorly fed minds” and bring “that first impulse toward a higher life.”

The momentum of wealth accumulation, club membership, and social capital building affected the civic culture in Indianapolis. Voluntary associations, now formalized as clubs, recreated small-town intimacy within the growing city, reinforced traditional networks, and selectively vetted newcomers. John Holliday believed that club life “stirred ambition and inspired many of us to work that has enlarged our vision and made us more useful citizens if not better men.”

Elite men and women embraced what sociologist Daniel J. Monti calls commercial
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communalism, in which professionals and businessmen create a formal compact among one another to govern how they address public concerns. This maturing civic ideal bound together economic prosperity, morality, civic improvement, duty to community, and public accountability – with the city as the vehicle. This service ethic reinforced organized charity’s tenets yet shifted the focus gradually away from McCulloch’s Social Gospel and toward a formal obligation of the elite.

City Beautiful & The Commercial Club: “For the General Welfare of Indianapolis”

With the club phenomenon in full swing, the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago brought what Indianapolis women called “a national era of enlarging vision.” The Exposition embodied all the beauty that planning could create in one space: sanitation, aesthetics, urban reform, building design, artistic collaboration, professionalization, and civic pride. All these trends had been in motion, and now the Exposition created a grand stage that accelerated their influence into a national movement that became known as City Beautiful. City Beautiful evolved into a sustained, long-range, comprehensive movement of city transformation encompassing the fin-de-siècle aesthetic installations of public art, waterways, fountains, architecture, parks, and boulevards. The arts were so influential that the famous urban planner Charles Mulford Robinson quipped of what he called the civic battle between ugliness and beauty, “Henceforth no
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community need be ugly.” Business and social elites, as boosters, simultaneously promoted their city through physical and institutional improvements.

City Beautiful harnessed the spirit of civic obligation as a middle-class, urban reinterpretation of *noblesse oblige*. Robinson described man and his city as essentially one and the same: “He who loves his city is a better citizen and a better man.” Civic responsibility, City Beautiful, and booster phenomena were most often associated with male leadership, but women lived in cities too. After the Columbian Exposition, the national movement of city planning and beautification allowed for both men’s and women’s participation.

For cities to be beautiful, they first had to be clean. Many late nineteenth-century newly industrialized cities, including Indianapolis, looked filthy and smelled awful. Before municipal services developed, garbage and human and animal waste filled streets, smoke and soot filled skies, and waterways flowed with industrial waste and bacteria. Traditional small-scale projects could not combat the problems created by factories and rapid urbanization, so strategic planning was required.

Both women’s and men’s voluntary associations in Indianapolis embraced City Beautiful as industrialization began to encroach upon their home city. By the 1880s, Indianapolis had developed a reputation for green openness. When Evaline

---
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Holliday wrote her cousin that she could see so much green from her house, this was no coincidence. An 1870 City Council publication noted that the city’s “want of parks [had been] somewhat obviated by” wide shaded streets, public squares, a college campus, and even the U.S. Arsenal grounds.\(^{156}\) Residential developments during the 1870s aimed at the affluent, such as Woodruff Place and Irvington, featured large lots and tree-lined streets. Shade trees that bordered established neighborhoods on north Meridian, Delaware, and Pennsylvania streets met in arches overhead.\(^ {157}\) In *Zelda Dameron*, Mariona’s High Street represented Indianapolis’ Meridian Street, with maples that overhung it and “everywhere comfort.”\(^ {158}\) The ideal of what George Geib calls a “green town” affected the entire city.\(^ {159}\) Clubs, private individuals, and municipal government had begun to preserve more open spaces, although not yet on a systematic or holistic basis.\(^ {160}\)

Women around the country undertook a plethora of sanitation reforms under the rubric of “municipal housekeeping,” women’s systematic, collective efforts to make cities as clean as their own homes. Municipal housekeeping brought women’s authority into public spaces without threatening the traditional women’s sphere; clubs provided the institutional vehicles.\(^ {161}\) Clubwoman Imogen Oakley observed that municipal housekeeping “devolved largely upon women” because men were absorbed in business matters.\(^ {162}\) Writer Olivia Dunbar believed women assumed
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jurisdiction over cities’ cleanliness as “extended housekeeping” that did not threaten “men’s hereditary privileges” to govern their communities. Women’s municipal housekeeping efforts brought virtue into their communities, not to challenge, but to build on feminine qualities and domestic expertise. Indianapolis lauded clubwoman Luella McWhirter for her ability to bridge the private and public sphere: “First is her interest in the home, then her church, and she works for every enterprise which means the enriching of the community, physically, culturally, or spiritually.”

“The attractiveness of woman,” another clubwoman insisted, “instead of being diminished will be increased in direct ratio to her broader culture and more varied responsibilities.”

By keeping one foot in the world of voluntary associations, women justified community work and maintained a distinctly feminine style.

Indianapolis municipal housekeeping reached its zenith in the 1890s. Mary Louise Lodge McKee and IWC member Catharine Merrill created a task force of both black and white women, the Woman’s Sanitary Association, in response to an impending cholera threat. Two other association members had visited an obscure attraction at the Columbian Exposition: the “Sewerage and Garbage Disposal Plant.” They regaled interested women at the first association meeting with a vivid description of modern sanitation, and the task force was launched. The cholera epidemic never materialized, but women’s advocacy did. Indianapolis women delivered publicly funded garbage collection, a pure milk ordinance, an anti-spitting ordinance, disinfection of the public hospital and dispensary, a system to condemn
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and remove dilapidated buildings, and cleaner food markets, parks, streets, and schools.

Early on, municipal housekeepers struggled for credibility to prove they were not just interested in matters of fashion and advice to the lovelorn. The women therefore sought out facts and shifted out of their traditional domestic sphere into a scientific, educated motherhood to persuade government to clean up the city. The Woman’s Sanitary Association thus adopted a businesslike approach to “act as a stimulus to the men in power.” Association treasurer Pauline Merritt had authored a paper, “Industries for Women,” in which she championed women’s independence and entry into any business “for which she may be fitted.” Enter they did – and with gusto. Their business plan resembled the COS’s: formal constitution, districts, district supervisors and committees, visitors, a referral system to proper authorities, reliance on data, and publicity. Under the association’s auspices, women tromped around every inch of the city, into settings normally deemed unseemly for respectable ladies, studied voraciously, and then mediated among groups of men to effect change.

The women partnered with the Sanitary Inspector, Health Board, Board of Public Works, Police Department, City Hospital, Park Board, School Board, and City Council. In addition, they organized their own supplemental health board and street cleaning department. Women worked hard and wrote of fatigue, but women’s tenaciousness caused even greater exhaustion among men in positions of
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authority. COS member Dr. P.H. Jameson, for example, advised the association that the Health Board “can kick and complain, but has no authority to carry [the association’s] ideas into effect.”172 The association’s minutes recorded that the Health Board would need “far more than 24 hours a day to promptly meet all requests.” During debate over the pure milk ordinance, a milkman bemoaned, “I’ll have to see to getting my herd tested, I guess, as those sanitary women have taken up the subject.” When an association member questioned a city street sweeper, he asked her “with a surprised, half-frightened voice, ‘Be you one of them sanitary women?’” One of the city workers referred to the association as “an advanced section of the Millennium.”173

Whether fatigued, afraid, annoyed, or insulted, men and women ultimately cooperated to beautify Indianapolis. The Board of Park Commissioners even asked the Sanitary Association to support an ordinance to remove advertisements from trees and public structures, maintain public lawns and trees, and plant new trees.174 Women’s interest in city beautification continued for several years, as clubs beautified cemeteries and planted and improved green spaces in all manner of public places.175

The COS apparently respected the women’s public work since it considered the Sanitary Association a member of the circle of charities. The COS’s 1893-94 Annual Report promoted a plethora of charities in the circle, including this carefully worded vignette of the Sanitary Association: “to promote general sanitation by
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increasing public interest in the prevention of disease and by aiding the city

government in the enforcement of its sanitary ordinances.”176 The COS claimed the
Sanitary Association as part of its circle of charities through 1899. Neither the
association’s published report nor newspaper coverage, however, suggested that the
women felt they were a COS organ. The two entities were connected in at least one
way, as COS member George Merritt was married to Pauline Merritt, the Sanitary
Association’s 1899 president.177

Women engaged in municipal housekeeping as an element of their civic ideal.
Charles Mulford Robinson’s quote could easily have read, “She who loves her city is
a better citizen and a better woman,” for women recorded their feelings about civic
engagement with zeal. The inaugural issue of The American City urged women to
“help in this national movement toward civic betterment.”178 Another described the
turn from “mere charity to constructive work for improving municipal and social
conditions” as a civic awakening.179 Indianapolis women boasted a “personal
relationship to the municipality,” elated that “a civic pride has come to life within
us.”180 The Woman’s Sanitary Association dedicated its published history to “Lay-
citizens, Be They Men, Women, or Children: As is their Civic Patriotism, So is the
Municipality.”181 The Indiana State Federation of Clubs’ civics’ committee motto
read simply: “In all respects make a City Beautiful.”182
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The Woman’s Sanitary Association embodied the power of voluntary association and collective action. The City Beautiful movement gained traction among men’s voluntary associations as well. Indianapolis was in desperate need of paved streets, an organized street system, a sewage system, and a myriad of other public works. In 1890 a young journalist named William Fortune wrote a series of editorials for Holliday’s Indianapolis News promoting a civic organization that would unite business leaders to promote the city’s economic growth and infrastructure development. Fortune’s editorials caught the eye of COS founding member Colonel Eli Lilly. By this time, the colonel had accumulated considerable wealth and devoted his attention increasingly to philanthropy – a path many successful Gilded Age industrialists followed in cities around the country. Lilly imagined Indianapolis as “the model city of America 200,000 strong” by the turn of the century, complete with smooth roads and sidewalks, shade trees, and enhanced utility systems.183

Within weeks of Fortune’s editorials, Lilly and twenty-seven other men formed the Commercial Club with a broad civic agenda: “to promote the prosperity and work for the general welfare of Indianapolis … and vicinity.”184 The combination of the city’s needs and club’s organizing principles attracted many businessmen. In two days the club had 87 members; within three months it boasted over 1,000. Not surprisingly, the Commercial Club and the COS had many

members in common. Lilly served as Commercial Club president for five years; Fortune served as the club’s secretary and later its president.\textsuperscript{185}

The Commercial Club specifically eschewed political involvement at its founding meeting, yet its early initiatives tested the boundaries of the private and public sectors. It noted the inadequacy of existing municipal government, so took matters into its own hands.\textsuperscript{186} The club proposed model legislation for a new city charter, addressed “the street question” by inviting bids for resurfacing, lobbied for a city parks commission, vetted plans for a new jail, campaigned for public safety and public health measures, and lured conventions to town. Some efforts proved unsuccessful, such as proposals for a world’s fair, a professional baseball franchise, and elevated rail lines.\textsuperscript{187}

Another economic panic struck the country in 1893 after years of railroads’ overbuilding. Almost one hundred railroads went bankrupt, triggering a run on banks and the gold supply. Over 600 banks failed and some cities saw as many as a


\textsuperscript{186} The Commercial Club’s public welfare activities were characteristic of urban leadership at the turn of the century. Karl and Katz note that community leaders scarcely perceived public/private boundaries and that a sense of personal association and community action shaped foundation formation and, later, government welfare systems. Barry D. Karl and Stanley N. Katz, “The American Private Philanthropic Foundation and the Public Sphere,” \textit{Minerva} 19, no. 2 (Summer 1981): 241-243.

quarter of their unskilled laborers left without jobs. The panic stretched into a protracted economic depression, the worst the country had yet seen. The Indianapolis National Bank closure created the greatest devastation locally. Its failure in July 1893 precipitated other bank and savings and loan suspensions and closings. Indianapolis, the Merchants National Bank history ominously recorded, would be swallowed by the “whirlpool of disaster.” Farm prices fell, factories closed, local railroads went bankrupt, and unemployment climbed.

The economic crisis, as in the 1870s, overtaxed existing charitable capacity in Indianapolis. The COS expended its annual budget early in 1893 and would not be able to satisfy the usual increased demand for relief during the upcoming winter months. The men who led the COS and the Commercial Club developed the 1893-94 poor relief scheme, which operated under the banner of the Commercial Club Relief Committee (CRC). The resulting solution represented the apotheosis of Indianapolis' business/philanthropy/government collaboration to address poor relief. In the Relief’s published report, the authors noted that “knowledge of the experience of others in dealing with like conditions … would have been helpful” had it been available.
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for inspiration. COS and Commercial Club leaders Hanna, Lilly, and Holliday likely looked to Indianapolis Mayor Caven’s 1870s Belt Railroad employment project.

The COS’s established presence, however, meant that Indianapolis’ responses to the 1870s and 1890s depressions differed significantly. Key members of the CRC’s finance committee were seasoned COS members with charity fundraising experience who could apply their knowledge in the new public/private scheme. Employer-based employee contributions to the CRC represented another form of fundraising led by businessmen. Commercial Club leaders grafted the firmly established COS principles onto the CRC’s model: registration, investigation, relief without creating dependence, a work test, and Indianapolis citizens given priority over transients. These principles were embedded into the CRC’s stated fundamental goals: to alleviate suffering with neither “pauperizing” influences nor “the humiliation of charity” and to protect Indianapolis against “imposition by an influx of dependents” from outside the city.

The COS by 1893 possessed enough knowledge of the causes of poverty to see with absolute clarity that unemployment caused this crisis – not insobriety, illness, lack of ambition, lack of thrift, or any other personal lack of responsibility. The organization told the Indianapolis Sun that “everybody who calls upon us for aid nowadays would scorn an offer of money. They all want work – work.” The COS did not create jobs, for which the unemployed clamored. “We would be delighted in
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furnishing employment to seekers if it were possible to do so,” the secretary stated, “but you know that we can’t create positions.” The COS operated the Friendly Inn and Wood Yard, but true employment solutions could only come from government or businesses. Businesses, of course, were reeling and had been laying off workers.

Voluntary association occurred not only in business or elite circles. At a time during which labor was beginning to organize around the country, the unemployed of the city banded together to form a committee of “unemployed workingmen.” Committee members filled a vital role, almost as an adjunct to the COS, before the CRC got underway. The workingmen’s committee sought out and identified those in “actual need,” vetted the needy for legitimacy, and helped coordinate neighborhood initiatives to solicit and deliver aid. Fraud persisted, so investigation remained a cornerstone of the response, even from the workingmen’s viewpoint. Trustee Gold, for example, told the Indianapolis Sun that a man applied for aid who was not in need at all, but owned three homes. At times, the workingmen’s committee had to persuade people to go to the COS. One woman told her neighbors she would never beg for food even as “she saw the wolf approaching her door.” She finally consented to send for one of the committee members, who referred her to the COS.

The Commercial Club Relief Committee held public meetings with the committee of unemployed, Township Trustee S.N. Gold, and Mayor Thomas
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Sullivan to assess the situation and devise plans that would “not be confused with charity.” Both the COS and workingmen’s committee tried to keep up with the avalanche of aid requests as the CRC raised funds. By November, the workingmen channeled all applicants to the COS. At the end of the year, the Relief officially launched with the 800 families dependent on the COS receiving priority assistance.

The COS registered applicants, as the CRC expected aid recipients to be able to work if at all possible. The society had the trained friendly visitors, forms, and processes in place to conduct investigations. The CRC assumed the city would readily supply jobs. Most of the unemployed were unskilled laborers, so the committee assumed manual jobs could be readily created for them. The city, however, provided less help than the committee expected. The Board of Public Works ultimately arranged for most unemployed men to clean streets, excavate a city sewer, and construct a dam and lake in the municipal Garfield Park. The city and gas companies provided shovels so that the men could shovel snow from city streets. The COS arranged for women to wash clothes at the Friendly Inn, although it granted relief to most women without requiring them to work. The Citizens’ Railway Company provided free transportation to workers, as it had been doing for years for the COS.

With over 1,000 members, the Commercial Club brought scale and capacity to the problem that the COS could never have marshaled on its own, although the COS operated as a full partner in the scheme from its inception. Hanna solicited
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donations from every business and most individuals in the city. Holliday’s finance committee followed up with requests for cash and in-kind donations. Together they raised over $18,000 – more than triple the annual COS budget. Donations to the CRC, moreover, did not negate donations to the COS, as the COS’s major donors continued to support the organization at their customary levels.203 The Commercial Club and the COS jointly operated a Food Market for the winter months. Food Market workers issued thousands of pounds of food and coal, in the form of weekly rations, in exchange for work or nominal payment.204 COS investigators researched whether people requesting food had received assistance in the past and noted in many 1880s case records that previous applicants now appeared at the Food Market.

![Diagram of the Food Market](image)

As the COS’s general operating funds were depleted, the CRC reimbursed the entire COS annual budget so that it could continue its usual operations for the remainder of 1894. Surplus funds, coal, and shoes were turned over to the COS at

---


the end of the relief operation. Part of the reimbursement to the COS came from a city appropriation. The township trustee, S.N. Gold, endorsed the appropriation as the relief measures saved his office, and thus taxpayers, “many thousands of dollars” because he believed the relief was far more efficient than government.205

When the 1893 panic struck, fewer than one hundred COSs existed in the U.S. Fewer than fifty had operated for more than ten years. But Watson’s history credits those established COSs with a unique ability to address the unemployment crisis even as the industrial depression “all but paralyzed industry.” Cities without COSs distributed relief “without machinery,” therefore wastefully and overlooking the most urgent needs.206 Watson singled out four cities that created temporary, multi-sector schemes as most effective: New York City, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Indianapolis. The efficient and cooperative Indianapolis plan, he noted, “clearly demonstrated the wisdom of the methods of charity organization.”207 No city supplied a comprehensive solution that addressed every case of need, but Indianapolis appears to have fared as well as possible, especially for a city of modest size.

Reverend McCulloch’s Social Gospel had made the Indianapolis COS an organization to emulate. Now the COS’s exceptional symbiosis with the business sector made it a model organization in a different way. The Commercial Club Relief Committee garnered national attention for the city as a model of scientific
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man­age­ment. A soci­o­log­i­st who stud­ied rel­ief efforts in Amer­i­can cities called Indy­anap­olis the “most per­fect ar­rangement for rel­ief that has been devised.” Dr. Edward Devine, head of New York’s COS, noted the exec­u­tive lead­ership, con­trol of the sit­u­a­tion, and ingenuity of the scheme. Inquiries came in from all over the coun­try for ad­vice and spe­cif­ics of the plan. The 1893 panic thus solid­i­fied COS prin­ci­ples in Indy­anap­olis and around the coun­try. Watson noted “un­prece­dent­ed growth” in new soci­eties and strength­en­ing of exist­ing soci­eties after the depres­sion, as the COS re­sponse had proved its value in a time of dire need.

City Beau­ti­ful may have been the impetus for the Com­mer­cial Club to form, but the 1893 panic solid­i­fied its cen­tral­ity in mat­ters of pub­lic wel­fare. After its coop­era­tion with the COS as lead­ers of the Relief Com­mit­tee, busi­ness lead­ers of the Com­mer­cial Club now felt empow­ered to remain at the inter­sec­tion of busi­ness, phi­lan­thropy, and gov­ern­ment in the future.

The COS Achieves Leg­i­t­i­macy: “We Have Simply Learned the Right Way”

The COS ma­tured as an orga­ni­za­tion in sev­eral ways dur­ing John Holliday’s ten­ure. It eventu­ally be­came fi­s­cally sta­ble af­ter years of chronic debt. Staff ex­panded to in­clude four­teen case work­ers and a full­time fundrai­s­er; volun­teer friendly vis­i­tors peaked at sev­en­ty-five. The 1890s eco­no­mic crisis val­i­dated the or­ga­ni­za­tion’s found­ing prin­ci­ples yet sim­ul­tane­ously brought the lim­i­ta­tions of its human and fi­nan­cial re­sources into sharp relief. Like their Ger­man pre­de­ces­sors,
COSs locally and nationally found that friendly visitors could not possibly reach all the poor and that one-on-one moral guidance could not address poverty when hundreds faced unemployment. Brent Ruswick criticizes the COS for not abandoning its traditional work in the wake of the 1893-94 crisis. This criticism fails to recognize the social milieu in which the COS operated. The general public, and civic leaders in particular, revered individual work ethic and self-sufficiency, and this view would not change during the COS’s existence. They never understood those men they knew as “tramps,” itinerant, seasonal laborers without long-term plans or the drive to work full time. Consistent with their peers, Indianapolis COS directors insisted that “true benevolence consists in helping the poor to help themselves.” Tramps, therefore, would always fall outside the COS’s scope, as the organization believed those men neither would nor could help themselves. Other than this group, however, the COS did slowly turn away from censuring individual morality to looking at the circumstances in which the needy found themselves.

The COS’s internal history described the 1893 panic as the “first real test” from which it learned a great deal. The 1893/94 experience precipitated the first shift in the COS’s internal structure and approaches. The internal reorganization signaled that the COS was learning from its data and experience, a crucial step in the scientific method. The COS continued to maintain its geographic district structure for recordkeeping purposes, but began organizing its committees around subject
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areas. Through the 1890s, committees evolved as the COS continually evaluated its data, learned from its staff and volunteers, applied their collective knowledge, and worked toward systemic solutions. Michael Katz suggests a sudden turn in social welfare strategies because COSs had so utterly failed. In Indianapolis, the civic leaders adapted gradually as they learned. Fourteen years of experience illuminated the dominant reasons why people arrived at the COS for help: illness or disability, lack of training or skills, lack of support caused by divorce or desertion, and addiction. It continuously altered its committee structure in recognition of specific needs or remedies, such as Friendly Inn, Friendly Visiting, Care of Old People, Housing, Justice, Mendicancy, Home Libraries, Day Nursery, Summer Mission, and Vacant Lots Cultivation. As the number of caseworkers, broader caseworker knowledge, and institutional knowledge grew, staff began working specialized case loads.

Also in 1893 Charles S. Grout, a COS staff member, began his tenure as full-time executive secretary. Jacob Dunn’s Indianapolis history described him as “constantly studying ways and means to further the work committed to his charge, having a high sense of his stewardship and an abiding human tolerance and sympathy.” Grout served as a dedicated leader, ubiquitous in COS records and
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newspapers until his 1916 retirement. No evidence of conflict or strife has survived to indicate anything but a solid business relationship between Charles Grout and John Holliday. They appear to have worked closely together and held similar views on running the COS. Both assumed leadership positions with the Indiana State Conference of Charities and Correction, a statewide society patterned after the National Council of Charities and Correction.

The COS continued to innovate, albeit at a more measured and strategic pace than during the founding years. Each new program attempted to create structural, long-term solutions that moved away from reforming each and every applicant. The COS was not about to compromise the integrity of organized charity principles but recognized that certain circumstances called for more than individual investigation and visitation. Mary Richmond agreed that the personal and social causes of poverty were so entangled that character reform and social reform must work in tandem. COS case work drove its recognition of the external economic and social causes of poverty over which the individual had no control, so it softened its classification systems, migrating away from its Class I, II, and III categories toward more generalized decisions (see Appendix 4). It began to describe itself as having two divisions, repressive and constructive, similar to Paul Boyer’s “coercive and environmentalist” characterization. The COS’s repressive work was “to hold in
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check … the evil influences surrounding the family life of our poor,” such as applying the work test and eliminating wine rooms, truancy, and fraudulent applications for assistance. Constructive work encompassed its long-term programs, the Summer Mission for Sick Children, community gardens known as Vacant Lots Cultivation, the Mothers’ Aid Society, and the Fairview Settlement as new systems to combat poverty. By the end of the maturing phase, the COS informed the public that its constructive programs predominated over repressive strategies or worthiness tests.

Local histories credit Oscar McCulloch with opening the Summer Mission for Sick Children. A lesser-known account is that John Holliday envisioned the mission and spearheaded its creation. During the summer of 1889, one of John and Evaline’s children fell ill. The heat aggravated the illness, although the Hollidays provided every material comfort possible. Holliday began to worry about the fate of poor children during the summer months and wrote an editorial for the News. Momentum built quickly. The same year, the Summer Mission for Sick Children opened at Fairview Park, under the auspices of the COS and in the style of “fresh air missions” conceived by the New York Children’s Aid Society.

---

223 Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis, “Care of the Poor,” 1901, ISL Pamphlet Collection; 1905-06 Annual Report, Box 5, Folder 1, FSA Records.
224 “Scheme of the COS Work,” Organized Philanthropy (A Continuation of The Helping Hand) 1, no. 5 (March 1912): frontispiece.
226 Fairview Park is now the campus of Butler University. The mission requested parents to pay a nominal fee for care if they were able. “Holliday Funeral to be Monday Afternoon,” Indianapolis News, October 22, 1921, ISL Clipping File: Biography; Mary Lewis Nash, “Recent Tendencies in Charity Organization Society Work” (Master’s thesis, Indiana University, 1913), 14-15.
The Summer Mission offered fresh air and free medical care in a pastoral 
setting several miles from the city. With a district nurse’s or doctor’s order in hand, 
mothers and children received complimentary rail transportation to and from the 
mission, daily rest and meals, and nursing supervision. Children could receive care 
for any length of time, from one day to the entire summer. The mission quickly 
expanded into an entire complex with a hospital, dispensary, kitchen, dining hall, 
playground, and bathhouse. Holliday created the mission to serve poor children, but 
it served anyone regardless of income.227

Indianapolis citizens, both donors and recipients, embraced the Summer 
Mission at once. Prominent men and women donated and volunteered. Seven 
women acted as “Lady Visitors in Charge” who presided over the mission grounds 
one day each week, with additional volunteer lady visitors to assist them. Six 
doctors formed a Physicians Committee. The doctors published the brochure 
“Health Hints,” issued on the authority of the city board of health on nursing, fresh 
air, proper summer clothing, water in hot weather, bathing, and cleaning baby 
bottles.228 In its first year, the mission served as many as one hundred children daily 
and approximately six hundred children over the summer.

The Summer Mission invited citizens to visit, not in the COS friendly visiting 
sense, but in the customary sense of visiting. The mission invited anyone to “mingle 
with the little ones” to stimulate interest in the work, thus generating significant 
donations.229 The Indianapolis News and Indianapolis Star seemed determined to 
outdo one another in raising funds for the Summer Mission. Every summer, both

228 Summer Mission Scrapbook 1890-1899, BV 1193, FSA Records.
papers barraged readers with weekly fundraising updates. The *Star* began its Fresh Air Fund and recruited entertainers and school and youth groups to raise money for the mission. Lawn fêtes and lemonade stands abounded. Photos of happy children at Fairview Park ran in the *Star* all summer long.  

The COS's Summer Mission served a niche and captured the interest of donors, volunteers, and clients through the entire maturing phase. Though it relied on the basic organized charity tenets of qualification, education, and supervision, it departed significantly from the work test, investigation, morality, or worthiness. The Vacant Lots Cultivation blended qualification, investigation, and self-help. The COS began its initiative to cultivate vacant lots in 1899, both to assist the poor who were willing to work and alleviate community blight. The COS donated plowed lots and seed to families for kitchen gardens. Families kept all the harvests to feed them over the winter months. Mayor Bookwalter actively supported the gardens and called on landowners to lend any unimproved lots to the COS. At the peak of the community garden program in the early 1900s, almost four hundred family gardens thrived in neighborhoods and on school and settlement grounds.  

In October 1907, the New York Stock Exchange lost approximately 50 percent of its value, setting off an economic panic sometimes called the Bankers' Panic. The October crisis led to an economic depression, although far shorter than in 1893. Indianapolis did not suffer the same bank collapses as in 1893 and demand

---


231 “The Man with the Hoe Will Soon Be at Work,” *Indianapolis Sun*, March 13, 1902, p. 3.


for labor had exceeded supply for the preceding several years, so the 1907 downturn paled in comparison. The COS wrote that it had evolved from its founding purposes to also be “an agency for the direction of emergency relief made necessary by fire, flood, or economic panic.”  Readers today recognize the mission of the American Red Cross in that statement. The Indianapolis Red Cross branch would not exist for another nine years, so in 1907 the COS managed unemployment relief on its own.

The COS applied its relief-through-work strategy to combat the 1907 panic. During the 1893 depression, the COS had recognized that jobs were the solution that most people demanded, but the organization had neither the inclination nor the ability to create jobs. By 1907, the COS had been incubating the idea of building rent-free cottages for single mothers on the same grounds as the Summer Mission for Sick Children. Mission workers and volunteers had noticed that the health benefits of the summer experience at Fairview Park eroded over the winter months when poor mothers and children returned to their homes in the city. Unemployed men provided the labor for construction of small cottages at Fairview Park, allowing the COS to “kill two birds with one stone.” Men received food for their labor; the COS added cottages for a bargain price to launch its next project. Women received aid or did work at home in exchange for food. The COS conducted investigations consistent with its usual practice and gave priority treatment to the elderly and those not served by any other charities or churches.

236 1908 Annual Report, Box 5, Folder 1, FSA Records.
237 Ibid.
The Commercial Club offered its assistance to the COS, not to co-lead the relief effort but to aid in fundraising. The club noted that “the officials of this well managed institution [COS] preferred that no outside effort be made except in extreme emergency,” so the club remained in the background. It held a “Baseball Game for Charity” and pressured the mayor to create jobs on proposed street improvements.238 Applications for aid tripled and the COS raised sufficient funds and material donations to keep up with demand, engaging churches, schools, and newspapers as fundraising organs.239

The newly built cottages spawned the Mothers’ Aid Society and the Fairview Settlement, interrelated COS auxiliaries to serve widows and single women with children – for the long term.240 The Mothers’ Aid Society (MAS) formalized the COS’s newly formed Personal Service Club, a group of eleven women who wanted to visit clients without the full responsibility of friendly visiting. Club members visited the poor and sick, read to the elderly, and distributed literature to children.241 Women clamored to be a part of the Mothers’ Aid Society as they had flocked to the Indianapolis Free Kindergarten. The society’s founding executive committee of ten women included Evaline Holliday, Emma Grout, and future Indiana University Professor Edna Henry. In one year, the society boasted 481 members and donors.242

238 1909 Annual Report, Box 2, Folder 3, Chamber Records.
240 The COS referred to all female heads of households with children as “widows.” The work of the Mothers’ Aid Society and Fairview Settlement largely overlapped but they operated as two separate entities until 1916, when the two merged. COS, A Partial Report of Four Months’ Work, 5; Little, “History of the Family Service Association,” 50.
242 First Annual Report of Mothers’ Aid Society, 1908, Box 5, Folder 13, FSA Records.
Temporary aid had long been the cornerstone of IBS and COS relief. Now, like the Summer Mission and Vacant Lots Cultivation, the MAS furnished long-term solutions without the imposition of worthiness tests. The COS had learned from its twenty-five years of investigations and data gathering that single women with children had few roads out of poverty. The Mothers’ Aid Society therefore sought to “offer any and every sort of permanent assistance to any widow or deserted woman, with young children, who requires it.” Without the burden of rent, mothers could be “free and able to meet all other needs of their families.” 243 The MAS board and members were highly sophisticated and skilled in philanthropy, yet they distinguished charitable housing from traditional benevolence:

The families who live in the cottages, however, are by no means under the constant supervision of any organization. When a home is established and a family settled, it is then expected to live an independent life. Otherwise the cottages would soon form a charitable institution, defeating its own end – that of furthering home life and self-helpfulness among women now dependent on charity through no fault of their own. 244

As the society was forming, the COS conducted a study of fifty-five mothers with children on its current caseload to better understand the women’s situations and their needs. The report noted that it had “long been a question” how best to assist these particular clients and despaired that husbands deserted their families more often when employment was high. 245 The COS concluded that temporary assistance was simply insufficient. The new MAS would not merely teach women how to work and run their households, it would “practically oversee the management” of households.
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243 First Annual Report of Mothers’ Aid Society, 1908, Box 5, Folder 13, FSA Records.
244 Ibid.
245 The rise in desertions in better economic times appears counterintuitive. The COS concluded that husbands indulged more in “drinking and carousing” when they had more income, which led to discontent with marriage. “Few Calls for Charity,” Indianapolis Journal, November 16, 1900, p. 8.
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on its clients’ behalf. MAS leaders did not consider separating family members into orphanages or other homes an option. “No family should be broken up,” it reported, “because the task of bread-winning is too great for the mother.” The MAS, moreover, committed to its permanent housing approach “to save [mothers] the humiliation of asking for relief from the various societies.”

For the first time in the COS literature, donors’ sensitivity to the potential stigma of charity appeared and a remedy followed.

COS leaders, with John Holliday at the helm, filled the founding board of Fairview Settlement. COS and MAS board members formed the settlement board thereafter, which developed and managed the facilities while the Mothers’ Aid Society managed all other services. Neither Fairview Settlement nor MAS leaders found fault or immorality among the women who had to work and support their children after being widowed, deserted, divorced, or burdened with an unemployed, ill, disabled, or alcoholic husband – although charity leaders looked on mothers who had never wed as undeserving. The specter of becoming a single mother appears to have lurked in the donors’ minds. Even the well-heeled MAS women feared a reversal of fortunes could put them into precarious circumstances: “Even with a College Education do you think you could do it WITHOUT AID?” That feeling of empathy led to advocacy. In an appeal for funds, the settlement laid blame at every citizen’s doorstep for the women’s dire straits: “society, custom and also even

247 Fairview Settlement, “If I Had $100,000, What Would I Do?,” no date, ISL Pamphlet Collection.
248 Ibid. Capitalization in original.
the law, imposes on this destitute widowed mother an almost impossible task – she must properly ‘bring up’ her family and she must go out and work to support them. How would you do it?” Since everyone created societal norms that could leave women vulnerable, everyone must change them.

By 1910, Fairview Settlement included seven cottages, a central kitchen, grocery, laundry, Sunday school, and day nursery. Young children attended the day nursery if mothers were at work; older children attended public school. The MAS held training classes at night to improve women’s skills and employability if they were able to work.\(^{249}\) The MAS hoped to improve the situation of mothers and their children, so that within one generation there would be no demand for its services.\(^{250}\) The society stated with pride that it was an organization of women, managed by women, for women. It had begun as a handful of benevolent women whose commitment stopped short of becoming full-fledged COS friendly visitors, but in a few years the MAS evolved into a miniature COS with a carefully defined mission. It managed all charitable services delivered to the women and children who resided at Fairview Settlement, complete with investigation, temporary relief, weekly calls, and instruction on thrift, industry, piety, cleanliness, sewing, and cooking.\(^{251}\)

By 1911, the COS declared Fairview Settlement a “monument to humanity.”\(^{252}\) It believed its pilot program could be a model for serving other dependent classes. The COS began to seek donations of money to build, or property

\(^{249}\) Few employment options existed for single mothers. As clerical and manufacturing work expanded for women after 1900, the female labor force was primarily young, single women without children. Little, “History of the Family Service Association,” 49-50; Wilson, The American Woman in Transition, 119.

\(^{250}\) Annual Report of Mothers’ Aid Society, 1909-1910, Box 5, Folder 13, FSA Records.

\(^{251}\) Mothers’ Aid Society, “For Our Friendly Visitor,” no date, ISL Pamphlet Collection. Pages 2 and 3 of the pamphlet served as a case record; data captured was similar to the COS statistical blank.

\(^{252}\) “Sketch of Fairview Settlement,” The Helping Hand 1, no. 3 (February 1911): 33.
to occupy, to develop new colonies for “the blind, the crippled, the aged and the sick [who] have families dependent upon them.” John Holliday donated the first house to test the strategy, and the COS began with two “social center houses” for which it employed caretakers as managers in exchange for rent.253

Although the cottage system did not appear to lead the poor out of poverty, COS leaders believed that it could. One of the most significant changes in the scientific philanthropy movement, organized charity in particular, was the optimistic goal to end poverty, not just offer palliative assistance. The COS had always granted temporary relief, never permanent relief, to many of its applicants while simultaneously delivering instruction on thrift, industry, and sobriety. Now the two related COS organizations delivered a long-term structural solution, permanent housing, with the identical goal: to end poverty for the next generation. The rent-free cottage strategy mirrored the decline of the asylum movement which the IBS had helped to bring about in the nineteenth century. Both provided long-term housing solutions, but these smaller colonies carried fewer stigmas, allowed occupants more independence, and permitted mothers and children to remain together.

Community gardens and the widows’ colony bore some similarities to the early settlements in Indianapolis. As the COS’s circle of charities continued to widen during its maturing phase, settlements joined the circle as they formed.

---

253 “A Year of Social Service,” 1910-11 Annual Report, Box 5, Folder 1, FSA Records.
Historians often depict COSs and settlements as opposing forces in social work history, with their classic tenets often portrayed as irreconcilable:\textsuperscript{254}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Attributes of COS and Settlement Movements</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Organized Charity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Settlements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Casework</td>
<td>Friendly visitors investigate applicants</td>
<td>Volunteers live among the poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Aid</td>
<td>Central registry</td>
<td>Mutual aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short-term relief</td>
<td>Self-help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moral uplift</td>
<td>Social and political action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Intervention</td>
<td>Casework with individuals and families</td>
<td>Community organization and group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reform individuals</td>
<td>Reform the environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to this standard interpretation, Ruth Crocker has shown that in Indianapolis the COS was instrumental in the local settlement movement. The COS helped to found Flanner Guild and the Immigrant Aid Society, two of the three of the city’s early settlements.\textsuperscript{255} Flanner Guild began when COS member Frank Flanner donated two buildings in the heart of the city to the COS with instructions to create an African-American community service center and succeed the Indiana Avenue Neighborhood House. Christamore most closely resembled Chicago’s Hull House model. Two Butler students established the settlement in the industrial neighborhood near Atlas Engine Works. Like Chicago’s Hull House, its mission combined community programs with investigation and reform, although its attempts


\textsuperscript{255} Flanner Guild, later known as Flanner House, 1898, and the Immigrant Aid Society, later known as American House and Mary Rigg Neighborhood Center, 1911. The COS did not help found Butler College Settlement, later known as Christamore House, 1905, but recognized and praised its work. Ruth Hutchinson Crocker, \textit{Social Work and Social Order: The Settlement Movement in Two Industrial Cities, 1889-1930} (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 23, 46, and 73.
at gathering statistical data were nowhere as comprehensive as *Hull House Maps and Papers* (1895). John Holliday and James Collins formed the Immigrant Aid Society to serve the mostly single-male immigrant population on the industrial near northeast side and help them assimilate into American society. (Chapter Five discusses the Immigrant Aid Society in more detail.)

The city’s two other settlements, Mayer Chapel and Nathan Morris House, have not received as much scholarly attention. Second Presbyterian Church created Mayer Chapel in 1892 as an urban community center “to amuse, to instruct, to educate morally, to uplift.” While not called a settlement house until it opened in new quarters in 1917, Mayer Chapel featured community programs characteristic of settlements of the time. Jewish women founded the Nathan Morris House in 1904. They named the settlement in honor of attorney and COS founding member Nathan Morris who died in a fire while attempting to rescue his family from their burning home. The settlement served the immigrant poor of the south side Jewish community with traditional programs and vocational training for adults.

Historians find that settlements generally opposed capitalism and aligned with organized labor, but Crocker argues that Indianapolis settlement workers sought to help their clients adapt to the industrializing economy, rather than to lobby to change it. The Indianapolis settlements all formed pragmatic alliances with business leaders, which is not surprising in view of their founding ties to businessmen and the

---

COS. Familiar civic leaders, for example, served on the Butler College Settlement’s founding board, including Charles Grout, Evaline Holliday, and IFK director Eliza Blaker.260

The COS routinely praised settlements’ valuable work and included all the Indianapolis settlements as members of the circle of charities.261 COS language read as that of a proud parent whose children have gone on to lead successful lives. Charitable leaders were well acquainted with the settlement model and engaged its precepts in describing their own work. For example, the IFK placed a free kindergarten at each settlement. Evaline Holliday believed the IFK carried out settlement work in that teachers slept at home but otherwise spent their whole time in the “districts,” meaning in the classrooms and students’ homes.262

As the COS focused on work relief and its long-term schemes it hoped the combination would eventually obviate the need for outdoor relief.263 It drove the township trustee’s outdoor relief down from its peak of $55,000 in 1876 to an average of $10,000 through the 1890s. When asked about this “revolution” in the city’s poor relief spending, Secretary Grout replied pithily, “We have simply learned the right way to administer charity.”264 But growth in Indianapolis made the circle of charities increasingly difficult for the COS to manage. In addition to the COS’s own affiliates and settlements, a plethora of other new charitable organizations formed in the city. Increasing population, hospital development, national movements taking hold, and

260 “Butler College Settlement Association, Open April 1, 1905,” ISL Pamphlet Collection, 2.
262 Evaline M. Holliday, “President’s Report,” The Kindergarten Monthly IV, no. 9 (May 1900): 1 (Box 3, Folder 4, IFK Records).
263 Little, “History of the Family Service Association,” 43.
264 Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis, “Care of the Poor,” 1901, ISL Pamphlet Collection.
rising numbers of wealthy donors all contributed to their development. One local history lists five new organizations between 1879 and 1891, and thirty between 1891 and 1911. The *Indianapolis Star* reported fifty-nine charities in the COS circle, not counting churches, at the end of 1909. In addition to enlarging, the circle of charities took on a new configuration that reflected greater complexity and fields of specialization. Instead of the COS at the center of a continuous ring of charities, the COS now commanded a network of distinct clusters of charities and public agencies.

---
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How did clients respond to the growing circle of charities and constructive programs? Applicants’ voices permeated 1890s case records, although COS investigators and visitors recorded their encounters with less care and precision than in the prior decade. The application form, or statistical blank, included the same requests for data as the 1880s, but case workers captured fewer, and shorter, narratives. The
same themes continued to recur, alternating between gratitude and resentment with the turn of the page. A grateful family, whom the COS had aided over nine years, wrote to Charles Grout: “We are tired of being a worry and expense to you: you have been so good to us in times of need that we do not wish to impose on you any longer than we can help.”\(^{268}\) The COS denied assistance when investigation showed that the applicant did not actually request aid, such as the indignant woman who told the visitor “she wanted no help from either the COS or Flower Mission as they were both frauds … and would not accept their help if she was starving.”\(^{269}\) Another woman expressed bitterness toward the society for their refusal to help her and for the “aspersions which she says they cast upon her character.”\(^{270}\) Other applicants felt entitled to help and wondered why others received assistance and they never received any.

People continued to resist institutional treatment and to fear the breakup of their families. Applicants flatly refused to go to the County Asylum if investigators suggested that was the only option, frequently stating they would rather beg or live on the streets.\(^{271}\) Visitors who specialized in truancy encountered the continuum of appreciation and anger when they tried to convince parents to keep their children in school. They initially urged parents to relinquish children to orphanages or adoption, then resorted to threats if they could not persuade parents otherwise. Some were affronted that someone was interfering with their family, such as the woman who shouted that when “they got her children it would be over her dead

\(^{268}\) COS Case Book 1889-1897, BV 1229, FSA Records.
\(^{269}\) COS Case Book 1893-1894, BV 1228, FSA Records.
\(^{270}\) Ibid.
\(^{271}\) COS Case Book 1892-1893, BV 1227 and COS Case Book 1893-1894, BV 1228, FSA Records.
Other mothers enlisted visitors to talk with their children and help them keep them under control, and therefore in school and living at home.

Again we must consider the COS’s unyielding commitment to self-sufficiency and work ethic. Chapter Three discussed the precedent that people might want to work in exchange for assistance. Philanthropy’s tenets since ancient times presumed that people naturally want to receive assistance, such as Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* that noted, “it is human not to repel aid.” This view, however, stands in contrast to other interpretations in which receiving charity is an insult to one’s pride. These opposing perspectives provide instruction to those practicing philanthropy today. Consider the case of an impoverished woman with five small children and an alcoholic husband. She reported to her case worker: “I could hardly make up my mind whether to lock up the house, turn on the gas and poison us all, or go to the COS for aid. I finally decided to come here.” The COS secured employment for her, provided food and clothing, and located her brother who willingly sheltered her family. The woman’s situation became more comfortable after she requested assistance and Grout proudly reported that “story-book happenings do sometimes come true.” This sort of turnaround testified to and reinforced the COS’s determination to help the poor help themselves.

Other critiques of organized charity surfaced. Amos G. Warner acknowledged that many people over-emphasized organized charity’s work to eradicate fraud, resulting in COSs’ persistent reputation as “bloodless, cold, and

---

272 COS Case Book 1893-1896, BV 1174, FSA Records.
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uncharitable” despite their value to their communities. Jane Addams’ “Subtle Problems of Charity” (1899) asserted “a most striking incongruity” between charity among poor neighbors and the COS friendly visitors’ guarded, insincere, stilted charity. Addams laid bare her distaste for the juxtaposition of “organized” and “charity,” accusing the organizations of applying pseudo-scientific methods “with a sternness which we would consider stupid.” Meredith Nicholson nestled commentary on the COS into Zelda Dameron, an otherwise romantic treatment of the Indianapolis community and its civic leaders. Nicholson could have been quoting John Holliday when one of the characters at the Mariona COS annual meeting proclaimed, “Shame be upon us if we fail in these endeavors to aid and protect the unfortunate among us!” But Zelda took exception to the “scientific philanthropists” as she alluded to the Friendly Inn:

I think the idea of giving tickets to tramps, so they may go to the charity [organization] society office for inspection before they are given a chance to saw a cord or two of wood before breakfast, is hideously un-Christian. I don’t like your idea of making a business of philanthropy.

None of these critiques shook the Indianapolis COS’s confidence, especially its commitment to the fusion of science and philanthropy. Support from the religious community generally increased, nationally and locally. Harvard’s Francis G. Peabody called for COSs to be even more self-assured and aggressive in recruiting

---

277 Nicholson, Zelda Dameron, 113.
278 Ibid., 118.
volunteers, as the organized charity model linked charity and citizenship. He believed modern society had created needs so vast that science and philanthropy must join to address them: “The scientific mind fastens on this dynamic capacity of the love of man … and harnesses it to the machinery of modern life.” When the University of Chicago’s Charles Richmond Henderson addressed the COS annual meeting in 1897, he stated unequivocally that “the modern contribution to the cause of charity is science.” Science could never displace sentiment, he continued, but it had “invaded and transformed” every aspect of social activity and thinking, including philanthropy. Ten years later, Father Francis Gavisk reaffirmed “the new philanthropy, indeed, clothed in the garb of science … a philanthropy purified, enlightened and informed by a growing human intelligence.” Gavisk underscored the essential role of the COS in relieving want and restoring individuals to independence and self-reliance.

Businessmen’s support did not pale as the COS matured. They continued to recognize organized charity’s efficiency as well as its ability to develop general knowledge about charitable work. As one executive put it, “The business instinct is dead against a system of charity” that leaves a poor man to find his way out of the

---

tangle of his poverty, but organized charity fully “meets all the demands of the business mind.” Charity leaders lauded the Indianapolis COS as an “inspiration,” the ideal charity organization, as it had sufficient critical mass of donors, staff, and supporting charities to devise and implement solutions that would someday eliminate the scourge of poverty from Indianapolis.

From Friendly Visitor to Case Worker: “The Utmost Kindness and Delicacy”

For its entire forty-three year existence, the COS struggled to attract and retain friendly visitors. Visiting was a topic at virtually every annual meeting and throughout board minutes through the maturing phase. COS experts such as Mary Richmond and other NCCC delegates constantly reminded organizations of the purposes, benefits, and ideal qualities of reliable visitors, but recruitment proved to be easier said than done.

The pampered, callous friendly visitor began to appear in benevolence literature, an image that the COS surely hoped to dispel in Indianapolis. In the story “Company Manners,” for example, rich and poor women met during a friendly visit that highlighted what had become stereotypes. The visitor, moved to volunteer by a vague sense of duty, viewed her “case” with indifference, boredom, and condescension. She spoke mainly in platitudes, using the royal “we.” The client spoke in educated dialect and could recite the visitor’s robotic questions by rote: “Ain’t it ‘most time for you to say now, ‘I will make out an order for a few

While the plot resolved when the women recognized a common human experience, COS leaders took exception to the story as an unfair portrayal of organized charity methods.\(^\text{287}\)

The corps of friendly visitors appears to have peaked at seventy-five in 1894. The COS told the public that those visitors were its agents who delivered “sympathy, encouragement, and hopefulness,” more important than any material wants.\(^\text{288}\) The COS promised that volunteers would conduct their home visits and investigations “with the utmost kindness and delicacy.”\(^\text{289}\) Yet the language of the appeal for visitors belied the very delicacy the COS promised by describing the poor as inmates in their own homes: visitors entered “these humble dwellings in no patronizing way, but recognizing…the brotherhood and sisterhood of every inmate.”\(^\text{290}\) The COS targeted women from the most prominent neighborhoods, “up and down Meridian and Pennsylvania and Illinois Streets,” who would come “out of their homes that are luxurious and beautiful … and become the voluntary servants of the poor and needy.”\(^\text{291}\) Records do not indicate that peer relationships among visitor and client ever developed. The few resulting sustained relationships reflected mentor to mentee, or “special guardian-mother” to child, much as “Company Manners” satirized.\(^\text{292}\) Richard Gunderman reminds us that one of the weaknesses of scientific

\(^{286}\) Florence Converse (1871–1967), prolific author and editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*. Her partner, Vida Scudder (1861-1954), was a Wellesley English professor, and social activist; Scudder co-founded the settlement Denison House. Converse’s story was a short, but scathing, commentary on heartless women of the “Charities Organization Association.” Florence Converse, “Company Manners,” *Atlantic Monthly* 81 (January 1898): 133.

\(^{287}\) Richmond, *Friendly Visiting among the Poor*, 195.

\(^{288}\) 1894 Annual Report, Box 4, Folder 7, FSA Records.

\(^{289}\) 1896 Annual Report, Box 4, Folder 8, FSA Records.

\(^{290}\) 1895 Annual Report, Box 4, Folder 7, FSA Records.

\(^{291}\) 1896 Annual Report, Box 4, Folder 7, FSA Records.

\(^{292}\) 1896 Annual Report, Box 4, Folder 7, FSA Records.
philanthropy is that it risks deepening the social distinctions between givers and receivers, and this weakness appears to have existed during this period.293

Much of the rhetoric surrounding friendly visitor qualifications made the job seem challenging but feasible for people of the proper temperament. Mary Richmond’s *Friendly Visiting among the Poor* (1899) described visiting as neither a pleasant diversion nor an exacting profession, but “intimate and continuous knowledge with a poor family’s joys, sorrows, opinions, feelings, and entire outlook upon life.”294 An article in *Charities* stated that “friendliness is the most natural thing in the world,” and that visitors need only be truly friendly and patient enough to wait for results.295 Indianapolis no doubt had friendly and patient citizens, but most did not embrace friendly visiting. By the end of 1896, only thirty visitors volunteered for the COS. In two years, the number had dropped to twenty. Charles Grout spent much of his time in 1895 and 1896 personally soliciting ministers’ support and courting current and prospective friendly visitors. He compiled church membership rosters, met with Ladies Aid Societies, and attended Flower Mission meetings to drum up support. Current visitors expressed hopelessness with their current clients and were discouraged that their clients had deceived them or would not heed advice. Ladies usually pledged their commitment to the work, but to no avail.296

By the end of 1899, the COS bemoaned that friendly visiting was “practically at a standstill.”297 The Society of Friendly Visitors minutes from 1896 to 1901
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294 Richmond, *Friendly Visiting among the Poor*, 180.
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provide insight as to why this initiative had stalled. Eight women resurrected the dormant society with the object of “holding regular meetings in which there may be a free interchange of thought as to the best methods of doing friendly visiting.”298 The secretary’s deliberate use of the word “free” indicated a previous environment not conducive to information exchange. Sources do not allow us to know, however, who squelched conversation, or at least gave the ladies the impression of limiting conversation.

The newly established visitors’ society met monthly and discussed approximately ten cases. Brief commentary registered whether or not children attended school and whether or not adults were working, in jail, or in the hospital. Early meetings reflected enthusiasm, as visitors perceived improvements in their clients’ situations. On one pleasant day, the women felt engaged and interested and metaphorically “left loaded with roses.” Optimism gave way to frustration, and reports began to be “somewhat discouraging in regard to most of the families.”299 The Society of Friendly Visitors sputtered and expired by 1901 as it had done in the 1880s. As friendly visitors retired around 1900, the COS began to lobby for trained workers. It is reasonable to conclude that training did not disenfranchise volunteers, but instead was an attempt to fill a void in service that disenchanted volunteers left as they grew fatigued and frustrated. Perhaps in Indianapolis the COS’s insistence on trained staff was not a response to the professionalization movement but to a more immediate problem – a manpower shortage.300

298 Society of Friendly Visitors Secretary’s Book, 1896-1901, BV 1182, FSA Records.
299 Ibid.
300 The St. Vincent de Paul Society also conducted home visitation but operated very differently from COS friendly visitors. The Vincentian society denied equal membership to women during the late-
As Chapter Three noted, historians have documented the rise of the social work profession, and the concomitant value of the trained charity worker, that gradually minimized the role of the COS friendly visitor. In Indianapolis, this transition unfolded differently than in other places. Formal, extensive training began in 1890, earlier than in most cities, although historians credit the New York COS’s practitioner training, its Summer School of Applied Philanthropy (1898), as forming first. The Indianapolis COS created a formal lecture series in practical sociology, in which experts in the field held classes for staff and volunteers. Alexander Johnson, newly arrived in Indiana from Chicago’s COS, taught the first ten-part “Study Class in Social Science in the Department of Charity” at Plymouth Church. He began by clearing away “the hazy and inaccurate ideas [about] whether there is a science of charities.” Johnson even took students to the field and studied “charity in a practical manner” at the County Asylum. Training expanded with Butler College and Indiana University professors conducting lectures and discussions for staff and volunteers. An internal sketch of the COS called Johnson’s class the first planned social work course and claimed that his class influenced the organization of Indiana University’s Social Service Department (later the School of Social Work).
The COS acknowledged that visitors had “many discouraging experiences” and appealed to everyone in the city to support their work. Grout reported that friendly visiting was only a partial success because the COS lacked the funds to develop it fully, even though he knew of numerous instances in which friendly visiting had “brought about a revolution in the condition of families.” The COS redoubled its efforts to attract new volunteers and new staff. Butler professor Harriet Noble wrote a comprehensive manual for friendly visitors. The COS contacted every minister in the city asking them to nominate volunteers and dedicated a committee of the board to attract more visitors. It developed its most sophisticated training program yet, “Studies in Philanthropy,” recruited Butler and Indiana University students through special lectures and internships, and required new employees to attend four months of training as unpaid interns. The COS saw a brief spike in volunteers and reported that it could accommodate at least 300 visitors. The COS undertook all these efforts only to realize that friendly visitors quickly gave up when they felt their task was “fruitless” and trained staff went to work in other cities and for other charities.

Indianapolis COS literature began to emphasize the importance of training and expertise just as the second iteration of the Society of Friendly Visitors evaporated. The COS explained that it was constantly being asked for training. Moreover, its work required not just people with mental and physical vigor, but with
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a command of the legal environment, all public and private charities, and the circumstances of clients. The COS, scholars, and other practitioners in the early 1900s had difficulty reconciling the respective roles of volunteers and professionals. Indiana University Professor U.G. Weatherly believed in the “genius” of organized charity and vehemently disagreed with charges that the COS squeezed the love and tenderness out of charity work. He explained in 1907 that social work training was every bit as crucial for “citizens and leaders of public sentiment” as for those who might choose paid professional service. He did not expect many college students to “enter upon philanthropic work as a career,” but saw volunteers with an interest in social betterment as vitally important to communities. Thus, even though Weatherly played a significant role in forming the university’s social work school, he did not expect professionals to push volunteers aside. In 1908, New York COS’s Edward Devine recognized that volunteers were giving way to expert visitors and nurses. Yet he equivocated when he stated “modern social work calls for experts,” but that neither friendly visitors nor communities could afford to let volunteers disappear.312

At the end of the maturing phase, the Indianapolis COS had not achieved a balance of voluntarism and professionalism and struggled to find human resources of
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either kind. In 1911, yet another Committee of Friendly Visitors formed with only thirteen volunteers. The COS again preached that “any woman with a kindly heart, common sense, faith, and a sense of responsibility” could be an excellent volunteer. But a good woman was hard to find and hard to keep. The COS also acknowledged the “usefulness” of an even rarer commodity, the professional social worker. It stated that training made for better staff members, but volunteers’ intimate knowledge of the conditions of the poor benefited everyone: the poor, the volunteer, the social worker, and the community.313

What was really going on? Social work scholars Wenocur and Reisch suggest that national socioeconomic and cultural changes diminished the pool of friendly visitors around 1900.314 In her Master’s Thesis, Ruby Little argued that professionals did not eclipse volunteers, but that the emphasis on training clarified the relationship between the two groups. By the end of the COS’s maturing phase, the organization presumed that paid workers served consistently longer tenures and provided greater continuity in case work. None of these arguments fully explained the circumstances in Indianapolis. At the core of the issue was women’s demand to control their own volunteer time and activities. Women volunteers had provided the bulk of the care at the Summer Mission and Fairview Settlement, conducted on-site friendly visiting, and raised funds for those programs.315 The all-female Flower Mission flourished and even built a hospital in 1903. The Indianapolis Free Kindergarten prospered. It operated thirty kindergartens in the 1900s and obtained public appropriation for its

313 “Volunteer Visitors,” The Helping Hand 1, no. 2 (January 1911): 23.
314 Wenocur and Reisch, From Charity to Enterprise, 36.
315 Little, “History of the Family Service Association,” 42.
operations. Evaline Holliday reported in 1903 that IFK volunteers made thousands of kindergarten and home visits annually. Although those visits may not have been directly comparable to COS friendly visits, Evaline’s report indicated a significant volunteer force. And, as we shall see in the next section, women volunteered en masse for the Children’s Aid Association.

Research informs today’s understanding of who volunteers and why, and can help us understand what the women of Indianapolis did at the turn of the century. Psychologists have shown that individuals likely pursue more than one set of goals when volunteering, and that volunteering satisfies both personal and social goals. Because social interaction influences motives, motives are socially constructed rather than fixed attributes of individuals. Sociologists ask, therefore, why are these motives persuasive in this context? Indianapolis women developed their own culture of volunteering. They were often together in social situations in which their charitable goals developed and matured. Evaline Holliday and her peers in the swirl of society volunteered in droves, but rarely as COS friendly visitors, because they found it more rewarding to volunteer for their own organizations rather than charities in which men wielded more control.

COS Principles in Public Policy: “Not Punishment, but a Friend”

Organized charity principles affected public policy as state and local leaders looked toward scalable solutions to poverty and dependence backed by the force of law. Government experimented with the supervision of charities as part of a holistic

316 Indiana was the first state to approve public taxation for the maintenance of kindergartens. 1911 Annual Meeting, Box 1, Folder 1, IFK Records.
317 “President’s Address, Report of Officers of Indianapolis Free Kindergarten and Children’s Aid Society, 1901-1902” (Special Collections and Rare Books, Irwin Library, Butler University).
318 Musick and Wilson, Volunteers, 64, 72. Italics in original.
view of cities’ environments and recognition of the interdependence of poverty with living and working conditions. The state established the Indiana Board of State Charities (BSC) in 1889, a volunteer board which Oscar McCulloch had championed shortly before his death. The governor presided over the board and appointed a full-time secretary. The governor chose as board members prominent men and women from around the state. People intimately connected with the COS served the BCS, including Oscar McCulloch, Cornelia Fairbanks, Mary Arabella Peelle, Monsignor Francis Gavisk, and John Holliday.

The board seized supervision of the state’s public charitable and correctional institutions and care of the poor more broadly. The BSC secured legislative changes that reflected scientific philanthropy’s parallel in government. It first set its sights on the state’s township trustees. The board perceived that trustees acted with little supervision, spent county funds indiscriminately, and did not properly care for the poor whom they were charged with serving. Trustees received their positions through popular election. Often untrained and inexperienced, trustees’ offices had become riddled with incompetence, abuse, and waste. Worst of all, the board noted, the trustees were doing nothing to cure the poverty problem, and a “new generation of dependents” was growing up in Indiana.


Through the 1890s Indiana passed poor law reforms in phases, designed to systematically wrest control away from the township trustees and their putatively inefficient and corrupt offices. An 1895 law increased trustees’ record-keeping and audit requirements; an 1899 law embedded charity organization principles into public policy.\textsuperscript{322} The board claimed victory, believing that Indiana had the most advanced piece of poor-relief legislation in any state. Warner’s \textit{American Charities} concurred that the 1899 Indiana poor law revision was the first application of charity organization principles to an entire state.\textsuperscript{323} The new law firmly grafted the cardinal principles of the COS movement onto the public sector. The law stipulated the following for all poor-relief applicants:

1. Case investigation,
2. Coordination of family and neighborhood resources,
3. Compelling able-bodied family members to work,
4. Cooperation with private relief societies,
5. Limitation of public transportation to the ill, aged, or injured, and
6. Limitation of temporary aid amounts.\textsuperscript{324}

The poor laws were further revised in 1901 and COS principles remained the mainstay of the reforms. Almost forty years later, \textit{The Indiana Poor Law} referred to the 1890s poor laws, based on “successful private charity organization principles,” as “heroic” and still the most advanced.\textsuperscript{325} Between 1891 and 1911, Indiana passed a plethora of social legislation to regulate charitable and correctional institutions, and

\textsuperscript{323} Warner, \textit{American Charities}, 212.
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to address industrial safety, women’s and children’s labor, widows’ benefits, compulsory education, sanitation, disease control, saloon and brothel control, and public recreation.326

Child welfare, also known as child saving, was a key element of Indiana’s public policy. One of the most successful child welfare agencies in Indianapolis, the Children’s Aid Association (CAA), developed neither out of the COS nor the settlement movement, but the organized charity imprint was clearly visible. The CAA formed in 1905, born out of several related child-welfare initiatives: the Board of Children’s Guardians, the Juvenile Court, and the Volunteer Probation Officers Association. The CAA’s president, Rabbi Morris M. Feuerlicht, and its executive secretary, Frank D. Loomis, ran the organization for its first decade. Both men were heavily invested in the CAA’s work in the formative stages of their respective professions and the CAA’s formative years. Feuerlicht and Loomis went on to enjoy lengthy, distinguished philanthropic careers.327

Morris Feuerlicht joined the Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation in 1904 as associate to Rabbi Mayer Messing, succeeding him in 1907. Feuerlicht came to Indianapolis with higher education and a passion for social service.328 He strove to
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live his life “treating everyone the same – Jew or Christian, white or Negro” more than as a professional minister. Feuerlicht acted on his tolerance of other faiths when he offered his temple to other congregations when their churches were destroyed. He believed that both Jewish and non-Jewish charities were in the process of transforming through centralization and the influence of science. More importantly, Feuerlicht hoped that social service was “lifting” from condescending relief to “the more equal and dignified status of tsedakah – the traditional Jewish and prophetic concept of a mutual and precisely even justice between man and fellow-man.” Moses ben Maimon (1135-1204), best known as Maimonides, the Jewish rabbi, physician, philosopher, and scholar, developed the enduring system of the ethics of giving known as the Eight Stages of Tzedakah. Maimonides’ ladder was elegant in its simplicity and deceptive in its complexity. The Eight Stages, in descending order of admiration, are:

1. Gift, loan, partnership, or to find work;
2. Anonymous giver and receiver;
3. Giver knows receiver; receiver does not know giver;
4. Receiver knows giver; giver does not know receiver;
5. Direct gift without being asked;
6. Direct gift after being asked;
7. Friendly, but insufficient, direct gift;
8. Unfriendly, begrudging direct gift.


Meridian Street, Plymouth, and St. Paul’s Church congregations met in the Indianapolis Hebrew Temple when their churches were under repair. Dunn, Greater Indianapolis, v. 2: 629.


Kass, The Perfect Gift, 125-126.
Maimonides taught that the Eight Stages, as givers aspire to the highest stage, created a mechanism for balance, fairness, and equality within communities. The highest ranking gift is by far the most empowering. Only through the top stage can the receiver become self-sufficient, independent, fulfilled, hopeful, and strong. Rabbi Feuerlicht hoped to apply Maimonides’ principles of *tzedakah* in the community.

Feuerlicht had just arrived in Indianapolis, eager to forge his congregational and social service identity, when he accepted the CAA presidency. He was especially interested in the newly established Juvenile Court. The roots of the Juvenile Court dated back to 1889 Indiana legislation that created the Board of Children’s Guardians (BCG), the first in the country. The governmental board of six appointed citizens, three men and three women, had the authority to assume custody of children via court order. During the BCG’s first three years, the COS considered the public board an integral member of the circle of private charities. The COS included the board in its *Year-Book of Charities*, assisted with fundraising, and gave it considerable space in print and on stage at annual meetings.

The COS’s imprint on the BCG and the Juvenile Court cannot be overstated. When the court removed children from their parents’ custody, the BCG found suitable homes for them. The board employed a visitor to check on the children,
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counsel the temporary parents, and study the child-welfare situation in the city more
generally.335 This role bore obvious resemblance to the COS investigators and
friendly visitors. Within five years the BCG handled more than one hundred cases
annually and acquired its own home to augment family placements, funded by both
private donations and public subsidy.336 The COS supplied one full-time visitor for
three years who acted as a truant officer to partner with the board.337 The Board
supervised children after they had been begging in public or if parents were deemed
immoral, abusive, or suffered from addiction, conditions which may have brought
families to the COS for aid. The COS had promised “not alms, but a friend.” Now
the emerging juvenile system promised “not punishment, but a friend.”338 The
board’s stated purpose was not to punish children, but to treat and rehabilitate them.

Indiana’s Juvenile Court arose directly out of the BCG and voluntary
probation system. The Juvenile Court built upon the BCG foundation and presumed
the state must act as guardian when children’s circumstances could develop into
crime.339 At the turn of the century, children’s criminal behavior appeared to be on
the rise. When Police Court Judge George W. Stubbs began his second term in

335 Wright, “The Board of Children’s Guardians,” 60.
336 The board placed children into different circumstances: the board’s home, placed with families to
be adopted or indentured, or sent to reformatories or other homes. Children rarely returned to their
parents. Board of Children’s Guardians, Report of the Board of Children’s Guardians of Marion County,
Indiana for the Year Ending March 31, 1893; Report of the Board of Children’s Guardians of Marion County,
Indiana for the Year Ending March 31, 1894; Report of the Board of Children’s Guardians of Marion County,
Indiana for the Year Ending March 31, 1895 (Indianapolis: Carlon & Hollenbeck, 1893-1895).
337 This volume was the most detailed for all COS case record books for the period 1891-1911. The
visitor usually called on twelve families daily plus visited most of the public school teachers to track
children’s attendance and behavior. She regularly threatened children and families with the specter of
the BCG. The visitor rarely delivered aid but received many appeals for clothing and shoes so that
children could attend school. COS Case Book 1893-1896, BV 1174, FSA Records.
338 Harald Salomon, The Juvenile Court: Indianapolis (Indianapolis: Juvenile Court of Indianapolis,
1910), 36; Frank Sullivan, Jr., “Indiana as a Forerunner in the Juvenile Court Movement,” Indiana
339 Elizabeth J. Clapp, Mothers of All Children: Women Reformers and the Rise of Juvenile Courts in
1901, he noticed a steep increase in the number of children under arrest. He began to hear children’s cases one day per week and relied on COS and BCG visitors for information about the children who appeared before him. In 1902, John Holliday, on behalf of the COS, convened a public meeting to discuss the possibility of a separate court for children under age sixteen. The Local Council of Women supported the Juvenile Court Law, which passed in 1903. Several outcomes could result from court proceedings. The court could drop charges, suspend sentences and return children to their homes on probation, or send children to private or state institutions. About one third of children were released on probation under the charge of a volunteer probation officer. The probation system thus purported to simultaneously help children readjust to their community, improve children’s lives, protect the community, and create responsible future adults. The juvenile court model spread quickly across the country. By 1911, delegates to the Juvenile Court Conference claimed that juvenile courts recognized youths’ social needs and therefore had already succeeded in keeping juvenile crime in check.

The Juvenile Court Law formalized the role of volunteer COS and BCG visitors working with delinquent children and permanently linked juvenile justice,
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investigation, individual counseling and rehabilitation, and the BCG placement network. Visitors, both men and women, became known as probation officers and formed the Volunteer Probation Officers Association. Volunteer probation officers used statistical blanks virtually identical to COS application forms.\(^{345}\) Like COS visitors, probation volunteers were to use a mixture of skill, energy, and tact to discern the children’s character.\(^{346}\) Judge Stubbs believed in the “personal touch” and aggressively recruited and vetted probation officers to provide it.\(^{347}\) He began his appeal at the COS’s 1903 annual meeting, then canvassed virtually every church, the YMCA, settlements, and other charities. Within eighteen months, the volunteer probation officer ranks stood at an astounding seventy-five women and 230 men – five times the peak number of COS friendly visitors ever assembled.\(^{348}\) Demand for probation officers climbed steadily. The Local Council of Women created a probation committee and appealed to its network of clubwomen to volunteer.\(^{349}\) By 1910, Stubbs had a stable of 560 men and women available for probation work.\(^{350}\)

Helen W. Rogers became the chief probation officer and managed the volunteers. Women probation officers supervised all girls plus boys under age twelve; men probation officers supervised boys over age twelve. Rogers found the
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volunteer probation officer position attractive to business and professional men as a “practical form of philanthropy” that produced a great “return for its investment.”

Men were often familiar with COS principles but had not applied them in one-on-one personal service. Mentorship over punishment appealed to them and the men were flattered when their charges looked up to them. These volunteers stood as “sentries of society” who protected young people from marauding influences.

Through the creative art form of probation, Rogers argued that Indiana’s juvenile system reconciled science and humanitarianism.

The Children’s Aid Association (CAA) incorporated in 1905 “to aid and protect children” with “its membership comprised of all probation officers of the Marion County Juvenile Court.” The court’s experience led the judge to believe a “specific volunteer organization” would best coordinate children’s services in the city. Thus calling itself the “direct offspring” of the Juvenile Court, the CAA applied COS language and tenets throughout its programs. This comes as no surprise, as COS principles had become firmly entrenched in the BCG and many CAA board and committee members also volunteered for and donated to the COS.

The CAA, like the COS, made many of the same promises to their constituencies in classic scientific philanthropy fashion: coordination, cooperation,
investigation, efficiency, modern business methods, personal service, and relief only through human friendliness. It affiliated with national organizations such as the National Conference of Charities, the National Child Labor Committee, and the General Federation of Women’s Clubs to add to its credibility and stay abreast of national trends. The CAA retained prominent speakers, including Jane Addams, for both fundraising and educational purposes. Within three years it had six departments run by volunteer committees drawn from community leadership:

1. Probation – to secure probation officers for the Juvenile Court,
2. Visitation – to provide friendly visitors in children’s homes,
3. Child protection – to enforce and secure child protective legislation,
4. Employment – to place children aged 14 and older into wholesome employment,
5. Pure milk – to supply pure milk to children under age five, and
6. Recreation – to establish and maintain playgrounds, vacation schools, and public bath houses.

The CAA’s probation and visitation functions absorbed those of the Board of Children’s Guardians (BCG) and therefore carried forward many COS principles on which the BCG had relied. Like COS friendly visitors, CAA visitors drew on Mary Richmond’s *Friendly Visiting among the Poor*. Volunteer probation officers received an instructional pamphlet to guide them on befriending children and becoming a positive influence in their lives. Guidance to probation officers was clearly aligned with the COS’s instructions to friendly visitors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAA Volunteer Probation Officers Guidance on Working with Delinquent Children</th>
<th>COS Friendly Visitors Guidance on Working with Poor Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Gain confidence of child  Get acquainted with family
You are to be a friend  Establish a friendly relationship
Never let him deceive you  Be very guarded
Study home conditions  Study home and neighborhood, suggest changes
Study habits and interests  Learn outside influences
Visit school and teacher  Get children into kindergarten or Sunday School
Visit employer (if applicable) and understand labor conditions  Give advice or assistance regarding employment
Encourage savings  Create the habits of saving and thrift
Encourage relationship with church  Encourage church attendance
Encourage reading and library use  Take books and read stories to children
Do not discipline  No advice unless asked
Report regularly to court  Report regularly to COS
Chief probation officer supervises volunteer  Society of Friendly Visitors supervises volunteers
Don’t become discouraged  Do not feel discouragement or failure

Visitation and investigation were every bit as crucial to the CAA as they were to the COS. The Juvenile Court could prevent the repetition of delinquency, but not stop it. Frank Loomis described the Visitation Committee as the CAA’s most important function, as it was integral to preventing future delinquent behavior. Investigation required training and experience, as the COS had learned, as no one could by chance discover the significant facts of a case when the facts hung “in the air.”361 In its first five years of operation, the CAA claimed effectiveness and penetration deep into poor or troubled families. In 1910, the CAA visited and investigated over 900 children, and employed or supplied milk to another 2,000.362 The COS routinely handled 800 to 900 applicants, representing 2,500 to 3,000 people, between 1900 and
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While COS casework had reached a plateau, CAA programs grew multifold.

Loomis believed the CAA had grown out of the COS movement, but that its mission to prevent juvenile delinquency was a “greater and wiser philanthropy.” He did not suggest the CAA was or should be the only charity in the city. It was, however, easily a close second in importance behind the COS, because it had the potential of changing the course of children’s lives and obviating the need for charity in the future. The COS considered the Children’s Aid Association a member of the circle of charities at the end of COS’s maturing phase, but competition between the COS and CAA for child welfare work in Indianapolis would cause the apparently seamless circle of charities to crack wide open in the coming decade.

A fault line began to develop between business and philanthropy. During the 1890s and 1900s, the Commercial Club had succeeded in addressing a number of civic problems. Winfield Miller, the 1910 Commercial Club president, reminded members that the club had been founded for the “general welfare” of Indianapolis and enumerated a few of its areas of interest: elevated tracks, public health, child welfare, education, transportation, and public lighting. In addition, based on a Cleveland, Ohio, experiment, the club undertook to correct perceived weaknesses in the matter of charitable giving. The club recognized the “valuable service” of the
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COS, especially its investigative practices, but felt citizens remained vulnerable to beggars on the street and dishonest charities. 367

The Commercial Club accordingly formed a Committee on Benevolent Associations to assert control over charitable fundraising in the city. The Committee began to investigate individual charities, including the COS and IBS, based on mission, governance, solvency, revenue diversification, and fundraising methods. 368 The committee then endorsed charities as either worthy or unworthy – reminiscent of how the COS initially had handled individual applicants. By mid-1910, forty-four investigations were underway. Approved charities received a formal endorsement card, which fundraisers were required to brandish when soliciting funds.

The Commercial Club believed this new venture “had more sincere and profound thought” than its other work that year. The Committee on Benevolent Associations paid particular attention to matters heretofore the province of the COS – “the avoidance of much unnecessary duplication in charity work” – and looked forward to the “sympathetic cooperation of all the benevolent organizations of our city.” 369 As 1911 began, the club resolved that it stood “aggressively” for organized charity principles, including cooperation, non-duplication, efficiency, supervision, and clearing house methods. It recognized the COS for its “quiet but persistent advocacy” of those principles and its ability to effect change “on a limited scale.” 370

368 Sample “Application for Endorsement, Commercial Club of Indianapolis Committee on Benevolent Associations,” included in Box 1, Folder 8, FSA Records.
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Winfield Miller expressed his gratitude to the gentlemen of the COS for their previous efforts, but his missive ended on an ominous note. “Economy and efficiency … could only be ensured through a central organization having a survey of the whole field,” Miller concluded. McCulloch’s COS had attempted to control the whole field of benevolence in the city. Holliday’s COS maintained purview over the majority of the charitable field for some time, but the field grew so large and multifaceted that the circle of charities could no longer encompass it.

As COS principles became law and embedded into public policy, the closing of the COS’s maturing phase adumbrated threats that the organization would face in the coming decade. The Commercial Club and COS, once full partners in poor relief and still with many members in common, shifted in their positions of power over the charitable agenda in Indianapolis. The Benevolence Committee, World War I and War Chest fundraising, and the Community Fund all lay ahead. These major developments in the 1910s would lead to the demise of the Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis.
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Chapter Five: Corporate Phase, 1911-1922
“A Dirty and Wonderful City”

In January 1899, S.S. McClure summoned Booth Tarkington to New York City to prepare the manuscript, *The Gentleman from Indiana*, for serial publication. Tarkington embarked on a journey that included New York, New England, and most of the major cities of Europe. He did not touch down in Indianapolis, other than for occasional brief family visits, for the next twelve years. When Tarkington finally returned to live in Indianapolis, he was one of the most famous authors in America. The year was 1911.

The next fifteen years represented Tarkington’s major period, in which he published four novels that critiqued the social, cultural, and economic change in Indianapolis. He received the Pulitzer Prize for two of them, *The Magnificent Ambersons* (1917) and *Alice Adams* (1920). Tarkington believed the literary setting of “his city” conjured the spirit of what he called “the other growth cities” of the 1910s: Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and Chicago. Booth Tarkington remembered the Indianapolis of his formative years as one of comfort, virtue, and neighborhood benevolence. He romanticized the town of his youth in *The Magnificent Ambersons*, describing 1870s Indianapolis streets as pleasant and shaded, homes as unpretentious, and people as industrious and thrifty. As other Indianapolis citizens
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fondly recalled, everyone knew everyone else’s family.4 The church governed
customs and conventions, and a universal respect for respectability permeated the
town’s character.5

Upon his return in 1911, however, Tarkington found that industrialization
had “utterly destroyed” his home town.6 Indianapolis had grown alarmingly at its
own peril. A character in The Turmoil (1914) could have been speaking for
Tarkington himself when he exclaimed, “When I was a little boy this wasn’t an ugly
town; now it’s hideous …. Wasn’t the whole country happier and in many ways
wiser when it was smaller and cleaner and quieter and kinder?”7 The nouveau riche
supplanted established families’ social prominence, churches lost their moral
authority, crowded and shabby neighborhoods sprawled, immigrants came with
different ideas, and the unmitigated drive for wealth polluted the once green
landscape.8 Now smoke created a fog that hung over “a dirty and wonderful city …
like the bad breath of a giant panting for more and more riches.”9 Ordinances to
control smoke existed on paper, only for municipal officials to scoff at in practice.
Smoke and soot, visible by-products of industrialization, hung ominously in
Tarkington novels as a ubiquitous symbol of the social disorder that now wreaked
havoc in the midland city.

4 Booth Tarkington, Growth [Part One: The Magnificent Ambersons] (Garden City, NY: Doubleday,
5 Booth Tarkington, The World Does Move (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran & Company, 1929),
46-50.
7 Tarkington, Growth [Part Two: The Turmoil], 516.
8 Tarkington, The World Does Move, Chapter 16.
9 Tarkington, Growth [The God], 1.
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What Tarkington observed in 1911 was the beginning of a decade of unprecedented expansion. Indianapolis witnessed greater real population growth between 1910 and 1920 than during any other decade in its history, from 233,650 to 314,194 (see Appendix 7). The city remained Indiana’s industrial capital through the 1910s. Meat packing, rail car construction and repair, and automobile production dominated until Lake County’s iron and steel milling led the state’s industrial output after 1920. Led by Indianapolis, the state’s aggregate manufacturing capital almost tripled between 1909 and 1919.10

Indiana, moreover, held its position as the physical, cultural, and political hub of the U.S. When Theodore Dreiser and Franklin Booth traveled through Indianapolis in 1916, Booth remarked that “you feel like this is the center of things.”11 More and more railroads connected Indianapolis to the rest of the country, automobiles clogged city streets, and the population grew and diversified. The Commercial Club served as an enthusiastic booster for the city. It advertised that “one-fourth” of the U.S. population lay within three hundred miles of this steam and interurban center. Forty-three rail lines, with 495 passenger trains, now travelled through Indianapolis depots.12

The diagram was noteworthy not for the minutia of routes and destinations, but for its striking contrast to the 1879 rendering of Indianapolis as a rail hub. Where the Commercial Club saw growth and economic prosperity, others perceived confusion, congestion, and near frenzy.

Not everyone in Indianapolis, however, believed that prosperity had to entail unmitigated smoke and unordered sprawl. Some civic and business leaders launched a concerted effort toward city beautification to lose the “dirty” aspect of Tarkington’s “dirty and wonderful city” and to maintain Indianapolis’ status with peer cities. Citizens donated land for parkways, memorials, and park improvements. The COS spearheaded a 1911 general cleanup campaign. It promoted its Vacant Lots Cultivation program and distributed seeds, vines, whitewash, and brushes, all to
“add to the prestige of Indianapolis as ‘the city beautiful.’” The Local Council of Women partnered with the COS by securing donations of vacant lots. The Commercial Club had advocated for improved streets and city beautification since the city’s park system began in 1897, so the club supported beautification with a “clean-up, paint-up” campaign and undertook its own vacant lot gardens project.

In 1908, the city’s Park Board retained landscape architect George E. Kessler, a nationally known leader of the City Beautiful movement. In 1909, he submitted his Indianapolis Park and Boulevard Plan, known as the Kessler Plan, based upon two fundamental elements: the key natural features of the city and the automobile. The Kessler Plan called for parkways which lined the major rivers and streams: Fall Creek Parkway, White River Parkway, Brookside Parkway, and Pleasant Run Parkway. Parkways provided flood control, pleasure driveways, and access to the upgraded Riverside Park, Brookside Park, and Garfield Park. Ornamental bridges connected the boulevards and served as landmarks.
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14 *The Indianapolis Local Council of Women, 1892-1924* (Indianapolis: Local Council of Women, 1924), 20.
17 The Kessler Plan was implemented over fifteen years. The city passed a series of bond issues, with the majority of the proceeds devoted to acquiring the land. At the time of Kessler’s death in 1923, he was still working with Indianapolis. He had planned a boundary north of Maple Drive (now 38th Street), an outer ring of parks and boulevards, and the Butler campus; the city named it Kessler Boulevard in his honor. The Indianapolis Park and Boulevard System is on the National Register of Historic Places. Paul C. Diebold, “Kessler’s Boulevard and Park System,” in *The Encyclopedia of*
Kessler’s design crystallized the City Beautiful movement in Indianapolis and served as the backdrop for the city’s centennial celebration of Indiana statehood. The Kessler Plan provided the context for citizens to fully appreciate John and Evaline Holliday’s 1916 bequest, their most visible gift to the city. In conjunction with the centennial, the Hollidays donated their eighty-acre country estate “for recreation and the study of nature … as a public park and a playground.”¹⁸ Park board members were overjoyed to receive “one of the finest estates” in Indianapolis. Charles E. Coffin, Park Board president, called the bequest the “crowning act” of Holliday’s useful life.¹⁹ Many residents of Indianapolis today have heard of Holliday Park, but may not know for whom it is named or why “Holliday” is spelled with two L’s. When visiting the park, however, its significance is instantly clear. Visitors cannot miss John Holliday’s 1916 public statement:

I believe that a responsibility of his community rests upon every citizen. If he has prospered through the growth and business activity of the place, he ought to do something to make it better than he found it.²⁰

John Holliday stated clearly that growth led to prosperity, the theme that Tarkington drove home so intensely, yet the Hollidays hoped to balance their wealth accumulation with this signature gift that would assure their legacy.

Most of Tarkington’s characters from this period were far less fortunate. Novels foretold of impending tragedy and doom as those who built the new industrial economy also fell victim to it. As the middle class rose and the automobile

---

increased mobility, the city sprawled and neighborhoods changed. As a matriarch in Tarkington’s *Women* bemoaned, the city experienced “the disappearance of neighbourliness [sic]” even among established families. An Indianapolis Woman’s Club member similarly wrote that she saw “the old continuity of women’s lives breaking up.” Because Indianapolis would no longer be a “walking city,” neighbors did not necessarily share common interests or close friendships. Tarkington’s oeuvre illustrated through painful narratives and violent reversals of fortune how an old order was perishing and giving way to a new materialism:

In the din of all the tearing down and building up, most of the old family names were not heard, or were heard but obscurely, or perhaps in connection with misfortunes; for many of the old families were vanishing …. They had built thick walls around themselves, these ‘old families,’ not only when they built the walls of their houses but when they built the walls encircling their close association with one another. The growth razed all these walls.

Booth Tarkington despaired over what he saw as an emerging civic ideal, “a new spirit of citizenship,” that rested on an upcoming generation of boosters who equated bigger with better. The modified civic ideal, he feared, revolved around the factory as the key to happiness and beauty. He lampooned boosters who spoke with the pretentious vocabulary of altruism, in which their success supposedly created prosperity for all. John Holliday remained visible in the community until his death,

---

but new business and civic leaders emerged with their own ideas of stewardship. The solid nucleus of social capital that had developed during the COS’s maturing phase accordingly began to fracture during its corporate phase, allowing new entrants into the philanthropic arena and challenges to established organized charity principles.

The COS Stagnates: “Carrying Coal to New Castle”

The COS underwent dramatic changes between 1911 and 1922 due to a mélange of factors: fatigue, competition, tension with other agencies, board and staff turnover, social work professionalization, and federated giving. The organization had evolved from its home in Plymouth Church and a lofty mission of the social and moral elevation of the poor, to a business office that proclaimed a bridging social capital function: “It brings together all interested in the work of helping the poor, it investigates, it publishes the best methods of caring for the needy.”29 The COS rarely found itself having to explain what it was, how it worked, or why citizens should support it. Its 1912 booklet proudly traced its “antecedents and natural development” and descriptions of a panoply of public and private agencies, including its own operations as well as Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, German, and black charities.30 When Alexander Johnson addressed a group of Indianapolis citizens, he traced Oscar McCulloch’s founding of the COS to the social consciousness that had flourished since 1879. The COS was so firmly entrenched, he said, that it would seem like “carrying coal to New Castle to preach in this city the old gospel of

organized charity.” A 1916 survey of Indiana’s charities and correction noted that systematized or organized charity was the “only safeguard” against haphazard giving. Accordingly, fifty-nine Indiana cities and towns boasted some sort of organized charity. New pressures, however, would be much more difficult to withstand. Signs of the Indianapolis COS’s decreasing influence appeared throughout the 1910s.

The COS wrestled with the distinction between charity and philanthropy – therefore its very identity. In 1912, the COS wrote that “‘charity’ strongly suggests condescension and the relation of donor to beggar. ‘Philanthropy’ seems to be free from such objection.” The COS thus began to position itself as a more progressive, philanthropic organization. On the cover of its Organized Philanthropy (1912), it defined philanthropy as the “desire or effort to mitigate social evils; comprehensive benevolence; active humanitarianism; literally, love of man.” Also in 1912, it reconfigured the former circle of charities into “Organized Philanthropic Agencies of Indianapolis.” The diagram reflected COS’s search for its position on the charity/philanthropy continuum as well as the constantly increasing number of specialized agencies in the city.

31 “Address of Alexander Johnson at the Neighborly Week Mass Meeting, Murat Theatre,” September 26, 1915, Amos W. Butler Manuscript Collection, Collection #L25, Indiana State Library.
33 Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis, Organized Philanthropy (A Continuation of The Helping Hand) 1, no. 5 (March 1912): 1.
34 COS of Indianapolis, Organized Philanthropy, 1, no. 5 (March 1912): cover.
35 Author’s rendering of diagram in “Organized Philanthropic Agencies of Indianapolis,” 1913 Annual Report, Box 5, Folder 1, FSA Records.
The Indianapolis COS, moreover, continued to struggle to reconcile science with the natural human inclination toward generosity. “To be sure organized charity is scientific charity,” the general secretary wrote in 1916, “but scientific in that more
attention is given to the needs of the individual applicant, and less to the impulse of
the giver.”36 By simultaneously harnessing donors’ generosity and reducing the
haphazard nature of giving, the COS had hoped to develop benevolence beyond
traditional compassionate giving. It still attempted to chart a middle course between
two seemingly disparate ideals, scientific philanthropy and ancient faith traditions:

Only a few years ago, education and science were considered apart
from religion, but today science and religion are harmonized – our
wisest and best are exponents of a religious life .... The lives of our
fellow men are the human laboratory in which we develop our
expressions of human interest and love, which religion has inspired in
our lives.37

In addition to these internal, ideological fault lines, external challenges arose
that tested the COS’s authority over charity and benevolence in the city.
Public/private partnerships constantly shifted over years of the COS’s existence.
During the 1893-94 economic panic, the COS acted as a full partner to the
Commercial Club and the city during unemployment relief efforts. During the 1907-
08 depression, the COS managed the unemployment relief largely on its own.
Following the 1913 flood that disrupted several thousand Indianapolis families,
Mayor Lewis Shank assembled the Citizens Relief Committee for Flood Sufferers.
Prominent men comprised the committee as usual, including the COS’s John
Holliday and Charles Grout and the Children’s Aid Association’s (CAA) Rabbi
Feuerlicht and Frank Loomis. The COS collected a few donations early on, but
turned that sum over to the Relief “when the magnitude of the work became

36 1916 Minutes of Finance Committee, BV 1171, FSA Records.
37 1918 Semi-annual Report, BV 1171, FSA Records.
apparent.” Immediate relief (food, clothing, and shelter) took place in shelter stations and churches until flood victims could return to their homes long enough to assess damage and restoration needs. The COS and CAA then provided experienced visitors to assist with classification and investigation of those who needed long-term assistance. The Relief collected over $104,000 in donations. The COS and CAA shared a small remaining balance of $1,600 to aid sufferers after the majority of the relief work was complete. The COS thus supported the general work in the wake of this natural disaster, and its president and secretary participated as committee leaders, but it clearly did not lead the relief effort. Moreover, the organization’s most distinguishing contribution, its visitors’ expertise, had developed in other agencies by the time of the flood.

The COS had always partnered with churches and considered them part of the circle of charities, but its links to churches had weakened over time. The Social Service Church Union attempted to strengthen those relationships and harness the relief work of fifteen denominations and eighty-five churches. The COS hosted the first public meeting of the Social Service Church Union as a way of endorsing the concept. The Union claimed to build upon the COS’s work, not compete with it, and to return the personal element into charity that some believed had slipped

39 Individuals, businesses, churches, and lodges comprised approximately 70 percent of donations and went directly to the Relief. The Relief dispersed over 80 percent of the proceeds for home repairs, furniture, and household items. The Indianapolis News and Indianapolis Star collected approximately one-third of donations on behalf of the Relief. Indianapolis General Relief Committee for Flood Sufferers, The Indianapolis Flood, 39-40.
40 Indianapolis General Relief Committee for Flood Sufferers, The Indianapolis Flood, 42.
away. The Union’s spokesman reprised a Social Gospel agenda, claiming that churches had the duty to conduct charitable work, not other agencies – much less the government. The Union replicated the organized charity principles of rehabilitation and friendly visiting, outside of but in cooperation with the COS and its circle of charities. Fifty women from the Union’s churches volunteered as friendly visitors and began regular meetings to share case studies. Evidence does not allow us to understand whether the Union handled cases long enough to deliver relief. The COS briefly promoted the Union, calling it a feature of its “Indianapolis Plan.” It is difficult, however, to determine precisely the effectiveness of the COS/Union working relationship and it appears to have created more of a distraction than a true partnership.

The COS increasingly looked to other cities and organizations for validation of its work, instead of acting as an advisor or model for others. Charles Grout solicited an external review from the Cleveland COS in 1915, which merely
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41 In addition to the ministers who supported the Social Service Church Union, the CAA’s Frank Loomis challenged “the church,” asserting that churches had neglected social problems and neglected to develop citizens. Frank D. Loomis, “Social Service in the Church,” Our Children 1, no. 6 (September 1912): 6-9.


43 The Indianapolis Plan appeared to be the result of a few internal departmental reorganizations but did not substantially modify the fundamental COS operations. “Friendly Visitors Meet,” Indianapolis Star, January 8, 1915, p. 5; The Indianapolis Plan (Indianapolis: COS of Indianapolis, ca. 1914), 9-11, ISL Pamphlet Collection; “What Organized Charity Has Done in the Last Year,” Indianapolis Star, January 3, 1915, p. 38.
validated that Indianapolis still followed traditional organized charity principles. Grout then consulted with the American Association for Organizing Charities and studied the structure of COSs in six other cities. He reported that the COS could “bind all relieving agencies closely together” in its early decades, but the plethora of new public and private agencies made that function now impossible. “We have again numerous agencies,” he stated, “and these often are working at cross purposes because their work touches and they are not in harmony.” He noticed a decided trend toward “loose federations” of agencies, but he did not believe the COS could fill this role as currently configured. Charles Grout likely did not expect that the April 8, 1916 board meeting would be his last.

In May 1916, Indianapolis for the second time hosted the National Conference of Charities and Correction (NCCC) annual conference, the year in which Indianapolis' Monsignor Francis Gavisk served as NCCC president. Exactly one week later, COS General Secretary Charles Grout resigned after twenty-three years in the position. Records do not reflect the specific circumstances of Grout’s departure. The Indianapolis Star noted that the COS executive committee had been “considering plans looking to a broader form of organization” and gathering information about the operations of COSs in other cities. In addition, the board consulted other charity executives attending the NCCC conference. COS leaders said they were gathering suggestions so that the organization could once
again “measure up to the best in the country.” Rumors circulated about a Mrs. W.P. Meyers, a woman of formidable wrath who claimed to have “ousted” Mr. Grout. It appears that Grout became a scapegoat for the COS lagging behind national trends, resisted changes with which he disagreed based on his long tenure with the organization, or some combination of the two.

The COS had hired Grout from within the organization in 1893; now it conducted a national search to replace him. After six months it announced the new executive in an open letter addressed to “the people of Indianapolis who are not in need,” a curious salutation from the once preeminent social service agency in the city. The COS hired Eugene C. Foster, from Associated Charities of Cleveland, “under the advice of the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity.” Foster’s first COS annual meeting was sadly reminiscent of Oscar McCulloch’s first Benevolent Society meeting. During the COS’s heyday, annual meetings had filled the English Opera House to capacity. In 1916, twenty-eight people attended to greet the new executive secretary.

The COS, with its general clientele, expansive mission, and long-established principles, had not eradicated poverty as it had hoped and promised. Its data collection, once considered scientific and revolutionary, added little to existing
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47 “Charities Secretary Tenders Resignation,” Indianapolis Star, May 19, 1916, p.11.
48 Edna Henry also refers to Mrs. Meyers’ blacklist, which included the CAA, Public Health Nursing Association, and Henry herself. Indiana University Social Service Department Director Edna Henry to Indiana University President William Lowe Bryan, March 20, 1917, Box 1, Folder 2, Indiana University School of Social Work Records, Ruth Lilly Special Collections and Archives, University Library, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (hereafter: IUSSW Records).
49 Eugene Cary Foster (1880-1948), served as COS general secretary until 1922 and as the Indianapolis Foundation staff director from 1924 to 1948. Foster was active in the Church Federation, Indiana Probation Board, Emergency Work Committee (1929-1933), Christamore House, American Red Cross, Wheeler City Rescue Mission, Flower Mission, and American Association of Social Workers. COS letter November 16, 1916, ISL Pamphlet Collection.
50 Report of General Secretary, December 5, 1921, BV 1192, FSA Records.
knowledge of poverty’s causes (see Appendix 4). As such it could not keep up with the pace of change and specialization in the social service field. The COS and its supporters exhibited fatigue in part because mothers’ and children’s welfare dominated social welfare policy with more urgency than ever before.

Several interrelated forces brought mothers, especially widows, and dependent children to the forefront of social welfare policy, often known under the rubric of “child-saving.” In the early twentieth century, society came to see children not merely as future laborers, but as future responsible adults full of promise and possibilities. Civic leaders increasingly recognized that children especially suffered from the ravages of poverty, illness, industrialization, and institutionalization. Neither philanthropy nor government had protected children from all these risks, even with entities such as Boards of Children’s Guardians, juvenile courts, children’s aid societies, and orphanages. Mothers whose husbands had died or deserted them had few options to support themselves and their children, so families continued to break up due to poverty or illness.51 Arguments that assistance created dependence fell flat regarding widows and children, for whom the classic COS strategy of “help the poor help themselves” was not realistic. To the contrary, widows and children were especially sympathetic and worthy of help.52 As Bertha Lockwood of
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51 Most white women employed outside of homes worked in textile mills, retail stores, laundries, or schools, and women earned far less than men. Most of these working women were single and lived either with their parents or in boarding houses. Black women were generally employed as domestic workers in the homes of others. Logan Esarey, *A History of Indiana From 1830 to the Present* (Indianapolis: B.F. Bowen & Co., 1918), vol. 2, 1038; Marie L. Obenaur and Frances W. Valentine, *Hours, Earnings, and Conditions of Labor of Women in Indiana Mercantile Establishments and Garment Factories* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1914), 9-11, 60-62.

Indianapolis proclaimed, this was “the century of the child,” with philanthropists, psychologists, educators, scientists, and physicians all engaged in the cause.53

Questions over protective legislation, the proper balance of philanthropy and government, the appropriateness of indoor versus outdoor relief, and the viability of long-term assistance fueled heated debates over the first third of the twentieth century. State and federal governments assumed greater roles in caring for women and children, thus reducing the role of private charity. Many of Indiana’s 1911 social welfare laws, for example, related to child protection.54 Indiana, like most states, passed legislation to regulate charitable and correctional institutions, and to address industrial safety, sanitation, disease control, saloon and brothel control, and public recreation.55 By 1914, Marion County subsidized more than a dozen benevolent groups with annual appropriations; women’s and children’s homes received almost 80 percent of the county support.56 As Chapter Four discussed, Indiana was the first state to establish a Board of Children’s Guardians, a


government organ run by volunteer citizens. By the 1920s, similar boards operated in the majority of states.57

The federal government drew national attention to child welfare concerns at its landmark 1909 White House Conference on the Care of Dependent Children. President Theodore Roosevelt opened with a discussion of a widow unable to support her children. Child welfare experts had been arguing for keeping children with their mothers and out of orphanages and foster homes. Conference attendees largely agreed that children should live with their mothers if at all possible, and many sympathized with the need for outdoor relief for families who lacked male breadwinners. The key debate revolved around the proper source of support, philanthropy or government. The White House Conference provided the spark for a decade of unprecedented change in public welfare. As Theda Skocpol phrases it, income-replacement public benefits in the form of mothers’ pensions “spread like wildfire” after the White House Conference.58

Child advocates may have agreed that mothers and children were worthy of support, but their opinion on whether government or philanthropy should fund programs was far from unanimous. Organized coalitions, largely of married women, worked deliberately at the state level to secure government-funded pensions.59 Women’s clubs and settlements placed women’s and children’s welfare high on their agenda during the 1910s, and embraced the pension crusade with tremendous focus

57 Katz, In the Shadow of the Poorhouse, 126.
58 Skocpol, Protecting Mothers and Soldiers, 424.
59 Ibid., 464-465.
and energy. Historian Mary Ritter Beard remarked that more women agreed on the wisdom of mothers' pensions than any other single piece of social legislation. Nationally, the General Federation of Women’s Clubs (GFWC), National Congress of Mothers (later the Parent Teacher Association), and the U.S. Children’s Bureau, all supported pensions.

As previous chapters have shown, men’s and women’s efforts in Indianapolis to support mothers and children began several years before the White House Conference. The COS had encouraged the formation of the Mothers’ Aid Society (MAS) and begun special programs such as the Summer Mission and Fairview Settlement. The Children’s Aid Association (CAA) grew out of the juvenile justice system and expanded to provide a variety of children’s services. Of the three organizations that would become the Family Welfare Society, the COS, MAS, and CAA, the Mothers’ Aid Society enjoyed accolades for its charitable programs while the CAA became the most sophisticated organization. The MAS in particular had to defend its mission as the mothers’ pension movement rolled across the country.

Illinois passed the first mothers’ pension law in 1911. An astonishing nineteen states followed by 1913, and ten more by 1915. Distinct groups of supporters and detractors advocated for their position on government-funded mothers’ pensions. Advocates felt organized charity, through private action, had
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60 Child welfare included issues such as protection against child labor, school nurses, visiting public health nurses, prenatal and infant care, and day care for working women. Robyn Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform 1890-1935* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), xi-xvii.
63 Leff, “Consensus for Reform,” 400-401.
identified social needs that entire communities, meaning governments, should now address. Private charity leaders, including Josephine Shaw Lowell, Edward Devine, and Mary Richmond, generally supported protective legislation but opposed pensions, often vehemently. Public welfare threatened all that private philanthropy, especially COSs, and schools of social work had built. If government administered mothers’ pensions, benefits could be subject to political inefficiency or corruption, and traditional COS investigation and case work could disappear.

In Indiana, the debate fell along national lines and churned until 1919. Public interest rose, backed by labor constituencies, while businesses, professional social workers, and charitable agencies resisted. Amos W. Butler, of the Board of State Charities, defended the network of welfare systems and asserted that poverty never led to the forced separation of mothers and children. State-funded pensions, therefore, remained unnecessary. The MAS, Summer Mission, and Fairview Settlement presented themselves as alternatives to pensions. The intertwined organizations attracted donors and glowing publicity through the 1910s, and the Indianapolis Star continued its Summer Mission Fund. The MAS peaked at 600

---

members, stating the work appealed to any woman who was herself a mother.  

Subscriptions to the charity remained high even as mothers’ pension bills passed in state after state. MAS President Henrietta Ellinwood explained that her Society took the place of the mothers’ pension by supplying rent, groceries, coal, clothing, and a day nursery so that mothers could work. Moreover, the MAS housed and clothed fatherless families at a lower average cost than any mothers’ pension provided by the time two dozen states had passed their laws.

When the COS promoted the Summer Mission and Fairview Settlement as elements of its “Indianapolis Plan,” it boasted that “experts from New York and other cities have visited it and commended it highly.” One expert, the New York housing reformer Lawrence Veiller, lavished high praise on the widows’ colony.

Calling the settlement “extraordinary,” Veiller wrote in 1914:

I know of nothing like it in America …. To have taken these families, as you have, from their bad living environment and transplanted them into the delightful and charming atmosphere that they now enjoy at Fairview is an achievement in itself, but to do this and at the same time keep the families on practically a self-supporting basis … is, I think, a unique American experience. I was delighted with the entire arrangement at Fairview …. I hope that the work will be extended tenfold.
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The *Indianapolis Star* featured the Summer Mission on its twenty-fifth anniversary, commending the city for developing the mission and Fairview Settlement that had become models for “great Eastern cities.” While obviously the widows depended on benevolence, the COS described them as “happily independent.” Because the families lived in the “colony plan,” the *Star* added, the operation ran efficiently and effectively. Mothers had the opportunity for homemaking and all family members avoided the dreaded almshouse or orphanage.

Indiana finally passed a 1919 amendment to the Board of Children’s Guardians laws to provide for mothers’ pensions. Indiana, the first state to create a Board of Children’s Guardians and only the third state to create a juvenile court, was the last state in the Midwest and the thirty-ninth state in the country to adopt government-funded mothers’ pensions. Attitudes toward the Fairview widows’ colony reversed almost immediately, at least publicly. Before the end of 1919, Lawrence Veiller’s colleague Edward Devine advised Indianapolis charity leaders that the city “would not want to long continue its participation to the extension of [Fairview Settlement] colonizing poor families.” Eugene Foster similarly observed that social workers realized that “disadvantaged families” should not live in close proximity to one another, but should be surrounded by “normal people and normal
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environment" whenever possible. The MAS and Fairview Settlement, after a decade of justifying their existence, were now obsolete.

As the COS founndered, the CAA prospered. The CAA added programs, increased capacity, and enjoyed visibility during the early decades of the “century of the child.” By 1920, operations encompassed child protection, visitation and aid, employment, home finding, baby health clinics that included pure milk, dental clinics, general education, and summer programs. Its staff of twenty-nine, comprised mostly of professionals, included doctors, dentists, nurses, and caseworkers. The CAA managed a large network of individual “boarding home” families, into which it placed over 200 children annually. Children then lived with these families, instead of orphanages, under the organization’s supervision.

CAA publicity capitalized on the emerging view of children as the future of America. Frank Loomis described donations to the CAA as investments which would pay dividends in the future by developing citizens who would be better off morally, mentally, and physically. Loomis bound the notion of children as citizens to the broader civic ideal. By educating the public on constructive child welfare assistance, never alms-giving, the CAA enhanced community spirit and created a larger brotherhood, a larger community of interest, and a larger citizenship in Indianapolis. The CAA continually reported that it lowered crime, increased health, and saved children from poverty, imprisonment, or institutionalization,
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thereby producing constructive citizens. These general claims paled in comparison to saving children’s lives. The CAA’s initiatives, pure milk stations in particular, steadily reduced infant deaths in the city. Between 1907 and 1916, infant mortality dropped dramatically. The CAA’s success locally, showcased against the national backdrop of child welfare, made it a highly popular charity to support.

COS, MAS, and CAA investigators did not record narratives in the fashion of the early COS decades, so the emotional exchanges between client and charity worker have been lost. We can hear clients’ voices only through the numerous testimonials that charities chose to publish, or excerpts that became embedded in other reports. The most popular excerpts showcased rescuing mothers and children. For example, a father who feared he would lose his children if he came to the COS said, “to think that strangers could take so much interest and do more than even your own relatives, and I didn’t have to have my children taken from me.” The ultimate testimonials came from the mouths of babes, as in, “I heartily thank the Children’s Aid.” The CAA featured several smiling children in each quarter’s Our Children, designed with photos and captions that advertised the organization’s triumphs.

The COS thus experienced internal turmoil, a broad and outdated mission that lacked the immediacy and popularity of child-saving, and attenuated church relationships which combined to erode its legitimacy as the social service hub of
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Indianapolis. The COS did not respond to serve niche populations, which further reduced its effectiveness.

Immigration and Ethnicity – “We Have a Very Serious Problem in Our Midst”

Historians have documented that Indianapolis received less European immigration and black migration than other midwestern cities.\textsuperscript{88} Nonetheless, the city’s population diversified more during the first two decades of the twentieth century than at any other time. While the COS theoretically would assist all applicants without regard to religion, ethnicity, or race, in practice it did not serve all communities of people uniformly. Specialized philanthropic agencies, mutual aid, and self-help all arose as sources of assistance. The changing mix of ethnicity powered mutual aid and community-building as collective responses to the special problems of adapting to a new urban setting. New arrivals built small communities around them that reflected their places of origin to help them assimilate into the larger city.\textsuperscript{89} The COS assisted primarily white, native clients and a large number of black citizens. It generally referred Jewish cases to Jewish agencies. Because poor immigrants rarely approached the COS, the organization founded one of the city’s settlements to reach them.\textsuperscript{90}


\textsuperscript{90} Between 1916-1922, the COS served approximately 13,000 families: 78% white, 19% black, and 3% immigrant. A similar pattern held true for the CAA. Bailey, “The Social Agencies of Indianapolis,” 54-55; Frank D. Loomis, “CAA Annual Meeting Address, February 12, 1917,” \textit{Our Children} 4, no. 2 (April 1917): 13; Partial Display of Development (COS), Box 1, Folder 5, FSA Records.
Chapter Two described German immigrants who had come to Indianapolis in the mid-nineteenth century. The majority of these citizens, of all religions, integrated into the social, economic, and philanthropic life of the city with remarkable success. Protestant Germans assimilated easily and contributed to Indianapolis more than any other immigrant group. 91 German Jewish congregations and social clubs prospered. As wealth was the criteria for broader social acceptance, well-to-do Jewish families lived in same neighborhoods and participated as trustees of charities with native white citizens. 92

Subsequent large waves of eastern European, poor and working-class immigrants changed the complexion of both the city and its Jewish population. 93 Jewish immigrants between 1890 and the onset of World War I differed from the previous generation in custom, religious practice, and language. New arrivals from Austria-Hungary, Romania, and Russia formed their own Orthodox congregations and societies to preserve the communal tradition that had been fostered in the rural, self-contained communities they had left behind. Jewish families in need turned either to each other or created their own benevolent societies for help. They did not look to the COS, nonsectarian charities, or municipal relief programs. The Workmen’s Circle fraternal organization provided sickness and death benefits.

Three Jewish ladies aid societies sheltered the homeless and indigent and provided a

93 New immigrants often spoke Yiddish rather than Hebrew and observed Orthodox rather than Reform Judaism. Exact population statistics are not available. One estimate is that the Jewish population in 1910 was approximately 7,000, of which 4,000 to 5,000 were recent immigrants. At 3% of the city’s population, the 1910 percentage was higher than most other times in Indianapolis history. Endelman, *The Jewish Community of Indianapolis*, 60.
wide variety of temporary assistance. Kahn Tailoring actively recruited immigrants for employment and helped them assimilate into Indianapolis. Its social welfare department, unique for its time, provided sickness benefits, company physician, savings department, night school, and a staff of social workers who visited employees at home.

The Jewish Welfare Federation of Indianapolis (JWF) formed in 1905 to consolidate the growing number of Jewish social welfare agencies in the city. The Federation's goals closely paralleled those of organized charity: to reduce duplicate and overlapping services, improve efficiency, provide education, and streamline fundraising. Elite Jewish community leaders controlled the Federation. Rabbi Feuerlicht drafted the founding constitution based on those of larger cities and brought his commitment to social service and social justice to the organization. Business leader Gustave Efroymson served as the first JWF president. Women of the Hebrew Benevolent Society initially rebelled at joining the Federation and feared their charity work would be usurped, just as women of the Flower Mission had resisted joining the original COS circle of charities. Feuerlicht recognized that the women did not want to lose their virtual monopoly on charity and had to work to
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allay their concerns. “The community was thrown into turmoil,” he recalled, but “all was again peaceful and calm” within a year.97

Within ten years, the Jewish Welfare Federation developed into a credible, financially sound, well organized “concerted communal effort” to care for the Jewish population in Indianapolis.98 Its basic principles, coordinated programs, and endorsement from elite citizens replicated a miniature COS exclusively for the Jewish community. The JWF provided temporary assistance but aimed “to make the applicant self-supporting and self-respecting.”99 As a central agency, it coordinated funds and channeled assistance through constituent organizations, much like the circle of charities. JWF leaders feared creating dependence among its applicants, so case workers conducted investigations and usually denied aid to transients and beggars. Like the COS, the JWF received criticism for its impersonal approach, restrictive policies, and paternalistic attitude.100

Notable differences between the COS and JWF existed. The Federation had a broader view of what defined its community and its constituent organizations. From the outset, it supported local, national, and worldwide Jewish people and organizations. It directed those in need of hospital or orphanage care to Jewish institutions in Denver and Cleveland rather than nonsectarian counterparts in Indianapolis.101 The Federation supported pensions for mothers with children or other “deserving” families without breadwinners, whether funded by government or

98 Ninth Annual Report of the Jewish Federation of Indianapolis, April 1913-March 1914, ISL Clipping File: Indianapolis Charities, Community Centers.
99 Ninth Annual Report of the Jewish Federation of Indianapolis, April 1913-March 1914.
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101 Ninth Annual Report of the Jewish Federation of Indianapolis, April 1913-March 1914, ISL Clipping File: Indianapolis Charities, Community Centers.
philanthropy. By 1918 it funded eighteen families with pensions to be spent on basic needs at the families’ discretion. Finally, the JWF took exception to the concept of COS friendly visiting. The Federation’s superintendent wrote that friendship was based “more or less on equality of station – financial, moral, mental and social.” The poor needed and wanted better housing, clean streets, and financial aid, not sympathy. Federation social workers, therefore, visited the poor, but also “the legislature, councilmen, mayors, and the rich.” In addition, the JWF expected social workers to advocate for social justice and support social movements to improve the quality of life for all citizens. By 1925, most Jewish residents were self-sufficient. Requests for aid dropped significantly and the Federation expanded into other areas.

Several thousand eastern and southern European immigrants of other faiths and nationalities arrived in Indianapolis between 1900 and 1920. Established Indianapolis citizens expressed anxiety over the changing population. Ethnic and immigrant neighborhoods developed around two large employers, the Kingan & Co. packing house and the Malleable Casting Co. in Haughville. Benevolent organizations, schools, and employers sought to help immigrants assimilate into American society, but some old-stock Americans felt that would not be enough. An exchange in Tarkington’s The World Does Move captured the concern: “The immigrant has Americanized himself, but in the process he foreignizes us a little; he

102 Ninth Annual Report of the Jewish Federation of Indianapolis, April 1913-March 1914.
105 Endelman, The Jewish Community of Indianapolis, 128.
106 By 1920, Marion County’s population was approximately 85% white (including second-generation immigrant), 10% black, and 5% immigrant. Divita, Ethnic Settlement Patterns in Indianapolis, 38.
takes on our ideas, but he can’t help spreading among us some of his.”

Philanthropy emerged as a strategy, in part, to address this anxiety. The COS had long ago recognized that poverty coincided with certain areas of the city and organized its districts accordingly. In its final phase, it used its Confidential Exchange data to study entire neighborhoods in a more holistic fashion than it had previously undertaken. The COS attempted to understand, and then reach, people in particular areas of the city in several ways. The organization recognized that a single hub office for charities had become unwieldy as Indianapolis had grown. It watched with interest as settlements and missions worked to integrate their programs into certain neighborhoods. The COS expanded its social service centers, as miniature hubs, in its districts. By localizing efforts, it hoped to “come into much closer touch with our work and can arouse a cooperative interest among the people, the schools, and the churches that seems to be impossible” from one location.

The COS sponsored two special investigations. COS President John Holliday, with a translator at his side, personally canvassed two neighborhoods most heavily occupied by immigrants: the packing-house district and the Haughville area. Holliday and his guide talked to everyone who was willing to engage with them. The organization partnered with L.M.C. Adams, one of U.G. Weatherly’s master’s students, to publish a study of three districts: one of white working-class families (most of German and Irish descent), one of mostly single immigrant men
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surrounding the packing houses, and one of mixed white and black families near Atlas Engine Works and the Christamore settlement.\textsuperscript{111} The two resulting reports, Holliday’s “The Life of Our Foreign Population” (ca. 1909) and Adams’s “An Investigation of Housing and Living Conditions” (1910), produced keen awareness that some recent immigrants lived in miserable conditions. The COS synthesized the results of the two investigations. Its 1911 periodical, written on the heels of the two investigations, conjured images of Jacob Riis’s \textit{How The Other Half Lives}:

\begin{quote}
Helpless foreigners are paying for their squalid housing at a higher rate of interest than any other renters in the city. Wherever we go in the poorer quarters of the city we find the same cupidity at work. Lots that should have one house or at most two often have four crowded together; backyards are reduced to a minimum; tumble-down outbuildings are breeding places for rats and vermin; the drinking water is a perpetual menace to health.\textsuperscript{112}
\end{quote}

Through his tour of the immigrant neighborhoods, John Holliday became “convinced that just now we have a very serious problem in our midst.”\textsuperscript{113} COS board and staff viewed poor immigrants with a mixture of fear, sympathy, and paternalism, an attitude that differed from their view of white native poor in one significant respect. Charity leaders felt an obligation to facilitate the assimilation of American ideas and language – as quickly as possible – a pursuit Robert Wiebe described as well suited to the early decades of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{114} Until civic leaders equipped new arrivals with the skills to adapt to American life, immigrants could not accept full responsibility for citizenship.

\textsuperscript{112} “The Housing Problem,” \textit{The Helping Hand} 1, no. 4 (March 1911): 63.
\textsuperscript{113} John H. Holliday, “The Life of our Foreign Population” [ca. 1909], Pamphlet Q Collection, Indiana Historical Society.
\textsuperscript{114} Wiebe, \textit{The Search for Order}, 157.
The investigations led to tangible change. Adams had underscored the value of what he called “social features” such as churches, schools, libraries, and clubs. In contrast, he found a high concentration of “demoralizing” influences, such as five-cent theaters, saloons, and houses of ill-fame in the tenement districts. In the 1910s, each COS district tabulated the concentration of positive and negative fixtures, such as churches and schools versus saloons, vacant houses, and vacant lots. District meeting discussions increasingly encompassed community conditions as much as individual family circumstances.

The COS did not have the power or financial wherewithal to effect wholesale change to the mix of institutions in a neighborhood. Instead, it attempted to place resources into a poor neighborhood by founding a settlement. John Holliday and Judge James Collins in 1911 formed the Immigrant Aid Society in the heart of the packing-house district, densely populated with single immigrant men living in unsafe, unsanitary, and overcrowded tenements. Like many settlements at this time, the Immigrant Aid Society acted as a protective agency and intermediary to interpret American culture. The Society also taught skills to new arrivals to help them adapt to life in the city.

As housing presented the most grievous problem, women throughout Indiana championed statewide housing and tenement reform. The COS publicly supported

116 “North East District Survey” ca. 1915, Box 1, Folder 6, FSA Records; North West district minutes 1914-1915, Box 1, Folder 7, FSA Records.
their efforts. Prominent women supported new immigrants with work that complemented the Immigrant Aid Society. By 1911, with Evaline Holliday as president, the Indianapolis Free Kindergarten (IFK) had secured an annual state tax appropriation to support its schools. Large numbers of children of immigrant families enrolled in the IFK’s thirty free kindergartens. In three schools, foreign children represented the majority of students. At those kindergartens, teachers and volunteers worked “almost daily” with the mothers and older members of those families. The IFK proudly reported its role in helping new arrivals assimilate: “In the districts inhabited by the foreign population, the kindergartens are invaluable towards the Americanizing of the older members, as well as the children.”

COS case worker Crystal Benton Fall took a special interest in the immigrant population and wrote her master’s thesis “The Foreigner in Indianapolis” (1916). Fall’s work demonstrated that churches, clubs, and schools provided the greatest sources of support for immigrant families, not the COS. The most transient population in the packing-house district did not even seek out services. They arrived,
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worked, earned money, and went home.\textsuperscript{123} For those who intended to remain in the U.S., five different organizations conducted night schools for adults. Programs concentrated on English language and citizenship.\textsuperscript{124} Several churches conducted children’s clubs; most immigrant children attended school at Haughville’s Slovenian Church. Men, usually those with families, often belonged to lodges or fraternal associations for insurance benefits.\textsuperscript{125} Five insurance and illness benefit societies were represented in Haughville alone.\textsuperscript{126} Fall tabulated the frequency with which new immigrants approached the Center Township trustee, COS, CAA, Salvation Army, and Public Health Nursing Association between 1910 and 1915. The data showed clearly that these charitable agencies delivered few services to immigrants and whenever possible people sought assistance from a group of their own nationality.\textsuperscript{127}

Formalized mutual aid developed as poor immigrants arrived, and thereafter became a source of assistance to the poor in Indianapolis. Fraternal societies created vast social and mutual aid networks among the poor that peaked during what historians call the “golden age of fraternity.”\textsuperscript{128} By the turn of the century, fraternal societies, held together by ethical bonds of reciprocity, presented an option to philanthropy or government assistance. Mutual aid among the working class could

\textsuperscript{124} The YMCA briefly offered night school. Going into WWI, schools operated at two Indianapolis Public Schools, Kahn Tailoring, Cosmopolitan Mission, and Bethany Social Center. Fall, “The Foreigner in Indianapolis,” 42-44.
\textsuperscript{126} Fall, “The Foreigner in Indianapolis,” 21.
\textsuperscript{127}Ibid., 33-36.
supplement individual responsibility without creating the appearance of dependence. Fraternal societies offered insurance and medical benefits not as charity, but as services. Only a subtle contrast, however, existed between assistance from fraternity, philanthropy, and government. Fraternal societies enforced membership and application requirements that were strikingly similar to those of charity organizations and public agencies. They, like charities, vetted applicants, guarded against malingerers, and deployed investigative committees to verify applicants’ standing relative to societies’ moral and behavioral codes.129

Reverend McCulloch had delivered an entire sermon, “The Law of Mutual Aid,” but interpreted mutual aid as assistance from one human to another, not the fraternal society view of mutual aid as among those of similar socioeconomic and ethnic status.130 Charitable citizens kept alive the McCulloch interpretation, reprinting passages such as, “Why can not [sic] I eat my food when I see somebody starving? …. Because one of God’s strongest laws, just as imperative as the law of hunger, is on us, the law of mutual aid.”131 During McCulloch’s time, mutual aid and organized charity were one and the same. The 1880s and 1890s COS case records often listed other agencies, such as the Flower Mission and Indianapolis Benevolent Society, but only occasionally referred to fraternal societies such as the Odd Fellows or Masonic Lodge as sources of help.132 By the 1910s, the Masons, Knights of Pythias, and other fraternal orders routinely provided aid and life
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insurance to their members.\textsuperscript{133} The Haughville immigrant neighborhood demonstrated mutual aid at its zenith.

Mutual aid also developed among the black families who settled in Indianapolis as part of the Great Migration. Between 1900 and 1920 black citizenry remained consistent at approximately 10 percent of the city’s population.\textsuperscript{134} Black-owned enterprises developed along Indiana Avenue to serve black clientele, producing a core group of professionals and business leaders. These establishments formed a retail, entertainment, and residential hub and the district attracted even more blacks of all socioeconomic status.\textsuperscript{135} Some poor families moved into houses around the Atlas Engine Works and Christamore Settlement that white families had vacated.\textsuperscript{136} Churches, women’s church auxiliaries, men’s fraternal organizations, mutual aid societies, and women’s clubs fostered social capital and sources of support for black citizens, who were largely isolated from white culture and society through \textit{de facto} segregation.\textsuperscript{137}

The COS attempted to reach poor black families with assistance of food, coal, and connections to other agencies. While black citizens represented 10 percent of the city’s population, they were 19 percent of the COS’s case load during the 1910s. The COS’s Northwest District, which included Indiana Avenue, served an equal number of black and white clients. The Flanner Guild settlement, governed and funded by both black and white citizens, provided a comprehensive array of services for black
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families in the district. The COS’s district committee included people who were presumably in touch with black clients: Flanner Guild representatives, prominent black businesswoman Madame C.J. Walker, and a Walker employee. Other philanthropy that served the black community included five IFK kindergartens which enrolled black students exclusively. Because it would not integrate white and black members in the same facility, the YMCA opened its Senate Avenue branch with great fanfare in 1913. A grant from Julius Rosenwald’s foundation seeded the project. Supporters included Madame C.J. Walker, Booker T. Washington, and John and Evaline Holliday.

A COS’s visitor’s notes from 1915 cases listed the familiar refrains, “illness” and “out of work,” as the circumstances that had led families to the organization for help. This deceptively simple list of names and needs concealed the primary underlying reason for black poverty: discrimination. Blacks had little to no access to health care and fewer educational opportunities than whites. White philanthropy could not compensate for an entire social and economic system and did not challenge segregation during this time. Black self-help networks, churches, and clubs, therefore, were essential to fill gaps in services. Chapter Three discussed Lillian Thomas Fox and the Women’s Improvement Club (WIC). The WIC exemplified black clubwomen’s engagement in public welfare. It undertook several
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public health initiatives during the early 1900s. The WIC formed an outdoor tuberculosis camp, a nurses’ training camp, and conducted health education for blacks in Indianapolis. The COS made regular donations to the camp and acted as a liaison between white donors and the WIC.144

The Jewish, immigrant, and black populations of Indianapolis employed different strategies to cope with poverty. Each group had different needs and faced different challenges in overcoming poverty and assimilating into Indianapolis. The COS’s ability, and its approach, to reach people in need therefore varied with each group. Poverty continued to plague many people of Indianapolis, which in turn determined the course of social work training in the city.

Social Work Formalizes: “The Sharp Sword of the New Alliance”

Chapter Four discussed the Indianapolis COS’s perpetual struggle to attract and retain volunteers, as friendly visitors found the work difficult, frustrating, or not rewarding enough to continue. As we have seen, philanthropic women in the city volunteered in larger numbers for charities in which they were more influential stakeholders, such as the Indianapolis Flower Mission (FM), Indianapolis Free Kindergarten Society (IFK), and Mothers’ Aid Society (MAS). Indianapolis Woman’s Club members supported charities and matters of public policy such as child welfare. They eschewed the earlier gentle guidance to avoid taboo topics and unabashedly presented papers on politics, religion, and education. Women’s

suffrage, which one member called “red hot,” usually crept into club discussions.\textsuperscript{145} Engagement in public affairs, therefore, may have been more compelling than friendly visiting.

The MAS never retained professional case workers and therefore always relied on volunteer friendly visitors. The MAS did not waver from its original conception as an “organization of women, managed by women, for women.”\textsuperscript{146} MAS visitors remained connected to their widow clients for many years, and did not conduct the same sort of extensive investigative work as COS volunteers. MAS and COS visitors, therefore, may not have been directly comparable. In 1915, the MAS nonetheless published friendly visitor instructions and an investigation form reminiscent of COS documents.\textsuperscript{147} Approximately sixty volunteer visitors, largely comprised of MAS member/donors, made weekly calls on widows and families either to determine necessary aid or provide advice.\textsuperscript{148} Visitors sometimes remained advisors to their clients long after direct assistance was no longer necessary.\textsuperscript{149}

Through the 1910s, however, the COS emphasized friendly visiting less and professional case work more, consistent with national trends.\textsuperscript{150} Popular and
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professional opinions regarded Lady Bountiful as outmoded, presumptuous, and cocooned in her socioeconomic class. By 1915, the COS employed three full-time fundraisers and ten full-time case workers; it added four additional case workers by 1921. Staff worked hard for relatively low salary, causing burnout and illness – and therefore turnover. During the 1910s COSs often used volunteers to supplement staff depending on workforce strength at a particular time. The Indianapolis COS accordingly did not abandon friendly visiting, even as paid staff gradually assumed the majority of case work responsibility. It resurrected its Society of Friendly Visitors once again. Julia Moores Graydon Jameson agreed to serve as president in 1914. Mrs. Jameson descended from the old-stock Indianapolis families of Moores, Graydon, and Merrill, and had married into the prominent Jameson family (see Appendix 3). She brought social capital, a strong sense of Christian duty, and philanthropic heritage to the position. Julia Jameson hoped to “give joy to others” and “asked that a new era might be started” for COS friendly visitors.
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themselves [in volunteer service] the Friendly Visitors are doing real constructive social work.”\textsuperscript{158} This group of women experienced the same pattern of highs and lows as those before it: initial enthusiasm, an ephemeral feeling of making a difference, then disappointment when clients’ living conditions did not substantially change.\textsuperscript{159}

Perhaps another reason underlay the COS’s commitment to its volunteer force. The organization recognized that volunteers who felt a deep connection with their clients could benefit profoundly from their experiences. The COS, for example, published this visitor’s testimonial:

I cannot tell you how much pleasure and inspiration I have derived from having the opportunity your organization offers of touching lives which I probably would never have come in contact with through any other channel. I feel that my contact with them has developed my soul, broadened my vision, and enriched my life far more than anything I might have been able to do for them.\textsuperscript{160}

This quote expressed the rewards of volunteering more powerfully than any other in the COS’s records. Researchers today know unequivocally that volunteer service increases charitable giving: volunteer giving is \textit{two to four times} higher than non-volunteer giving.\textsuperscript{161} Friendly visitors always came from the well-to-do, socially connected families who donated faithfully, and in significant amounts, to the COS. The COS did not explicitly state that it understood the relationship between volunteering and donating, but by its corporate phase it demonstrated substantial
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fundraising acumen. Civic leaders John and Evaline Holliday’s lives, moreover, demonstrated the phenomenon. The organization thus protected a way for its volunteers to remain engaged, even if the women could not significantly improve the lives of its poor clientele.

The meaning of case work, as well as who conducted it, evolved with the organized charity movement. Individual investigations had originally aimed at the material, moral, and spiritual elevation of the poor with nominal concern for economic structures or the environment in which individuals lived. Case work after 1911 produced not only a decision on aid based on putative worthiness, but a “social diagnosis,” the title of Mary Richmond’s famous 1917 textbook. Richmond codified case work as the aggregated three decades of expertise of social agencies and schools of applied philanthropy. Likening social work to medicine, she defined social diagnosis as “the attempt to arrive at as exact a definition as possible of the social situation and personality of a given client.” By 1920, the Indianapolis COS defined case treatment as the process that “seeks out the causes of distress and poverty. It seeks out the resources of the family, and the community for combating these causes, and it makes the connection to get this curative treatment in motion.”

Robert Wiebe further clarified how science undergirded social work, calling case work “the scientific analysis of a life in process.” Investigation, social research, and scientific method intertwined to lead case workers to a diagnosis.
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Social work today encompasses many practice settings. Functional specialization began early in the twentieth century; hospital, or medical, social work and family social work initially dominated the field. Medical social work developed early because COSs’ data had demonstrated convincingly that illness led to unemployment and poverty. With the concomitant rise of scientific medicine, hospitals emerged from asylums and poorhouses into legitimate institutions in which people of all classes sought medical treatment. Dispensaries and hospitals accordingly faced increasing demand for services without the ability to assist clients with long-term recovery after medical treatment was completed.

The first formal medical social service department began in 1905 at Boston’s Massachusetts General Hospital, ushering in a national movement. Indianapolis was not far behind, but to form a school of medical social work the city required a hospital or dispensary – and a champion. U.G. Weatherly had been teaching what he called “practical sociology” in cooperation with the COS for several years and had come to view social work through the lens of sociology. He believed the principles of social action could be found through the study of groups, not isolated individuals, so a research facility that collected data on a group of patients could
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illuminate the causes of social problems.\textsuperscript{169} Three denominational hospitals opened in Indianapolis before 1900 and the Indiana University School of Medicine (IUSM) formed in 1907 (see Appendix 1). Weatherly chose to form the Social Service Department close to IUSM, the City Dispensary, and the plethora of social service agencies in Indianapolis. In 1911, Indiana University established the Social Service Department, a sub-department of Economics and Social Science, housed with the IUSM and the dispensary.\textsuperscript{170} A 1911 bequest from Dr. Robert W. and Clara J. Long endowed the Robert W. Long Hospital of Indiana University to serve the State of Indiana’s poor. Once the hospital opened in 1914, the Social Service Department moved its main operations there.\textsuperscript{171}

The new Social Service Department served two masters, Dr. U.G. Weatherly, chair of Economics and Social Science, and Dr. Charles P. Emerson, IUSM’s dean. Emerson had seen hospital social work develop when Johns Hopkins University medical students in 1902 formed an auxiliary board of the Baltimore COS to visit poor families in their homes. Students learned the intimate relationship between the home environment and physical illness.\textsuperscript{172} Emerson therefore supported Weatherly
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and the Social Service Department at Indiana University as he believed social work added to medical students’ appreciation of a patient as a whole person, not just an aggregation of organs.173

Emerson and Weatherly appointed Edna G. Henry to organize the department (see Appendix 3). She had been active in philanthropy and embraced the job wholeheartedly. Henry had helped found the Associated Charities (COS) in Anderson, Indiana, served on the Mothers’ Aid Society executive committee, and as an Indianapolis COS friendly visitor and central council member.174 Henry built the Social Service Department on COS principles: prevention of future illness through patient education, research and data collection to end illness and poverty, and the education of doctors, social work professionals, and “all persons interested in social conditions.”175 Like the COS, the department recorded extensive demographic patient data and its own version of a circle of charities, claiming 44 agencies and 19 churches with which it cooperated to serve its patients. It reportedly built a team of 200 volunteers to multiply the paid workforce and to “come into closer relations with the patient, and a more kindly human one, than can any member of the department.”176 It is not clear whether or not Henry truly managed 200 volunteers. Two hundred may have been an exaggeration, but even a fraction of that number was many times more than the COS ever rallied.
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Early on, physicians were reluctant to refer patients to the department as they did not expect it to survive, but the Social Service Department still assisted over 3,200 patients in its first five years.\textsuperscript{177} Even by its fifth year, the department saw a small fraction of Dispensary patients, who poured in at a rate of over one hundred people per day.\textsuperscript{178} Edna Henry was undaunted by physicians’ slow acceptance of social work. As she built the department on COS theory and practice, she validated many of its findings about the causes of poverty and possible solutions.\textsuperscript{179} The 1915 Indiana University newsletter described the department as a “sociological laboratory” that showed sickness to be the leading cause of dependency, and that doctors, social workers, universities, relief agencies, and the public should all join forces to save ill patients – and therefore the entire city. The department pledged to act as the “sharp sword of the new alliance” to bridge theory and practice.\textsuperscript{180}

Henry embodied the bridge between theory and practice, as she earned her master’s and doctorate degrees while building, staffing, and operating her department.\textsuperscript{181} Social work training connected the school, the COS, and the CAA. Weatherly led weekly lectures at the COS, promoted to be valuable to both “the Church and Social Worker,” which Henry attended as her schedule permitted.\textsuperscript{182} Weatherly also gave talks in other venues around the state to garner support for new

\textsuperscript{177} Report of the Social Service Department, 1913, 1915, Box 26, IUSSW Records.
\textsuperscript{178} Piepho, “The History of the Social Service Department,” 13, 29-30.
\textsuperscript{179} Report of the Social Service Department, 1911-1913, Box 26, IUSSW Records.
\textsuperscript{180} “The Social Service Department,” Indiana University Newsletter 3, no. 8 (August 1915), Box 31, IUSSW Records.
\textsuperscript{182} “Sociological Discussions 3:30 Mon Afternoons at the COS,” Box 1, Folder 1, FSA Records.
public health laws. Henry also coordinated weekly talks for her students on medical and social issues, given by herself, Weatherly, IU doctors, and COS and CAA executives. She collected both theoretical and practical textbooks for the department’s library, and established the school’s curriculum to include research methods, sociology, and practical training.

The Social Service Department stated three missions of equal weight: teaching, prevention, and research. The department had to define its missions with clarity and regularity. Its leaders believed social workers had to acquire scientific knowledge of the relationship between disease and social conditions, thus they had to understand people and their neighborhoods, schools, and industries. As such their work was not purely clinical, it was a humanitarian endeavor. Social work, however, was not charity. It was clear in Edna Henry’s mind that social workers could facilitate recovery from illness through patient education and connection to resources, while the COS and other charities relieved the immediate conditions of poverty. She had difficulty convincing the general populace of this distinction. Seeking publicity advice in 1919, she bemoaned that “the majority of the people in Indianapolis and Indiana still think that we are some sort of branch of the

183 “Charity Meeting to Hear Experts,” Indianapolis Star, October 25, 1915, p. 6; Report of the Social Service Department, 1911-1913, Box 26, IUSSW Records.
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188 Henry, “The Sick,” 55; Report of the Social Service Department, 1911-1913, Box 26, IUSSW Records.
COS or … the Red Cross or the jail.” 189 To increase awareness, provide oversight, and raise funds for the school, Henry created a female Advisory Committee.

Prominent women joined the committee, including Evaline Holliday and other IFK and MAS members. 190 The women understood that medical social work among the sick poor had proven to be vital. They raised funds for two full-time staff members through donations and a special knitting fund and followed individual cases with particular interest. 191

In her capacity as Social Service Department director, Edna Henry remained embedded in the inner workings of Indianapolis charities and the COS in particular. Her relationship with the COS appears to have been far from harmonious. Social work students and graduates moved to and from the COS and other agencies with fluidity. Current and prospective students confided in Henry about either their satisfaction or displeasure working at the COS. Crystal Benton Fall, for example, was a Social Service Department graduate, an active COS friendly visitor, and later a COS staff case worker. Henry held Crystal Fall in high regard and supported her when she abruptly left the COS in 1915. 192 Six months later, Charles Grout retired from the COS and rumors flew through the social service community about his

189 Edna Henry to Dorothy Buschman, New Haven Hospital Social Service Department, December 23, 1919, Box 1, Folder 6, IUSSW Records. Henry expressed resentment at the conflation of social work and charity in her letter to U.G. Weatherly, February 20, 1920, Box 2, Folder 4, IUSSW Records.
190 Mrs. Allerdice, Emerson, Holliday, Hornbrook, Lilly, MacDonald, Nicholson, and White were either IFK or MAS members when they joined the 27-member Social Service Department Advisory Committee. Members of the three societies found in Indianapolis Free Kindergarten Society, 1882-1942 (Indianapolis: Indianapolis Free Kindergarten and Children’s Aid Society, 1942), 28-29; Mothers’ Aid Society letterhead, Box 1, Folder 12, FSA Records; Report of the Social Service Department, 1917, Box 1, Folder 5, IUSSW Records.
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successor. Although the COS never offered her a position, Henry believed she was a potential candidate. Weatherly advised her to stay out of the “COS muddle” and not to abandon the social work school for the “stormy times” that were surely ahead if she were to leave. Henry concurred, adding that she sympathized with whoever joined the COS.

Neither the school nor the COS, however, could deny the other’s role in serving the sick poor of Indianapolis, so cross-training continued despite the obvious friction.

Just as the COS believed it knew who made an ideal friendly visitor, Henry believed she understood who made an ideal social worker:

> No amount of training will make a good social worker out of a person without good health, imagination, or the wrong temperament, or character, or personal appearance. Any successful social worker must be a teacher, and the best teaching is by example.

The social worker-teacher, she continued, must be able to work effectively with patients, doctors, students, and volunteers. Finally, this rare individual must “have a true knowledge of the texture of normal society, of modern social problems, of the interrelation of dependence and disease.”

By the end of her tenure as director, Henry’s realization that teaching and communication skills outweighed case-work skills was painful for her to admit. Her conclusion that this work relied more on innate talents than education placed her at odds with Mary Richmond’s insistence on case-work skills, sound reasoning, clear thinking, and advanced standards.

---

194 Edna Henry letter to Delia A. Vochem, June 28, 1919, Box 2, Folder 1, IUSSW Records.
The CAA and its General Secretary Frank Loomis took care to align more closely with professional social work than with volunteer friendly visitors. In a 1916 edition of *Our Children*, the CAA ran a scathing story about “My Lady Bountiful” and surrounded it with photos of smiling prize-winning babies. “My Lady Bountiful” captured every negative stereotype in a mere ten inches of type. She went “slumming,” patronized “the poor things,” promised “abundantly” but delivered only a modicum of assistance. The story closed on a venomous note:

> She continues her ministrations as long as the family continues to assume the proper attitude – or until she tires of the diversion or goes away for the summer, when she leaves this ‘family problem’ for the charitable organizations and the community to settle.197

Frank Loomis characterized case workers instead as “poverty doctors,” who skillfully diagnosed the elements of poverty in a person’s life so that that element could be treated. He decried those who cast intelligent sympathy as “cold blooded” or thought social workers simply labeled their clients worthy or unworthy.198 The friendly visitor’s legacy, however, permeated CAA case work as it advocated that visitors sought full knowledge of all the facts in a case and that its social workers delivered education, not alms.199

Indianapolis COS General Secretary Eugene Foster emphasized training of case workers more than Charles Grout had. Foster worked to hire either graduates of social work schools or case workers with prior experience. He wrote that, with appropriate staffing and direction, the COS would enter “upon a new era in

---

Indianapolis Social Work. Like the COS founders, Foster envisioned some elusive ideal blend of love, religion, and science: “As true scientists, we long for the ability to combine with delicacy and precision, the elements necessary to produce the desired results … we shall have to release in proportionate parts, all that we have of heart, brain and energy.” Similarly the COS sought, yet did not attain, the ideal blend of volunteer and staff. Accordingly, the COS kept its options open and never dismissed the friendly visitor.

By the early 1920s, social work had become a way of life and established a subculture that balanced the instrumental and expressive functions of philanthropy. As such, social workers advocated for systemic solutions to poverty, much as COSs had come to understand. Nationally, the Russell Sage Foundation (1907) devoted itself to modernize social work, advance women’s and children’s welfare, and shape reform in housing, city planning, industrial relations, and social research. Whether installed at a university, charitable agency, or foundation, the professional social worker had arrived.

The Chamber of Commerce Endorses Charities: “Survival of the Fittest”

---
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Chapter Four described the Commercial Club’s formation and interest in public welfare. The Commercial Club and five other business organizations merged in 1912 to form the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber thereafter remained active in bridging business, philanthropy, and government. It felt that management of the charitable sector was required to identify and eliminate scams purporting to be charities, but refused to rely on local government to carry out this function. The Chamber assumed this responsibility on behalf of its membership, as Chamber members represented the majority of charitable donors in Indianapolis.

The Commercial Club’s Committee on Benevolent Associations became the Chamber’s Committee on Relief and Charities and gained increasing authority over charities. The Chamber’s authority mirrored the rationale of corporate, not just individual, social responsibility to community across the country. By 1915, chambers of commerce in most major cities formally endorsed charities. The committee advised Chamber members that it served as a form of insurance to assure high standards and insulate them from fraud. It surveyed and screened up to fifty charities annually and formally endorsed those it deemed reputable. Once endorsed, a charity’s solicitors carried cards that stated, “The Committee believes it to be worthy the support of those who desire to further its aims.” The committee vetted charities against COS principles in its endorsement process: efficiency, efficacy,
ethics, and the elimination of duplication and waste. The committee acknowledged that the public now generally recognized organized charity principles and credited the COS with having put the concepts into practice, albeit on a limited scale.\textsuperscript{209}

The Committee on Benevolent Associations simultaneously expanded upon and undermined the COS’s circle of charities. The committee wrote that charities were too numerous and complex to be coordinated as the COS had done in the past. By endorsing worthy charities and declining to assist those unworthy of public support, the committee promised to ensure the “survival of the fittest” benevolent organizations in the city.\textsuperscript{210} The committee brazenly required the COS, once the leader of Indianapolis social services, to apply for approval just like any other.

In 1916, Grout’s sudden departure disrupted the COS and Foster reorganized the internal operations after he became general secretary. By the time the leadership transition stabilized, the Chamber’s Relief and Charities Committee had co-opted former COS principles as entirely its own: “The said new [COS] reorganization will more nearly harmonize with the ideas and principles of the Relief & Charities Committee.”\textsuperscript{211} The COS operated for six more years, but it no longer held its central position as the hub of all charitable operations. The circle of charities had lost its meaning.

Also in 1916, the COS, its commonly accepted principles, and its circle of charities were completely overshadowed by the newest entrant to the charitable landscape: the American Red Cross. As U.S. entry into World War I appeared imminent, the Red Cross mobilized in preparation across the country. Charles
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Sumner Ward directed an American Red Cross nationwide campaign that produced unprecedented results. The Red Cross increased membership from 22,500 to 18,000,000 and established chapters in 3,200 counties. Almost overnight the U.S. had a Red Cross chapter in virtually every city. When the national office of the Red Cross asked Indianapolis to establish a local chapter, eight citizens including John Holliday, Rabbi Morris Feuerlicht, and William Fortune agreed to lead the effort. Fortune, the young reporter who in 1890 had helped found the Commercial Club, was a successful businessman and civic leader by 1916. John Holliday claims the credit for nominating Fortune to lead the Indianapolis Red Cross branch. That gesture was tantamount to Holliday passing the baton to Fortune to be the next generation’s most influential civic and philanthropic leader. It would also place Holliday and Fortune in opposing positions when determining the COS’s future.

The national Red Cross headquarters set the membership goal for Indianapolis at 1 percent of the population, approximately 3,000 members. Governor Samuel Ralston and the local committee launched the membership drive on July 11, 1916. Within one week over 3,000 members enrolled. The chapter elected William Fortune as president, John Holliday as treasurer, and Monsignor

---

212 Charles Sumner Ward (1859-1929), developed the short-term, organized, intensive fundraising campaigns for charities. Ward pioneered his techniques when he was General Secretary of the YMCA in Grand Rapids, Michigan. Spending most of his time raising money just to keep the YMCA doors open, Ward approached the board of directors and requested they allow an organized campaign effort to pay for expenses over a long period of time. In exchange, he agreed not to request additional funding from them. Ward’s plan succeeded. He worked for the Red Cross from 1916 to 1919 while on loan from the YMCA. Ward and partners founded the first professional fundraising firm after World War I. They perfected many essential fundraising techniques, worked only on fixed fees, and established fundraising as a legitimate profession. Scott M. Cutlip, Fund Raising in the United States: Its Role in American Philanthropy (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1965), Chapters 4 and 5.

213 Marie Cecile Chomel and Anselm Chomel, A Red Cross Chapter at Work (Indianapolis: Hollenbeck Press, 1920), 6-8.
Francis Gavisk as vice president, positions they would hold through 1919. The local Red Cross then began preparations for possible emergency response. Its first test came in March, 1917 when a tornado destroyed much of nearby New Castle, Indiana. The storm injured 200 people and caused twenty-one deaths and a wide swath of property damage. While the COS, CAA, Jewish Federation, and Red Cross all worked together on the relief effort, it was immediately clear that the Red Cross possessed capacity that the other organizations never had. The Red Cross branch, less than one year old, raised over $25,000 in a matter of days – approximately the COS's annual budget. The COS had claimed in 1907 that it was an agency for the direction of emergency relief. After the New Castle tragedy, it recognized that the Red Cross filled this role and recommended relief work training be conducted in Indianapolis. By the end of the decade, the COS added that the Red Cross Home Service now “carried the burden” of chronic cases of need, further reducing the relevance of the COS.

In 1917, the U.S. entered World War I, Red Cross fundraising began in earnest, and William Fortune became president of the Chamber of Commerce. These interrelated events forever changed philanthropy in Indianapolis and rendered the COS obsolete. Charles Ward, who had conducted the national Red Cross membership drive, now orchestrated the first national fundraising campaign with the

---
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audacious goal of $100,000,000.218 Indianapolis’s share of the goal was $300,000.219 The city had never seen a campaign of this magnitude. Undeterred, local Red Cross leaders assigned fundraising teams and applied many of the high-pressure techniques that were quickly becoming elements of the “whirlwind campaign,” also known as the “Ward plan.”220 A campaign clock stood on Monument Circle, a tent pitched on the front lawn of Christ Church served as campaign headquarters, fundraisers met at noon in the tent to publicly report their progress, soapbox orators spoke from virtually every downtown street corner, and Red Cross flags, banners, and posters blanketed the city.221

The Indianapolis Red Cross campaign far exceeded expectations. William Fortune proudly recalled a famous dinner at which wealthy citizens pledged a total of $200,000 in less than one hour, exceeding “by far all records of an hour’s generosity in the history of Indianapolis.”222 The elite, however, did not participate alone. The Red Cross’s published history of the Indianapolis war effort recorded the universality of the appeal: “Everybody was at work or giving money, or both: white and colored, young and old, rich and poor, native born and foreign-born. Every class of citizenship was represented in the subscription list.”223 Even children staged plays and parades. Indianapolis raised over $530,000 in 1917.224
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John Holliday served as the Red Cross’s treasurer from 1917 to 1919 and managed approximately $1.5 million in donated funds over this three year period. While he still served as the COS’s president, his passion lay in the war effort. At a noon meeting under the fundraising tent on Monument Circle, his words conveyed his patriotism and devotion to the current cause:

For more than fifty years my principal regret was that I was not born a few years earlier so that I might have taken a larger part in the Civil War. Now my regret is that I was not born twenty-five years later, so that I might take a more active part in this war. For, great as were the issues of the Civil War, they are overshadowed by those of today.

Holliday had direct personal connections to the war effort. His oldest son died of illness while serving in the military. He had a son-in-law, Benjamin Hitz, stationed in France, and another son-in-law, Joseph Daniels, in reserve officer training. John Holliday had already served the COS for more than twenty years; it is reasonable to conclude that he increasingly relied on Eugene Foster’s management of the COS while he focused on the Red Cross.

William Fortune combined his leadership positions of the Chamber of Commerce and the Red Cross in 1918 to manage the city’s War Chest Board. War chests developed across the country to reduce overhead expense, harness individual giving, and allow corporations to deduct wartime charitable contributions from taxable income. The war chest was so successful that 300 to 400 cities created
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them. Fortune used his connections to organize the War Chest Board in a mere three weeks. Within the next week, campaign teams reached 100,000 donors and raised an astounding sum – just under $3,000,000. The board then had to allocate the funds to “provide for all war and benevolent needs in Indianapolis … according to the judgment of the War Chest Board as to their merits.” The board decided on a formal, businesslike approach to this allocation task.

Instead of relying on local expertise to advise it during the allocation process, the War Chest Board turned to a national firm. When the Commercial Club formed its first Committee on Benevolent Associations in 1909, it had considered forming a research organization. The club had invited William Allen, director of New York City’s Bureau of Municipal Research (BMR), to address its members and evaluate whether Indianapolis should develop a similar bureau. Allen and Frederick Cleveland, formerly of New York’s Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, founded the BMR in 1905 to apply scientific management to evaluate city governments. The founders’ goal was to harness “the work of social betterment” by informing citizens how to encourage efficient and ethical local governments. Rather than form its own bureau, the Chamber’s Relief and Charities Committee retained the BMR to complete comprehensive studies of Indianapolis government and charitable infrastructures. The BMR produced Report on a Survey of the City

---
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The BMR’s *Survey of Charitable Organizations* examined fifty-five social service agencies in Indianapolis. It did not consider other nonprofit fields such as health, education, or the arts. Nor did the BMR include the Red Cross, the most visible wartime relief agency, as though its value were so obvious that it need not be stated, much less examined in detail. Over two months, BMR staff toured facilities, read documents, and interviewed charity executives, then reported on the mission, operations, finances, and fundraising methods of each agency. For each charity, the BMR provided a summary of operations, recommendations for improvement if needed, and commentary on the suitability and amount of War Chest funding.

The War Chest Board hoped the BMR would encourage charities to adopt three practices: sound philanthropic principles, elimination of duplication and waste, and responsible expenditures.²³³ These practices were rather generic, but couched one of the board’s agendas – to lower fundraising expenses. The War Chest emphasized this priority with its own mantra: “The War Chest Board will serve the community as a matter of civic duty – without remuneration …. Not one cent of your contribution will be used for the expenses of the War Chest Campaign.”²³⁴ The BMR report accordingly consolidated the fifty-five agencies’ revenues and expenses into one income statement to reveal what the city spent on social services vis-à-vis private donors. It totaled all “costs of services” into a single entry, but isolated the cost of fund solicitation. To the relief, and possibly the surprise, of the War Chest

²³³ Seeley, *Community Chest*, 90.
Board, agencies’ engagement of solicitors turned out to be nominal. The BMR credited the Chamber’s Relief and Charities Committee for discouraging professional fundraising and presumably assuring this result.235

The Survey of Charitable Organizations grouped the charities into seven categories: indoor relief, outdoor relief, health promotion, protective, social agency, boarding homes, and missionaries. Its extensive discussion of the outdoor relief agency group laid bare the overlapping work, inefficiencies, and redundancies that had developed among the COS, IBS, CAA, and MAS – the very plurality of benevolence that the COS had hoped to rein in when it formed in 1879. The report noted bluntly that any distinction between the COS and IBS was a “fiction” maintained as separate organizations by “merely a bookkeeping trick.”236 Considering the two organizations as one and the same, the BMR complimented the COS/IBS poor relief efforts: “The work done for the poor is … of high character. The case work is good; the investigations are not too formal; the relief is just sufficient and the contact between the staff and the case humane.”237 Actual poor relief, however, had never been any COS’s raison d’être.

The COS’s management change from Grout to Foster had created disruption, causing the BMR to recognize that the charity faced “an up-hill fight … to rehabilitate itself in the confidence of the public.”238 But organizations regularly undergo leadership changes that do not lead to the end of their existence. Internal disarray was far from the COS’s fundamental business problem. The crux of the
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stagnation and sense of futility that had crept into the COS was the wide array of charitable work that had emerged all around it as Indianapolis had grown and diversified. Charities had multiplied and specialized since the COS formed in 1879. Try as it might, the COS could not assimilate the plethora of organizations that catered to increasingly narrowly defined clientele within the circle of charities. As we have seen, the COS had evolved in several ways over four decades, but it still remained committed to addressing poverty among the general populace.

The BMR concluded that the COS had become a charity clearing house, not for all cases of need in the city, but “for cases that no other organization wants to handle.”\(^{239}\) The COS was the city’s “best organized charity,” but it had devolved to running the Confidential Exchange and allowing other societies to “step in and claim the supervision of this or that case.”\(^{240}\) In the past, the COS had delegated work to the circle of charities. Now, the COS handled intake but the field of charities delegated to the COS the vestiges of the city’s needy population that the rest of the field chose not to assist. Many charities, and the BMR, still touted organized charity principles, but the very system that the COS had created allowed it to become the charity of last resort, handling only chronic cases of poverty that it once would have deemed unworthy.

The *Survey of Charitable Organizations* complimented the Jewish Federation more than any other outdoor relief agency, reinforcing organized charity principles on one hand and specialization on the other. The BMR readily gleaned that the Jewish Federation was a COS in miniature, exclusively operated by and for the


\(^{240}\) Ibid., 129.
Jewish population in the city. The report found that the system had been more successful than the city-wide COS:

One cannot avoid seeing that the Jewish Federation cares for its poor in a more adequate and also in a wiser manner than do the other organizations in Indianapolis. One reason may be that the wealthy members of the faith are by training or by their religion made more sympathetic and responsible for their own poor. One cannot also help being impressed by the fact that their charities demand higher standards than is the case in other organizations. The Jewish Federation must be commended upon the fact that they do not inflict any humiliation upon the competent poor by forcing upon them what may be good for them.\(^{241}\)

The report went on to cite details from the federation’s annual report, which were the cornerstones of organized charity. COSs in general were not under indictment. But the Indianapolis COS, in the BMR’s view, was clearly at risk.

William Fortune had become aware of potential duplication in charitable fundraising and operations. Now with the BMR report in hand, he began to use his position on the War Chest Board to force consolidations as he saw fit. In particular, he lobbied for the merger of the COS, CAA, and MAS. Fortune, on behalf of the War Chest Board, wrote to COS President Holliday, asking to meet with representatives of the three organizations. Holliday’s tepid reply suggested that such a consolidation was not entirely advisable.\(^{242}\) The matter was temporarily tabled. Fortune persisted, stopping short of withholding a War Chest allocation.\(^{243}\) Just after Armistice Day, the War Chest Board overruled Fortune and ceased all efforts to
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consolidate charities. William Fortune abruptly resigned from the War Chest Board in defeat, but the hiatus in merger negotiations would be short-lived.\footnote{Latham, \textit{William Fortune}, 122; Ruby Little, “History of the Family Service Association of Indianapolis, Indiana, 1835 to 1950” (Master’s thesis, University of Chicago, 1951), 57.}

The disagreement over the COS merger likely strained the relationship between Holliday and Fortune. Fortune emerged as the successor philanthropic power in Indianapolis, the leader of his generation as Holliday had been of his. William Fortune held several national leadership positions with the Red Cross and remained president of the Indianapolis branch until his death in 1942. He proposed a new Community Welfare Board to accept charitable gifts and bequests given to the city. This board, an extension of the Chamber’s Relief and Charities Committee, connected business, philanthropy and government, by controlling gifts and preventing them from falling into the hands of partisan politicians. Fortune served as the Welfare Board’s first president.\footnote{Community Welfare Board became the Board of Public Welfare. Milton Gaither, “The Rise and Fall of a Pedagogical Empire: The Board of State Charities and the Indiana Philosophy of Giving,” \textit{Indiana Magazine of History} 96, no. 4 (December 2000): 343; Geib, \textit{Indianapolis First}, 35; Latham, \textit{William Fortune}, 122.}

When he died, the \textit{Indianapolis Star} recognized him for having raised “more money for public movements than any other citizen in the history of Indiana.” The \textit{Star} also credited him for creating the War Chest Board, the nucleus of what became the Indianapolis Community Fund.\footnote{“William Fortune, Veteran Red Cross Chairman, Dies,” \textit{Indianapolis Star}, January 29, 1942, ISL Clipping File: Biography.}

The Indianapolis Community Fund: “It Can Be Done”

Community funds, also known as community chests, stemmed from both World War I war chests and the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. In addition to war chests previously discussed, Cleveland had piloted a community-wide
fundraising campaign as an outgrowth of its interest in organized charity work. Cleveland’s Chamber created a “federation” to make a coordinated appeal and allow donors to designate their gifts to particular charities. The Chamber’s board vetted both donors and charities, thereby increasing donations overall and directing funds to causes it deemed most important to the community. By 1918, fourteen cities adopted similar federated fundraising organizations.247 Of the country’s hundreds of war chests, all but thirty-nine disbanded after 1919, but the federated fundraising idea did not. The peacetime community fund, therefore, was the successor of both war chests and the Cleveland federation. Communities repurposed the federated concept to social welfare fundraising and by the mid-1920s over 300 coordinated campaigns were active.248 The “federation” and “federated giving” terms are in use today, commonly known as the United Way.

Indianapolis organized its community chest later than its peer cities.249 In 1920 the city created a “federation of agencies – of, by and for the agencies.”250 Its inaugural public relations brochure, similar to the scientific philanthropy messages of years past, attempted to convey the fusion of humanitarian compassion with businesslike efficiency with this cover.251

---


250 Seeley, *Community Chest*, 90.

251 Author’s rendering of diagram in 1920-1921 Community Chest pamphlet, COS Miscellaneous Reports, ISL Pamphlet Collection. The “no mean city” phrase caught on after Benjamin Harrison’s 1897 speech, reproduced at the request Indianapolis Mayor Charles Bookwalter on the City Hall cornerstone in 1909.
The COS had pledged unity and inclusion, reinforced by its circle of charities image. Now the Community Chest donned the heart image and stated that it “unifies the soul of the community by breaking down selfishness, narrowness, prejudice and bigotry, and in awakening a general broad-minded heart interest in the things that affect the welfare of the city life as a whole.” The chest promised to induce cooperation and avoid duplication of effort, almost as though no entity had previously worked toward those aims. The true differentiator between the Community Chest and any prior charitable entity, however, was its head-on attack of charity fundraising expenses:

```
THE COMMUNITY CHEST WAY:
96¢ OF EVERY 1$ GOES TO INSTITUTIONS
4¢ PAYS ALL EXPENSES
WOULD YOU GO BACK TO THE OLD WAY?
```

The Community Chest launched its first campaign with the goal of $1,000,000, to be run over exactly one week. It conducted what it called “one big drive instead of a score of drives” and set out to prove that chest fundraising was “the only proper
The Community Chest retained Christian Dreshman, a partner in Charles Ward’s new firm, in an interesting about-face from the War Chest’s opposition to professional fundraisers. Dreshman stressed the civic ideal as he directed the campaign: “For the first time in an organized way Indianapolis is recording how much she really cares for these things which make our city not just a place to work in but a place to really live in.” He added that the Community Chest was part of the structure of a “properly functioning city,” and that all prospective donors had the opportunity to “receive the satisfaction of contributing citizens.”

Thirty-nine charities applied, the chest promised them allocations, and the charities budgeted accordingly. The day before the drive began, the Indianapolis Star ran a feature story with large portraits of the eighteen chest leaders. Mayor C.W. Jewett’s portrait stood conspicuously near the center to add credibility to the drive.

The campaign did not succeed as planned. Unable to duplicate Red Cross or War Chest record-setting drives, the Community Chest collected $401,000 in subscriptions. After deducting approximately $50,000 in unpaid subscriptions and $20,000 in expenses, the chest distributed $325,000 in its first year of operation. The COS received the largest allocation at $37,500; the COS, CAA, MAS, and Summer Mission together received $103,250, or almost one-third of the total.

---
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Neither charities nor chest leaders were satisfied. The COS may have received the largest chest allocation, but the amount did not allow the COS to meet its obligations. Foster told his executive committee that the COS was “in more serious financial straits” than in the past five years. He enumerated his reasons for staunchly supporting the federated approach, but questioned whether the campaign had failed or the COS had failed to persuade the Community Chest that a larger allocation was in order. Foster felt so disheartened that he recommended a reevaluation of the COS/Community Chest relationship.258 At the semi-annual meeting, he shared his frustration with the audience. Why, he asked, do other cities have community chest slogans such as “humanity, unity, love, charity,” when the Indianapolis slogan is “only 4% administrative expense?” He pressed the point: “If you stood at the door of our Charities office … I do not believe your slogan would be how may we cut this service to the minimum” but how may we render better service? Foster’s bitterness could not be missed. When he continually advised his executive committee about the shortage of funds, the gentlemen – several of whom were also Community Chest leaders – advised him to “proceed with the strictest economy.” Left with a 20 percent budget shortfall, Foster felt such advice failed the organization.259

As the Community Chest board evaluated its dismal showing, it concluded that the charities still received greater funding than they could have raised on their own.260 Dreshman considered the campaign a victory “in that there is a different
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opinion and feeling about the Community Chest all over the city” and because the drive had overcome many [unidentified] obstacles.\textsuperscript{261} The second campaign was even more vigorous. With a 1921-1922 goal of $605,000, the chest recruited 931 campaign workers.\textsuperscript{262} At the kick-off rally, Community Chest chairman Fred Hoke proclaimed pithily, “It can be done.” Another speaker urged, “Civic pride in Indianapolis must be manifested in the creation of a new spirit of charity and fraternalism.” Minneapolis and Rochester had raised twice as much money as Indianapolis, and campaign workers would not be outdone.\textsuperscript{263} The campaign yielded $448,000 for thirty-nine charities, but leadership still did not abandon the community chest approach.\textsuperscript{264} Even with mediocre receipts relative to expectations, the community chest had momentum, a persuasive message, and prominent civically engaged men and women behind it.

One reason for the Indianapolis Community Chest’s durability was its intimate connection to the Chamber of Commerce. The 1920 Chamber of Commerce president Charles F. Coffin served as the chest’s first campaign director. The chest headquarters, logically, was in the Chamber of Commerce building. This sort of linkage existed around the country. Since many cities’ chambers were already acting as charity clearinghouses, or had welfare committees, raising money on a coordinated basis evolved quickly. If a chamber’s welfare committee and federated giving committee were different, the directorships were often interlocking so that the

\textsuperscript{261} “Chest Drive Nets $406,349,” \textit{Indianapolis Star}, May 14, 1921, p. 8
\textsuperscript{262} The goal was first announced as $643,575 but revised before the campaign began. “Community Chest Drive to Raise $643,575,” \textit{Indianapolis Star}, November 5, 1921, p. 46.
\textsuperscript{264} “Indianapolis Community Fund “1923-1924,” ISL Clipping File – Indianapolis Charities.
same men were intimately involved in community financing decisions. Even businessmen who may have been reluctant to become involved in charity supervision were attracted to chest principles as they closely paralleled those valued in business, especially efficiency.

Community chest development coincided with the evolution of corporate philanthropy. In the nineteenth century, the individual businessman represented a source of charitable contributions more than his firm did. Professionals and business owners, therefore, donated to charities – not their partnerships or corporations. After 1900, the corporation became more visible as a philanthropic entity in its own right. Chests therefore pursued businesses and employee pools as sources of funds that charities had accessed previously on a limited basis. The Indianapolis COS in the 1890s and early 1900s published a large roster of individual donors, with a modest number of businesses and employee groups. The 1922 Community Chest donor roster reflected the reverse, with many firms making the largest donations and fewer individuals participating. In a related development, service clubs such as Kiwanis, Lions, and Rotary allowed smaller businesses to combine in order to express civic engagement. The Indianapolis Rotary Club, for example, collected donations on

behalf of its primary philanthropic cause, the children of the Immigrant Aid Society settlement house.  

Centralized fundraising brought business and charity leaders into even closer association, allowing community leaders to grasp social problems and integrated solutions more readily. One testimonial described the chest as showing that “human welfare is one big problem rather than a series of unrelated small ones.”  

Ruth Crocker’s Indianapolis study describes the chest as a “quasi-public supplementary health department, education department, charities department, policy department, parks-and-playground department, and general welfare department.”  

Chamber and chest directors’ purview over charity was not only validated, it deepened. Community chests formalized the collaboration among fundraising professionals, business leaders, and social agencies through the federated fundraising and appropriations processes. The chest structure solidified businessmen’s power over social agencies because it gave them control over the majority of the charities’ annual operating budgets, in some cases as much as 80 percent of budgets.  

Chests were the primary fundraising organ for social services, and social service charities were the primary recipient of chest allocations. Moreover, charities had to relinquish their own fundraising efforts in order to receive a chest allocation. Community 
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chests and increasingly professionalized social work therefore grew to be hand-in-glove.  

The Indianapolis Community Chest exemplified this interdependent relationship. The chest changed in form and substance after its first two disappointing campaigns. Renamed the Community Fund, it adopted a new model that linked donors, workers, and agencies. The fund established the Council of Social Agencies, a body of eighty public and private agencies that worked in the fields of health, recreation, and family welfare. The Community Fund board of directors included representatives from the public welfare agencies. The Community Fund created separate committees, one for budget and distribution and another for fundraising. The budget and distribution committee, with board approval, in turn allocated significant funds to the agencies.

In its founding phase, the Indianapolis COS had worked to improve the individual morality of the poor as a long-term strategy to eliminate poverty. In its maturing phase, it strove to balance these repressive techniques with constructive strategies that included improvements to the urban environment. The community chest/fund influence now caused the pendulum to swing back as philanthropy and government worked to help individuals adjust to their newly improved cities.

Chambers of commerce eclipsed COSs’ power over the charitable agenda in many cities. Similarly, community chests/funds across the country wielded control

---
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over charities’ governance, operations, and even the hiring and firing of staff. Chests preferred paid, professional social workers over volunteer networks, so favored charities that hired trained staff. At the same time community chests/funds, together with the rise of legitimate professional fundraisers, became the dominant marketing and public relations arm for social agencies. This working triad of businessmen, social work, and fundraising professionals culminated during the 1920s.

Merger Creates the Family Welfare Society: “A Very Abrupt Termination of Our Work”

John Holliday resigned from his position as COS president as of December 1, 1919, citing failing health. He had helped found the organization, donated consistently and generously to it, and served as its president for twenty-five years. John’s son, Alexander R. Holliday, became a COS director. Evans Woollen succeeded Holliday as COS president. Woollen would be its last.

Evans Woollen descended from a prominent Indianapolis family. His father, William Watson Woollen, had been a charter COS member and his mother an Indianapolis Woman’s Club member. By the time Evans Woollen led the COS, he had built an impressive resume in business and philanthropy. He was president of one of Indianapolis’s three main banks, Fletcher American National Bank, founder and president of Fletcher Savings and Trust Company, and co-founder (with John Holliday and John P. Frenzel) of the Indianapolis Foundation. Evans Woollen had

married Nancy Baker, whose father had been Indiana’s fifteenth governor. Upon his death, Woollen was remembered as “never too busy to lend a helping hand to a worthy cause” and involved in virtually all civic, cultural, and welfare aspects of the city.

Woollen’s tenure as COS president lasted only two years and he never directed it as a going concern. Pressures to consolidate had momentum that had been building over the last ten years. Instead, his job would be to negotiate and implement the merger of the COS with the Children’s Aid Association and Mothers’ Aid Society. By the time he became COS president, Evans Woollen had participated as a director in several incremental steps toward the COS’s consolidation with other agencies. In 1918, the COS’s Summer Mission for Sick Children, CAA’s summer activities, the Indianapolis Star’s weekly Summer Mission fundraising drive, and the Indianapolis News’ Cheeryvale summer camp combined their summer work into the CAA to “eliminate duplicating and conflicting appeals and centralize all funds.”

---
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This move entailed several logistical transactions, such as transferring properties and records, but did not alter the fundamental missions of either the COS or CAA.281

Later in 1918, Frank Loomis left the CAA, which sparked merger discussions between the COS, CAA, and MAS. The COS board was divided, the CAA’s board unanimously favored a combination, and MAS leaders adamantly opposed a merger. The organizations finally deemed it appropriate to maintain separate operations, citing that other cities had not yet merged their organized charity and children’s welfare work.282 In 1919, Woollen, together with advertising executive Merle Sidener and Monsignor Francis Gavisk, served as the COS’s special committee to respond to William Fortune’s pressure to merge. Again the committee cited outside expertise as a reason not to merge, having consulted with the American Association for Organizing Charities and the Associated Charities of Cleveland.283 Also in 1919, the COS fully subsumed the Indianapolis Benevolent Society (IBS) by integrating management and bookkeeping. As the BMR had observed, the COS and IBS had functioned essentially as one organization for many years so this formal combination attracted little notice.284

From 1920 to 1922 Woollen served as an executive of both the Community Chest and the COS, so his involvement in each organization informed his
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participation on the other. At the 1921 COS annual meeting, speaking on behalf of all COS directors and members, he stated that the chest must serve two purposes: “That it must not only serve as a money collector, but it must supervise the work of and act as a counsel to the organizations receiving chest funds from it …. If the chest was to serve only as a ‘money getter’ it would be better that it did not function.”

While Woollen was well aware of the lackluster results of the 1920-1921 Community Chest drive, he also knew the COS was in trouble. The country was experiencing a deflationary recession following World War I. In Indianapolis, servicemen came home looking for work, unemployment rose, coal ran out during the 1920-1921 winter, and COS applications for assistance doubled.

Eugene Foster’s reports for the next eighteen months echoed previous cycles of economic downturn, unemployment, applications for assistance, and city-wide emergency relief committees. The 1921 setting in which the COS found itself, however, differed from 1893 and 1907. The COS worked in the shadow of the Red Cross Home Service and the YMCA, as well as under the budgetary confines of the Community Chest. The CAA provided children’s services. Charities for black, Jewish, and immigrant populations catered to their own clientele. Township Trustee assistance had scaled back during the COS’s maturing phase, leaving private charities with a greater share of poor relief, until mothers’ pensions established a new precedent for public welfare. In 1893-1894, the COS and Commercial Club received inquiries from around the country about how they managed the crisis. The COS and
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unemployment committees of 1921 produced no innovations to grapple with high unemployment and instead sought advice from Cincinnati’s organized charity executive. The COS failed to define a niche and struggled to aid segments of the population that were not served anywhere else. Eugene Foster knew how quickly the social welfare landscape was changing. During the war, he had warned the COS board of new problems, new resources, and new methods that affected the “whole complexion of social work .... Indianapolis should not be the back number.”

Foster wrote in 1921 that he had never felt so disheartened in all his years of organized charity work. The COS had been painted into a proverbial corner. The secretary saw no way out.

Disabled soldiers and their dependent families seemed to overrun the city. A committee of the National Disabled Soldiers’ League formed to aid the men, but did not relieve demands on the COS. The League did not follow protocols of the Confidential Exchange or investigation, frustrating the COS and not assisting the men on a systematic basis. The COS briefly operated a wood yard, including the work test of the past, with nominal success. Innovation and capacity no longer came from the COS, but from the Red Cross Home Service and the YMCA. The Home Service provided assistance to thirteen thousand families between 1919 and 1922. The Home Service made loans, arranged vocational training, provided unemployment and financial counseling, and aided in pursuing compensation and
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insurance claims. Foster reported that the Red Cross Home Service aided 800 families monthly and carried a large share of the relief work in Indianapolis.\(^\text{291}\)

The YMCA also emerged as a large, effective social service organization that dwarfed the COS’s operations and visibility. Going into World War I, it had operated dormitories, cafeterias, baths, a laundry, recreational services, and vocational and Bible study classes.\(^\text{292}\) During the war, the YMCA offered all its programs to servicemen free of charge; it estimated over 5,000 men used its facilities every day.\(^\text{293}\) In the immediate postwar years, over 3,000 discharged servicemen received free YMCA memberships, its three branches housed 1,784 men, and the YMCA conducted leadership training and job placement for veterans.\(^\text{294}\) In the first quarter of 1922, the YMCA sheltered one hundred men on an emergency basis at its central location and the Red Cross furnished all supplies.\(^\text{295}\) In addition to providing services, the local YMCA proved to be an effective fundraising machine, and presumably observed Charles Ward’s techniques with interest. During the war, the Indianapolis YMCA raised $238,459 in eight days for its local and overseas war relief work. By 1922, the YMCA had a $10,000 endowment and an annual budget of $240,000, almost ten times the COS’s budget.\(^\text{296}\)

In May 1922, the Community Chest formally resurrected merger discussions with the COS, CAA, and MAS. This time the chest wielded the weapon of budget

\(^{291}\) General Secretary’s Report, Semi-Annual Meeting, May 20, 1921, Box 1, Folder 4, FSA Records.  
\(^{293}\) Many servicemen were stationed at officers’ training camp at Fort Benjamin Harrison. George C. Mercer, *One Hundred Years of Service, 1854-1954: A History of the Young Men’s Christian Association of Indianapolis* (Indianapolis: Young Men’s Christian Association, 1954), 100.  
\(^{294}\) Mercer, *One Hundred Years of Service*, 102-103.  
\(^{295}\) General Secretary’s Report, Semi-Annual Meeting, May 20, 1921, Box 1, Folder 4, FSA Records; Latham, *William Fortune*, 145.  
\(^{296}\) Mercer, *One Hundred Years of Service*, 102-103.
allocation, one that William Fortune did not have at his disposal in 1919. The chest’s Budget Committee pushed hard for a timely merger decision, without veiling its insistence that a consolidation was overdue. The Budget Committee noted that the combined COS, CAA, and MAS represented 41 percent of the annual Community Chest revenue, with the remainder allocated to thirty-nine other agencies. The chest believed this allocation disproportionately favored the three agencies and it would not go into the fall fundraising campaign without a plan.297

Executives of the Community Fund and the three agencies convened to agree upon a coordinated social service plan that would be best for Indianapolis. The three agencies in turn formed a Family Welfare Subcommittee to survey the three organizations once again and bring a recommendation to their boards.298 The committee concluded within thirty days that two approaches were possible, either to organize a new family society or continue to operate the three existing agencies but explicitly dividing the field of work as follows:

1. To recognize the Charity Organization Society as the family social work organization of this city, caring for all family welfare problems not specifically the responsibility of another society, and
2. To recognize the Children’s Aid Association as the child welfare organization of this city, dealing with family social work situations in which the child problem is predominant, but equipped with relief funds sufficient to avoid transferring families to the COS merely because relief is needed, and

297 Minutes of the Special Meeting of the COS Board, June 17, 1922, Box 1, Folder 5, FSA Records.
298 The committee included Mrs. Fred Gardner, Fred Hoke (who chaired the 1921 Community Fund), Mrs. Frank Jones, Leo Rappaport, Mrs. Frank Stalnaker, and Mrs. Frank Wood. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the COS Board, June 17, 1922, Box 1, Folder 5, FSA Records.
3. To recognize the Mothers’ Aid Society as the guardian of dependent widows by death with minor children.299

Whether to divide the field or form a new organization had been debated among the agencies’ board members since Fortune’s 1919 overture. Similar viewpoints surfaced in 1922. The majority of the board members agreed that a merger was justified and spoke of the efficiency of a combined operation, viewing the work largely as service delivery and the instrumental purpose of philanthropy. Only Monsignor Gavisk reminded everyone of the values that drive philanthropy and its expressive purpose. He consented to a merger, but warned that the committee should “consider the human element in this work and … not lose to the community the interest and concern which many groups had tried to express.”300 Merle Sidener vehemently opposed a merger. Sidener believed a merger was only an experiment and that claims of economy or efficiency over putative duplication of work were exaggerated.301 Over Sidener’s dissenting vote, the committee notified the Community Chest that COS, CAA, and MAS would agree to either a plan to divide the field or a plan to merge.302 The final capitulation took only thirty days.

Eugene Foster was distraught. Foster had recused himself from voting on the merger plan as an ex-officio board member, but now that the merger was proceeding he recorded his thoughts for posterity. He reported to his executive committee in September that the COS had improved in the quality of its work and cooperation
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with other agencies since his arrival in 1916. Foster bluntly stated his
disappointment with the COS's withdrawal from social service and the “very abrupt
termination of our work” that was at hand. He politely, professionally, and
unequivocally declined to join the new agency.303

The constitution of new Family Welfare Society (FWS) integrated the missions
of the three predecessor charities and incorporated the “social work” and “social
legislation” language of the period:

1. To take over and occupy the general field of service formerly occupied
   by the Charity Organization Society, Children's Aid Association and
   Mothers' Aid Society,
2. To perform general family social welfare work,
3. To give long time assistance and supervision to families when
   necessary,
4. To engage in protective work for children including child boarding and
   placing and specialized service for peculiar child problems,
5. To plan and carry out preventative social measures and activities,
6. To promote social legislation, and
7. To maintain a cooperating center for all agencies interested in the
   various phases of family social service work and child welfare.304

The FWS subsumed the Juvenile Protective Association and the Summer Mission
just after the merger.305 The FWS deliberately eliminated the word “charity” from its
new name. The new agency proudly noted that its name was in keeping with the
trend away from emphasis on relief giving to one of service to individual families.306

The FWS created two divisions that aligned services from all the predecessor
organizations by family structure: families with children at home and children either
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orphaned or in need of public assistance. The Service and Relief Division handled family relief and rehabilitation; the Children’s Bureau cared for children outside their homes. The Family Welfare Society later wrote that it was the first, or at least one of the first, agencies in the U.S. to integrate family and children’s services.  

New leaders guided the FWS in its early years. William H. Insley served as board president and Paul Lyman Benjamin as executive secretary. Insley was a wealthy industrialist from an old-stock Indianapolis family, already active on the COS board. Benjamin moved to Indianapolis from New York to join the FWS with very definite opinions about social work. Benjamin had graduated from the New York School of Social Work and served as associate editor of the leading social work journal, Survey. An active member of the Social Workers Exchange (later the American Association of Social Workers), he believed that “mushrooming” social organizations, poorly trained workers, and lack of standardization in social work all jeopardized the fledgling field. Benjamin believed in the meaning of “professional” in the fullest sense. Paul Benjamin thus came to the job with no emotional attachment to any of the FWS predecessor organizations, a penchant for

---

310 Professional entails not only specialization in an occupation, but as an ordered system of education, infrastructure, domain over a body of knowledge, cultural acceptance, and a common value system. Dorothy Ross, “The Development of the Social Sciences,” in The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920, ed. Alexandra Oleson and John Voss (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), 117-118; Trattner, From Poor Law to Welfare State, 233-234; Wenocur and Reisch, From Charity to Enterprise, 2-4.
consolidation, and a drive toward instilling professional education, training, and status in his new staff.

The 1922-1923 Community Chest drive, the first to allocate funds to the Family Welfare Society, targeted total donations of $643,584. The campaign featured Community Chest volunteers who blanketed Sunday schools as “four-minute” speakers to preach the gospel of giving. Pastors linked their sermons with the Community Chest fundraising messages, as clergy had done for many years during IBS fund drives. The chest adopted a new slogan for the 1922 drive: “Suppose Nobody Cared.” The campaign secured $546,078, again less than projected. Subsequent drives in the mid-1920s produced approximately $600,000. The FWS’s Community Fund allocations were higher than the former COS, CAA, and MAS combined. In 1924-1925, the FWS received only 22 percent of the Community Fund income, the highest fund allocation to a single entity but down from its previous high of 41 percent. The FWS, however, appears to have lost the majority of other sources of public or private support, whether earned or donated revenue. The Community Fund’s allocations of $143,200 in 1923-1924 and 1924-1925 represented 85 percent of the FWS’s annual budget.

The major philanthropic forces in Indianapolis remained closely knit and working together. Eugene Foster, Monsignor Gavisk, Fred Hoke, William Insley,
and Evans Woollen all served as Community Fund officers after 1922. Foster became the Indianapolis Foundation staff director in 1924, a position he held until his death in 1948. Rabbi Feuerlicht chose to leave the CAA shortly after the merger. He believed that by 1922 the city had gradually taken over many CAA functions, including the juvenile probation officers, playgrounds, baby clinics, and milk pasteurization, so the original purpose of the agency would be “perpetuated.”

Five MAS women, including former president Henrietta Ellinwood, joined the FWS board in 1922. Henrietta’s responsibility was to manage the “skeleton” MAS organized to hold funds from bequests. She stayed with the FWS less than one year. She had founded the MAS from her home and been its driving force for its entire existence. While she had been involved in her church and clubs, she called the MAS her primary focus and even her “pet.” Presumably she found it distressing to manage an organization that was a mere skeleton of what had been her passion. Henrietta remained in Indianapolis and went on to other philanthropy, including helping to found the Indianapolis Association for the Prevention and Relief of Heart Disease.

Eugene Foster took some time before he accepted the position at Indianapolis Foundation. By the time Foster addressed the audience at the Flower Mission’s fiftieth anniversary celebration, he had had time to reflect on the end of the era of
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organized charity in Indianapolis. He had been wholeheartedly dedicated to organized charity as the way citizens needed to act on their value systems and ideals most effectively. Eugene Foster spoke in 1926 of the “social perils” that could affect humans: hunger, cold, heat, disease, unemployment, and conflicting passions and desires. He reinforced the civic ideal that had been a consistent theme for almost one hundred years: “We may, all working together, make even our modern city a place which is socially fit in which to live.” He commended the spirit of social work among those in the audience, different in the terminology of the day but not in the hearts and lives of citizens.319

Then Foster turned to stories that were close to his heart. Perhaps these narratives had allowed him to reconcile the end of the Charity Organization Society and the organized charity movement at large. In one story, a minister counseled a social worker to follow any path, of any social agency for social betterment, as long as we all follow some path. The other work that had touched Eugene Foster was Henry van Dyke’s short story “The Mansion” (1920). In “The Mansion,” a moving example of benevolence literature, a wealthy banker and philanthropist cannot condone his son’s “romantic devotion to work among the poor.” After an argument, the banker dreamed of his own arrival in heaven, only to find that those who had given of themselves on Earth had mansions awaiting them. The banker gave generously on Earth, but strategically, for egoistic, tax, and business advantages. Because he had not given “gifts in which the giver forgets himself,” the banker was
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doomed to live in a hut for eternity. The story resolved with father and son united, and the father vowing to live with a new perspective of the world.  

Eugene Foster found comfort in these tales as he, and his audience, had chosen to work in dedication to the service of others. He still believed that his organized charity work was in the community’s best interest, but he accepted the new path forward. With the perspective of a few years, Foster reconceived the image of philanthropy in the city no longer as a “circle of charity,” but a “mosaic of charity.” Many paths now existed to “brighten broken lives,” he recognized, from volunteer to professional, from child welfare to medical social service, from service to relief. Devoted philanthropic service, along many different paths, formed the new mosaic of charity. With the demise of the Charity Organization Society, the new mosaic would have to support Indianapolis as the city continued to grow and change in the future.
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Conclusion

“An Art as Complex as Life Itself”

The Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis experienced three distinct phases during its forty-three year existence, phases that this study has described as founding, maturing, and corporate. Although organized charity was undoubtedly a national phenomenon, the Indianapolis COS paralleled what historians Cayton and Onuf call the “triumph” of the Midwest. ¹ The COS and the Midwest region developed because of commercial capitalism, and the ensuing industrialization, consumerism, and pluralism. During the COS’s founding phase, the Midwest was home to responsible, faithful, industrious citizens who sought out opportunities to associate voluntarily to solve community problems. The moral foundation on which the men and women of Indianapolis had built their city provided the ideal setting for the organized charity movement to take hold and flourish. Civic leaders embraced Reverend Oscar McCulloch’s interpretation of the Social Gospel with enthusiasm and humanitarian compassion for their fellow man. They were able – and willing – to experiment, change, and take risks in order to act on their version of the civic ideal to make Indianapolis a desirable city in which to – live for everyone. Because charity workers were forging the new techniques of scientific philanthropy, they assembled data the only way they knew – one case at a time. They based solutions to social problems, therefore, on reforming individuals.

Capitalism during the maturing phase brought different people to the region, which created new socioeconomic strata and new forms of dependence. While Cayton and Onuf argue that the midwestern elite “lost its initiative and surrendered

its momentum” as early as the 1890s, the Indianapolis COS enjoyed its peak influence during this decade. Propelled by tightly connected, influential men and women, the organization learned from its work and used its platform of legitimacy to advise and lead other charities in Indianapolis and beyond. COS leaders adopted more business principles and shifted slightly away from the Social Gospel toward a more formal, secular interpretation of the civic ideal that blended humanitarian compassion and duty to community. Organized charity workers, in Indianapolis and around the country, learned from their experience that it was not enough to scrutinize, and reform, every individual person who came to them for help. COS and civic leaders recognized and implemented systemic solutions, on a limited basis, to combat illness and unemployment – and therefore poverty.

The COS failed to adapt to its rapidly changing environment during its corporate, and final, phase. It could not withstand the threat of competition, internal upheaval, and the trends of specialization and professionalization. To organize charity was no longer innovative and the general mission to aid anyone in need became lost in the shadow of child saving. Cayton and Onuf argue that the success of capitalism transformed midwestern society into one of stagnant celebrations of progress and prosperity. By 1922, the Midwest – and the Indianapolis COS – had lost dynamism and urgency.2

The powerful cache of social capital in the city also began to enervate after 1911. The civic ideal of Blake, Fletcher, McCulloch, and Holliday took on different dimensions by 1922. Mid-level businessmen, corporate entities, professional social
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workers, service club members, and ethnic and racial minorities were all civically engaged to some extent, eroding a civic ideal that prominent citizens would share. Indianapolis Rotary Club members, for example, saw themselves as men “who, during an aimless decade in which old certainties were fading, still tried to hold to the virtues, the values, the ideals of the past.”4 Men in service clubs such as Rotary demonstrated civic pride and solidarity primarily through social gatherings, outings, sports, and entertainment, thus subjecting themselves to comparison to Babbitt, Sinclair Lewis’s scathing indictment of “woefully average” mid-level businessmen.5 But service clubs also expressed civic responsibility by supporting social causes under club auspices. As businessmen of multiple levels emerged and society grew increasingly interdependent, the individual enlightened self-interest that Alexis de Tocqueville had observed in the nineteenth century now appeared as business’s enlightened self-interest.6

As the COS entered 1922, Eugene Foster hoped “its failures, its struggles, its trials” had passed. Even if the COS was no longer the city’s dominant social service agency, he wanted organized charity to serve as a “center of civic betterment” for Indianapolis.7 But the Indianapolis of 1922 had changed profoundly since 1879. The ideal crucible for organized charity in 1879 had grown multifold and diversified economically, culturally, ethnically, and socially. The COS had been founded and matured with a coterie of people in control. Local and national competition,

---

7 General Secretary’s Report, November 5, 1921, BV 1192, FSA Records.
specialization, professionalization, and new strategies to eradicate poverty eclipsed
the organized charity model. As the Midwest went, so did the COS in Indianapolis.
By 1922, it had lost more than its dynamism and its urgency. It ceased to exist as an
independent entity.

COS board member Merle Sidener may have been correct that a merger was a
mere panacea for a more complex business problem, for turbulence marked the early
years of the Family Welfare Society (FWS). Secretary Paul Benjamin created the
new organizational structure, defined the field of work, and added to staff at a rapid
pace. His first annual report illuminated both the organized charity foundations on
which the FWS was built and the new strategies to address social problems that had
developed over forty years. Case work, investigation, visitation, districts, the
confidential exchange, and forms of relief clearly had emerged from organized
charity roots. COS’s data had created the recognition of illness and unemployment
as the primary causes of poverty. The Children’s Aid Association’s child-saving
work led to zealous efforts to mentor children and prevent delinquency. While COS
documents had not referred to clients as worthy or unworthy for some time, the
FWS still treated transient men differently from other able-bodied unemployed men,
and unmarried women with children differently from widows or deserted wives with
children – so much so that the stigmatized men and women were served by different
case workers and relief strategies. The COS had believed that each case, each family,
each widow, warranted a unique case plan, and it had a circle of charities within its
reach to implement the plan. The new FWS similarly wrote, “Each family plan is
different from the next. It is an art as complex as life itself.”

Connection to resources remained paramount, as it did in Mary Richmond’s circles of 1899.

Perhaps the greatest departure from COSs’ original tenets dealt with the perceived risk of providing relief. Until the COS’s maturing phase, when constructive strategies began to emerge, charity leaders were terrified of providing relief improperly lest it foster dependence. Benjamin wrote of the “changed attitude” in 1923: “There was the fear that relief would break down independence. The new attitude is that it is poor treatment rather than relief giving which does this.” It was unclear what constituted poor treatment in Benjamin’s mind. His description of “good treatment” harkened back to exactly what COSs had hoped to achieve, the development of resources so that fewer people required assistance.

Paul Benjamin and the FWS board clashed over how to run the new organization almost immediately. Two years into his term, the board requested Benjamin’s resignation. Nine social workers departed within a few weeks. W. H. Insley did not mince words when he told the press why the exodus occurred. The board, he said, wanted “to bring about a more harmonious situation in the personnel of the organization and bring about a change in the society’s policy.” Specifically, Insley reported with bravado, the executive committee believed “that ‘rough and ready’ methods of handling relief measures were needed in this city, rather than the

---

8 The Family Welfare Society of Indianapolis, 1923, p. 4, Box 3, Folder 1, FSA Records.
9 Ibid., p. 11.
10 Ibid., p. 12.
‘too cautious’ methods of the professional social worker.’\textsuperscript{12} The board’s search for a new secretary began anew.

Benjamin went on to lead the Social Hygiene Society in Washington, DC. Several years later he fired back at Insley and the Indianapolis FWS, reflecting the continuing struggles in the social welfare field over the balance of voluntarism and professionalization, proper relief methods, and how best to assist individuals and communities simultaneously. Benjamin felt confined by organized charity’s legacy, now an impediment to professionalization and progress:

You have the local agency with its roots in the past, its executive coming from an old family; you have the vested interest of a board in an outmoded piece of work; you have the emphasis on professionalism, and a certain hardening of the arteries which happens to any organization when it becomes over-institutionalized …. Is it any wonder when all this and other ingredients are stirred together there is a brew of bewilderment?\textsuperscript{13}

In a related editorial Benjamin opined, “Whether or not the primary loyalty is to an organization, to a client, or to the community rests upon what each individual conceives to be the highest good.”\textsuperscript{14} In this statement, he hit on the crux of his tumultuous Indianapolis tenure. What seemed a “brew of bewilderment” to him was a contested civic ideal.

When the National Conference of Charities and Correction (NCCC) returned to Indianapolis in 1937, some attendees viewed with nostalgia the state of social work and poor relief that had prevailed when the 1891 NCCC conference had taken place in the city. Much had changed. By the 1930s, social welfare policy leaders had


accepted the environmental view of cities over individual morality and recognized the interdependence of poverty with living and working conditions. Philanthropy’s limited scale to address massive unemployment was abundantly clear by 1937. The country, still mired in the Great Depression, had witnessed waves of New Deal welfare programs that rendered the turn from charity to the welfare state irretrievable. “The charities and correction trappings are gone,” one social worker noted, “but new panoplies of security and social work have taken their place.”15 The Depression’s financial assistance programs caused family welfare agencies, successors of COSs, to shift away from poor relief completely. Family welfare agencies therefore refocused their missions on all families, regardless of socioeconomic class. Their range of services expanded to include adoption, care for unwed mothers, and marriage and family counseling, all designed to keep traditional family units intact.16

The Charity Organization Society in Indianapolis always hoped its “preventive philanthropy” would someday put it out of business. “It is better to put forth determined effort toward the prevention of crime and want,” it stated, “than to … carry on charity organizations to care for the indigent.”17 The COS did put itself out of business, albeit not the way it had in mind. From the perspective of today’s welfare state, COSs represented all philanthropic failure writ large: amateurism, insufficiency, particularism, and paternalism. Some scholars argue that charity organization societies made no contributions at all, or, if they did, those

17 1896 Annual Report, Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis, FSA Records, Box 4, Folder 7.
contributions were negative. COSs did make contributions, many of them positive, and organized charity principles clearly exist today in philanthropy and in public policy. Charitable and government agencies investigate clients, collect data, analyze neighborhood, impose counseling, require welfare-to-work programs, and even operate community gardens. Social service organizations screen their applicants in some way, have criteria for assistance, and strive to help poor people become self-sufficient. All philanthropic and public social welfare agencies have finite resources and accordingly must make difficult decisions each day about who they serve and how best to serve them.

Some of the reasons that led to organized charity continue to haunt society. Questions arise about how the underserved can navigate a plethora of complex systems. People live without food, clothing, shelter, and healthcare, and don’t have access to other basic services. Duplication of services still exists. Charities compete for finite resources. We still debate publically over how to provide for citizens equitably and laud self-reliance. We cannot deny, therefore, the organized charity movement’s legacy in social welfare practice.

This project contributes to the scholarship of social welfare policy, in particular the understanding of the charity organization society movement, in several ways. COSs represented neither a sinister agenda nor the best system to eradicate poverty. Motives of COS trustees, donors, staff, and volunteers included civic pride, humanitarian compassion, religious duty, desire for social justice, fear of change, fear of dependence, privilege, paternalism, arrogance, and the need for recognition – a mixture far too complex and fluid to ascribe to a single motive.
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This study demonstrates that organized charity did not create a single response to poverty, but a series of incremental responses that evolved over more than four decades. The screening of the so-called worthy from unworthy did not dominate the COS practice, although it could appear so with only a cursory review and especially during the founding phase. Charitable actors continuously evaluated their data, were willing to learn from it, and created new and different strategies as conditions changed and as the data directed them.

The scholarly debate over the usefulness of social control theory is now well-traveled ground. As Linda Gordon points out in her study of family violence, for example, some clients were active in arguing for what they wanted. When they did not receive what they wanted, pressure from clients affected agencies' behavior.\(^{18}\) Eric Monkkonen notes that some efforts to regulate and protect can be viewed as fair and just forms of social control, not always as oppressive.\(^{19}\) At this time in social welfare policy history, there is no question that those in control of philanthropy, government, and business determined the charitable agenda in the city. But some COS clients argued for what they wanted. Clients advocated for assistance beyond what the COS offered, including programs for specialized clients or with benefits other than traditional poor relief. Precisely because we can now understand tremendous change within the COS’s theory and practice over four decades, the binary of evil or good falls short. As Walter Trattner concludes, human affairs are

too disordered and diverse to permit facile generalization. Trattner’s finding is especially apropos for COSs and this time period because of the persistent characterization that has lingered over organized charity.

In Indianapolis, moreover, the scientific philanthropy movement did not represent an enormous leap from neighborhood benevolence. The Indianapolis Benevolent Society had carried out its own version of screening the poor, district assignments, data analysis, home visitation, and counseling. Because the basis of organized charity was already in place in the city, the migration to a formal COS happened quickly. More research is necessary to determine what elements of scientific philanthropy were already in place as COSs formed in other cities.

The women of Indianapolis exhibited more agency in their charitable work than is commonly understood during the organized charity movement. Women, and especially women of means, stayed abreast of issues in philanthropy through their social networks. Dozens of women participated as friendly visitors and several women worked on the COS staff. Many more women, however, created their own charitable agencies, and then funded, governed, staffed, publicized, advocated and volunteered for them. Women preferred control over their own charitable missions and activities versus participating in a more circumscribed fashion for the COS. In the city of Indianapolis, women’s participation in organized charity complemented men’s roles in governing the Charity Organization Society. Viewing women’s benevolent work during this time any other way perpetuates their secondary position as auxiliary to or subordinate to men’s work.

Every study has its limitations. Like many studies of social welfare policy in this time period, clients' voices were difficult to hear. Although thousands of case records survive, it was case workers or investigators who recorded the encounters between applicant and charity worker. Even when noted as direct quotes, we know of the vast majority of clients’ thoughts and feelings through the prism of the charity worker. As such the records are imperfect substitutes for clients’ actual views. This study, as do similar studies, interprets institutional data, such as numbers of services provided, as a proxy for what clients needed. Because the COS served thousands of people over four decades, we can plausibly conclude that it offered what many needed.

Philanthropy is one of the primary, universal responses to the myriad of inevitable, yet tragic, conditions that may befall human beings. How philanthropic actors respond necessarily depends on the historical, religious, political, and economic milieu in which they live, the human and financial resources at their disposal, and the social and cultural norms that guide their theory and practice. The Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis and its actors responded to city-wide poverty, the proliferation of charities, rapidly changing economic conditions, and the infusion of science into American popular thought. The men and women of Indianapolis responded to the organized charity movement by implementing a new strategy that they expected would harness giving and volunteering, bring an end to misery, and ensure that their city would be an ideal place for everyone who chose to live there.
Epilogue

The circle remains an enduring image that represents philanthropy surrounding a person in need. Minister H.A. Cleveland in 1889 had described “the true idea and object of the COS – to draw around the poor … a circle of sympathy, affection, intelligent though resolute will.”¹ Philanthropy, business, and government continue to partner in developing and delivering assistance of many types to the underserved and underrepresented in society.

Today the nonprofit organization, Circles USA, hopes to inspire and equip families and communities to resolve poverty – permanently. Its strategy is reminiscent of charity organization societies. Circles USA integrates individuals, organizations, communities, and government to raise people out of poverty. The circle’s center, the Circle Leader, is that person or family in need.

Even the friendly visitor still works among us. Circle leaders are paired with trained middle-to-high-income community volunteers, called Allies, who support their efforts to achieve economic stability.² Whether called friendly visitor, Lady Bountiful, Lord Bountiful, or Ally, the concept is one and the same: to make individual connections, to instill value systems, to be an agent of social justice, and to lead people on the path out of poverty. Many people still work tirelessly not to alleviate the ravages of poverty, but to end poverty in their lifetimes. We hope someday they will succeed.

¹ Ten Minute Talks on Phases of Charity delivered at the Fifty-Third Anniversary of the IBS, Dec 1, 1889, Box 5, Folder 6, FSA Records.
² http://www.circlesusa.org/
Explanatory Notes to Appendices

Appendices 1, 2, and 3 are compiled from a plethora of primary and secondary sources, including but not limited to: manuscript collections; newspapers; periodicals; the ISL Biographical Index; cemetery records; Cottman, *Historical Scrapbook*; Dunn, *History of Indianapolis*; Sulgrove, *History of Indianapolis*; and Bodenhamer and Barrows, *Encyclopedia of Indianapolis*.

Appendix 1 attempts to capture major events in the history of the U.S., Indiana, and Indianapolis that pertain directly to the development of philanthropy in the city. National philanthropic events and other types of local events are depicted side-by-side to demonstrate how the philanthropic response in Indianapolis may have followed a national event or trend or local political event.

Appendices 2 and 3 include biographical details of men and women who were involved in philanthropy in Indianapolis during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The structures of these two appendices are not parallel. Men’s professions and businesses appear in detail in Appendix 2 as they explain networks with other men and sources of wealth and connections that contributed to their philanthropy and community service. Women’s professions, the exception rather than the rule, are referenced in Appendix 3 with their philanthropy and community service. In most cases, the women professionals in this study worked in the field of philanthropy. Husbands’ names are included not to reinforce women’s subordinate status but to underscore the women’s connections to the COS through marriage and the importance of networks that included both men and women.
## Appendix 1
Timeline of History and Philanthropy in Indianapolis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Local Historic Event/National Philanthropic Event</th>
<th>Local Philanthropic Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Indiana Statehood; American Bible Society founded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Indianapolis becomes state capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis Sabbath School Union forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>Indiana State Library established; American Tract Society founded</td>
<td>Marion County Bible Society (a/k/a Indianapolis Bible Society) and Indianapolis Tract Society form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Marion County Farm (Poor Asylum) opens</td>
<td>Indiana Historical Society forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td></td>
<td>James Blake and Calvin Fletcher form Indianapolis Benevolent Society (IBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Indiana State Asylum for Deaf and Dumb opens; Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor of New York City founded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Marion County Library forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Poor Asylum enlarged</td>
<td>Dorothea Dix tours Indiana poorhouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Madison and Indianapolis Railroad arrives; Indiana State School for the Blind opens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Indiana State Hospital for the Insane opens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>U.S. YMCA movement begins in Boston</td>
<td>IBS members form Widows and Orphans Friends’ Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indenture law passes allowing dependent children to be “bound out” as apprentices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Elberfeld, Germany adopts social welfare system in which citizens act as volunteer “poor guardians,” forerunner to organized charity movement; Charles Loring Brace institutes New York Children’s Aid Society orphan trains</td>
<td>Indiana receives 1,326 orphans from New York (1853-1865), more than any other state in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>President Franklin Pierce vetoes Dorothea Dix’s bill to provide federal land for mental hospitals</td>
<td>First Indianapolis YMCA branch opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Local Historic Event/ National Philanthropic Event</td>
<td>Local Philanthropic Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northwestern Christian University (Butler University) opens; Widows’ and Orphans’ Asylum (first orphanage building) opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Economic Depression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>U.S. YWCA movement begins in New York City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hebrew Ladies Benevolent Society forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>American Civil War; U.S. Sanitary Commission, with 7,000 branches, provides war relief to Union soldiers</td>
<td>Sanitary Commission of Indiana collects and distributes $600,000 worth of goods and $4.6 million worth of relief to soldiers; Crown Hill Cemetery established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>American Social Science Association forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Indianapolis City Hospital opens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Marion County permits county taxes to subsidize private orphanages; Indiana House of Refuge for Juvenile Offenders opens; Indiana Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Orphans Home opens</td>
<td>German Protestant Orphan Home opens; YMCA establishes Home for Friendless Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869-1873</td>
<td>Schuyler Colfax (R) U.S. Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>London, England Charity Organization Society forms</td>
<td>Widows’ and Orphans’ Asylum expands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Poor Asylum enlarges to four-story building; International YMCA holds annual conference in Indianapolis</td>
<td>Bobbs’ Free Dispensary established; Indianapolis Asylum for Friendless Colored Children opens; First Indianapolis YWCA branch forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873-1877</td>
<td>Economic Depression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis Public Library and Reading Room open (part of Indianapolis public school system); Little Sisters of the Poor open the Home for the Aged Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>National Conference of Charities and Correction forms; Women’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) forms</td>
<td>Indiana WCTU forms, governor’s wife Zerelda Wallace president; Marion County WCTU forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis Woman's Club forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis Flower Mission forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Buffalo Charity Organization Society forms, adopts Elberfeld model</td>
<td>Indianapolis Literary Club forms (men’s club); Matinee Musicale forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science Association of Indiana (SSA) forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Local Historic Event/ National Philanthropic Event</td>
<td>Local Philanthropic Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>City Dispensary opens</td>
<td>IBS hires first paid general secretary; Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis (COS) forms, subsumes IBS, and establishes Confidential Exchange, Oscar McCulloch president; Flower Mission opens News Boys’ Lodging House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>U.S. Salvation Army movement begins in New York City; English’s Hotel and Opera House opens on Monument Circle; National Woman Suffrage Association holds annual conference in Indianapolis</td>
<td>COS opens Friendly Inn &amp; Wood Yard and establishes corps of Friendly Visitors; First Indianapolis Salvation Army branch opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>“Gas Boom” (natural gas discovery in east-central Indiana)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>American Association for the Red Cross forms</td>
<td>COS investigates Marion County Poorhouse; St. Vincent Infirmary (Hospital) opens; Indianapolis Auxiliary of SSA forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882-1888</td>
<td>Benjamin Harrison (R) U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Charity Organization Society of New York forms; Reverend Stephen Humphreys Gurteen publishes <em>A Handbook of Charity Organization</em></td>
<td>COS closes “wine rooms;” Indianapolis Free Kindergarten and Children’s Aid Society forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Marion County workhouse opens; Indiana General Assembly approves three additional state mental hospitals, Indianapolis hospital renamed Central State Hospital</td>
<td>Art Association of Indianapolis forms and holds its first exhibit; Flower Mission Training School for Nurses forms at City Hospital; Alpha Home for aged black women opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>New York COS’s Josephine Shaw Lowell publishes <em>Public Relief and Private Charity</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Thomas A. Hendricks (D) U.S. Vice President</td>
<td>COS establishes free baths; Fortnightly Literary Club forms (women’s club), Cornelia Fairbanks president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Stanton Coit opens University Settlement, the first U.S. settlement house</td>
<td>Meridian Union WCTU forms; German Ladies Aid Society forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td></td>
<td>COS forms Dime Savings &amp; Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Indiana Statehouse completed</td>
<td>Oscar McCulloch publishes <em>The Tribe of Ishmael</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Local Historic Event/ National Philanthropic Event</td>
<td>Local Philanthropic Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr open Hull House settlement in Chicago; Andrew Carnegie publishes “Wealth”; Mary Richmond joins Baltimore COS</td>
<td>Indiana Board of State Charities forms, Alexander Johnson (from Chicago COS) appointed Secretary; Board of Children’s Guardians Law passes; St. Vincent Hospital opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-1893</td>
<td>Benjamin Harrison (R) U.S. President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-1892</td>
<td>Caroline Harrison President General, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Colonel Eli Lilly and William Fortune form Indianapolis Commercial Club; General Federation of Women’s Clubs forms</td>
<td>Indiana State Conference of Charities and Correction forms and holds first annual conference; COS opens Fresh Air Summer Mission for Sick Children; COS begins formal lecture series for staff and volunteers; Indiana Union of Literary Clubs forms; Propylaeum opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>NCCC holds annual conference in Indianapolis, Oscar McCulloch serves as NCCC president; Indianapolis City Charter revised</td>
<td>Oscar McCulloch dies – Hugh Hanna assumes COS presidency, Charles F. Grout appointed general secretary; COS establishes home libraries in tenement districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis Local Council of Women forms; Mayer Chapel settlement opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893-1896</td>
<td>Economic Depression; Indianapolis National Bank Failure</td>
<td>Commercial Club, COS, and city government form relief committee to coordinate relief, food bank, and work programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago; E.B. Martindale member of the exposition’s Board of Control and Buildings and Grounds Committee; International YMCA holds annual conference in Indianapolis</td>
<td>John H. Holliday assumes COS presidency; Indiana Board of State Charities appoints Ernest Bicknell Secretary; Women form Indianapolis Sanitary Association/Society; WCTU opens Door of Hope (Wheeler Mission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Amos G. Warner publishes <em>American Charities</em>; First Federal Income Tax Law enacted</td>
<td>First wing of Das Deutsche Haus (Athenaeum) opens as German cultural and social center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td></td>
<td>First Indianapolis YWCA branch forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Local Historic Event/ National Philanthropic Event</td>
<td>Local Philanthropic Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Volunteers of America movement begins in New York City</td>
<td>Indianapolis Volunteers of America branch opens; National Council of Jewish Women Indianapolis branch forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>National Congress of Mothers forms (Parent Teacher Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897-1899</td>
<td>Indiana Poor Laws revised, adopting many COS principles; Children in poorhouses now prohibited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897-1905</td>
<td>Charles W. Fairbanks (R) U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Spanish-American War; New York School of Philanthropy (Columbia University School of Social Work) opens</td>
<td>Church Women United in Indianapolis forms; Flanner Guild (Flanner House) settlement opens; Indiana Board of State Charities appoints Amos W. Butler Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Mary Richmond publishes <em>Friendly Visiting among the Poor</em></td>
<td>COS establishes Vacant Lots Cultivation (community gardens) program; Methodist Hospital and Protestant Deaconess Hospital open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Theodore Dreiser publishes <em>Sister Carrie</em></td>
<td>Indianapolis Woman's Club hosts Jacob Riis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>Cornelia Fairbanks President General, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Indiana Soldiers and Sailors Monument on Monument Circle dedicated</td>
<td>Florence Kelley lecture tour in Indianapolis; South Side Hebrew Ladies Charity Organization forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Indiana juvenile court established (Indiana is the third state in the U.S., after Illinois and Colorado, to create a juvenile court)</td>
<td>COS, Boys' Club, YMCA, and churches support juvenile court with 300 volunteer probation officers; Women's Improvement Club (for black women) forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Louisiana Purchase Exposition in Chicago</td>
<td>Jewish Welfare Federation forms; Nathan Morris House (Jewish settlement) opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching established</td>
<td>Children’s Aid Association (Children’s Bureau) forms; College Settlement/Christamore House opens; Indianapolis Humane Society forms; Jewish Welfare Federation forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Local Historic Event/ National Philanthropic Event</td>
<td>Local Philanthropic Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-1909</td>
<td>Charles W. Fairbanks (R) U.S. Vice President</td>
<td>COS manages unemployment relief program, establishes Fairview Settlement and Mothers’ Aid Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Economic Depression; Indiana passes pure food and drug law; Indiana passes first sterilization law; Russell Sage Foundation established; Indiana University School of Medicine subsumes all private medical colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908-1915</td>
<td>George Kessler serves as landscape architect for Indianapolis Board of Park Commissioners, institutes plan of parks, bridges, and boulevards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>First White House Conference on the Care of Dependent Children – Six delegates (out of 150) from Indiana attend, including Amos W. Butler, Monsignor Francis Gavisk, and Alexander Johnson; Indianapolis Motor Speedway opens</td>
<td>COS creates Auxiliary Committee for Volunteer Service; Board of State Charities licenses all children’s institutions and boarding homes; Foreign House/Immigrant Aid Society/American Settlement opens, John Holliday president; Indianapolis Federation of Parent-Teacher Associations forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Indiana passes child labor law; YWCA holds national convention in Indianapolis; Illinois passes first mothers’ pension law; National Association for Societies of Organizing Charities (NASOC) forms; Carnegie Corporation of New York established</td>
<td>Social Service Department at Indiana University (School of Social Work) opens at City Dispensary; Evaline Holliday president of Church Women United in Indianapolis; Senate Avenue YMCA for black members opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>U.S. Children’s Bureau established; NASOC becomes American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity (AASOC)</td>
<td>COS establishes Legal Aid Bureau; Training School for Social Service Workers at COS opens with 30 students; Luella McWhirter founds Woman's Department Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>The Great Flood in Indianapolis affects 4,000 residents; Indiana passes tenement law; Economic Depression; Rockefeller Foundation established; Second Income Tax Law enacted</td>
<td>Indianapolis General Relief Committee for Flood Sufferers forms – city government, business, and philanthropy all participate; Woman’s Press Club of Indiana forms; Florence Crittenden Home opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913-1921</td>
<td>Thomas R. Marshall (D) U.S. Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Local Historic Event/ National Philanthropic Event</td>
<td>Local Philanthropic Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-18</td>
<td>World War I; American (National) Red Cross raises $400,000,000; Fundraising develops as a legitimate profession</td>
<td>War Chest forms; 4,000 Indianapolis citizens volunteer to support the war effort; Indianapolis chapter raises over $1,000,000; Directors include John Holliday (Treasurer), Charles F. Coffin, and other COS members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Cleveland Foundation, the first community foundation, forms</td>
<td>Robert W. Long Hospital for the poor opens as an Indiana University Hospital; Indianapolis Council of Boy Scouts forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Abraham Flexner’s NCCC speech “Is Social Work a Profession?”; Booth Tarkington publishes The Turmoil, based on two Indianapolis families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Indiana Statehood Centennial; NCCC holds annual conference in Indianapolis, Monsignor Francis Gavisk serves as NCCC president</td>
<td>Charles Grout resigns, COS recruits Eugene Foster as general secretary; American Red Cross branch established; John Frenzel, John Holliday, and Evans Woollen form Indianapolis Foundation; John and Evaline Holliday bequest summer estate to city as public park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>United States enters World War I; Mary Richmond publishes Social Diagnosis; NCCC becomes National Conference of Social Work; Third Income Tax Law enacted; Rosenwald Fund established</td>
<td>IU Social Service Department establishes Ladies’ Advisory Board; First Indianapolis Girl Scout troop forms; Woman’s Franchise League of Indiana relocates from Terre Haute to Indianapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Influenza epidemic; Booth Tarkington publishes The Magnificent Ambersons, based on social change in Indianapolis – receives Pulitzer Prize and honorary Doctor of Literature degree from Princeton University; Indiana holds state conference on child welfare in Indianapolis</td>
<td>COS, CAA, and Indianapolis News’ Cheeryvale camp consolidate summer work, including Summer Mission for Sick Children, under CAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Local Historic Event/ National Philanthropic Event</td>
<td>Local Philanthropic Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Indiana is the last Midwestern state to pass mothers’ pension law; AASOC becomes American Association for Organizing Family Social Work</td>
<td>John Holliday retires from COS, Evans Woolen assumes COS presidency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>19th Amendment to U.S. Constitution grants women’s suffrage</td>
<td>Community Chest forms, subsumes War Chest, and Charles F. Coffin chairs $1,000,000 fundraising campaign; Woman’s Franchise League of Indiana (Indianapolis Branch) becomes Indianapolis League of Women Voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Sheppard-Towner Maternity and Infancy Act passes to provide federal funding for maternal and child care</td>
<td>Family Service and Relief Corporation consolidates small Jewish societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Sinclair Lewis publishes <em>Babbitt</em>; Frank Dekker Watson of Philadelphia COS publishes <em>The Charity Organization Movement in the United States</em></td>
<td>COS, IBS, Children’s Aid Association, and Mothers’ Aid Society merge to form the Family Welfare Society (FWS), recruits Paul Benjamin as general secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2
Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis Charter Members (1879)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Philanthropy &amp; Community Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August Bessonies</td>
<td>Pastor, St. John’s Catholic Church</td>
<td>Donated land for Catholic cemetery, St. John's Academy, Catholic Orphans’ Asylum, House of the Good Shepherd, Home for the Aged, Society of St. Vincent de Paul, St. Vincent’s Infirmary; temperance advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silas T. Bowen</td>
<td>Professor; Superintendent of Public Schools; President, Bowen-Merrill Co.</td>
<td>Trustee, Third Presbyterian Church; Trustee, YMCA; President, Indianapolis Board of Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Augustus Bradley</td>
<td>Rector, (Episcopal) Christ Church 1872-1888 – moved to Brooklyn, NY parish</td>
<td>Literary Club (Indianapolis); built St. Luke’s chapel, church, and Sunday school buildings in Brooklyn; Trustee, General Theological Seminary (New York City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin H. Brown</td>
<td>Newspaper editor and owner, <em>Indiana State Sentinel</em>; Editor, <em>Daily Journal</em>; Marion County Auditor; Marion County Clerk; President, Board of Public Improvement; Director, Indianapolis Practical Business, Military, and Lecture College; Member, Indianapolis Common Council; Lawyer; co-authored law to create Indianapolis School Board</td>
<td>Literary Club; Scottish Rite; Children of the American Revolution; Lecturer, Order of Lincoln; Trustee, Indianapolis School Board (chaired committees on teacher appointments, high school, and public library); Co-author, <em>The City of Indianapolis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. Browning</td>
<td>Partner, Browning &amp; Sloan Druggists; Director, First National Bank</td>
<td>Elder and Trustee, Second Presbyterian Church; Trustee, Crown Hill Cemetery; Trustee, Indianapolis School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Franklin Coffin</td>
<td>Lawyer (Howe &amp; Coffin); Dean of DePauw Law School; founder and general counsel, State Life Insurance Co.</td>
<td>Society of Friends; Literary Club; Century Club; Trustee, Indiana House of Refuge for Juvenile Offenders; Indiana Interdenominational Sunday School Association; Board of Managers, Methodist Board of Education for Negroes; President, Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Philanthropy &amp; Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John T. Dye 1835-1913</td>
<td>Lawyer; Judge, Marion Civil Circuit Court; General Counsel, Big Four Railroad; Editor Indianapolis Journal; author</td>
<td>Literary Club; President, Indianapolis Bar Association; advocate for black education at Berea College, Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton Alphonso Fletcher, Jr. 1831-1895</td>
<td>Member, Indianapolis Common Council; Partner, Fletcher &amp; Churchman Bank/Fletcher &amp; Sharpe's Bank; Director, Indianapolis National Bank; Co-founder, Atlas Engine Works; President, Indiana Gas Company</td>
<td>Trustee, Plymouth Congregational Church; Trustee and President, Crown Hill Cemetery; donated land for Church of the Holy Innocents; Member, Indiana Board of State Charities; Trustee and President, Indiana Reformatory for Women and Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gibson 1827-1883</td>
<td>Owner, Gibson Flour Mills; Owner, Acme-Evans Milling Co.; President, LaCroix Middling Purifier Co.; Member, Indianapolis Common Council</td>
<td>Second Presbyterian Church; Indianapolis Commercial Exchange; President, Indianapolis Board of Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrus Cooke Hines 1830-1901</td>
<td>Lawyer (Harrison, Hines &amp; Miller), Circuit Court Judge</td>
<td>President, Literary Club; Trustee, Indianapolis Bar Association; Trustee, Indianapolis School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hampden Holliday 1846-1921</td>
<td>Founder and editor <em>Indianapolis News</em>; Founder, President, and Chairman, Union Trust Company; Founder and editor, <em>Indianapolis Press</em>; Director, Consumers Gas Trust Co. (Citizens Gas Co.)</td>
<td>Elder, Trustee, and Sunday School Superintendent, First Presbyterian Church; President, Literary Club; Art Association; University Club, Trustee, Crown Hill Cemetery; IBS; President, COS; Member, Indiana Board of State Charities; Commercial Club; Grand Army of the Republic; President, Immigrants’ Aid Association; Director, Union State Hospital Association; Treasurer, WWI Red Cross; Marion County Council of Defense during WWI; President, Hanover College; Trustee, McCormick Theological Seminary; Co-founder, President, Society of Indiana Pioneers; Founder, Indianapolis Public Welfare Loan Association; President, Indianapolis Board of Trade; co-founder, Indianapolis Foundation; Donor, Holliday Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Philanthropy &amp; Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Henry Jameson 1824-1910</td>
<td>Physician; Head Surgeon, Camp Morton (Civil War); Commissioner, Indiana Hospital for the Insane; President, State Board of Benevolent Institutions; Member, Indianapolis Common Council; Author</td>
<td>Disciples of Christ; Co-Founder and President, Indiana State Medical Society; Co-Founder and President, Indianapolis Academy of Medicine; Trustee, Crown Hill Cemetery; President, Northwestern Christian University (Butler University); advocate for mentally ill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M. Antle Judah 1848-1936 (son-in-law of Patrick Henry Jameson)</td>
<td>Lawyer (Judah &amp; Jameson); partner in Caldwell and Judah cotton growers in Memphis</td>
<td>President, Literary Club; Trustee, Northwestern Christian University (Butler University); Art Association; Das Deutsche Haus (Athenaeum); Treasurer, Indianapolis Bar Association; Chair, Marion County Council of Defense during WWI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry H. Lee 1837-1919</td>
<td>Owner, Henry Teas &amp; Coffees</td>
<td>Commercial Club, civic booster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Eli Lilly 1838-1898</td>
<td>Founder, Eli Lilly &amp; Company; Director, Consumers Gas Trust Co. (Citizens Gas Co.)</td>
<td>Founder, Commercial Club of Indianapolis; major donor to Soldiers and Sailors Monument; major donor/founder, Eleanor [Children’s] Hospital; Trustee, Indiana Central College (University of Indianapolis); Art Association; Columbia Club; trustee, relief funds after 1890 downtown fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Carleton McCulloch 1843-1891</td>
<td>Minister, Plymouth Congregational Church (1877-1891)</td>
<td>President, Literary Club; Trustee, Indianapolis School Board; Advisory Board, Indianapolis Public Library; Trustee, Home Missionary Society of Indiana; President, IBS 1879-1891; President, COS 1879-1891; Commercial Club; Member, Indiana Board of State Charities; Member, New York State Charities Aid Association; Officer, NCCC 1886-1890; President, NCCC 1891;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph John Mills 1848-1928</td>
<td>Minister, Society of Friends; President, Earlham College 1884-1903 – expanded student body, faculty, and facilities</td>
<td>Society of Friends; Organizer and General Secretary, Five Years Meeting of the Friends of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Philanthropy &amp; Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael O’Connor 1838-1916</td>
<td>O’Connor &amp; Company Wholesale Grocer; President, Capital National Bank; President, Marion Trust Company</td>
<td>Major donor, Saints Peter and Paul Cathedral; Major donor, Church of the Assumption; Trustee, relief funds after 1890 downtown fire; Indianapolis Board of Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick A. Ostermeyer 1827-1901</td>
<td>Owner, Severin Ostermeyer &amp; Co. Wholesale Grocer; Indiana congressman; Board of County Commissioners (advocated for Marion County Work House); Trustee, State Savings Bank; President, German Mutual Fire Insurance Company</td>
<td>President and Trustee, Trinity German Lutheran Church; Major donor to establish four additional Lutheran churches; Trustee, German Orphans’ Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton Judkins Peelle 1843-1928 (moved to Washington DC in 1892)</td>
<td>Lawyer; U.S. Congressman; Chief Justice, U.S. Court of Claims; Professor of Law, George Washington University</td>
<td>Trustee, Howard University; Trustee, Washington College of Law; Advisory Board, YMCA (Washington DC); Cosmos Club (Washington DC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myron Winslow Reed 1830-1899</td>
<td>Minister, First Presbyterian Church 1877-1884 – moved to Denver</td>
<td>President, Literary Club; Trustee, Indianapolis School Board; Grand Army of the Republic; Loyal Legion; advocate for poor citizens and organized labor; President, NCCC 1892 upon McCulloch’s death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abram Crum Shortridge 1833-1919</td>
<td>Educator; Principal, Preparatory Department of Northwestern Christian University; Superintendent, Indianapolis Public Schools; Member, Indianapolis Common Council; co-authored law to create Indianapolis School Board; President, Purdue University</td>
<td>Trustee, Third Christian Church; Trustee, Northwestern Christian University (Butler University); Advocate for free public education for black citizens; co-founder, Indianapolis Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Davis Stevens</td>
<td>IBS/COS secretary 1879-1884; Itinerant Unitarian Minister (Perry, IA; Alton, IL; Moline, IL; Reading, MA; Sterling, MA; Walpole, MA; Whitman, MA; Menomonie, WI)</td>
<td>Social Gospel advocate; believed institutional churches “to be freely used for philanthropic purposes, lectures, concerts, and classes – places of worship and work open every day of the week”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Philanthropy &amp; Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Sumner Tarbell</td>
<td>Educator; textbook author; Superintendent, Public Instruction 1878-1884 – moved to Providence, RI</td>
<td>Literary Club (Indianapolis); opened first public school class to developmentally disabled children in Providence, RI; president, Methodist Social Union of Providence; Vice President, Rhode Island Bible Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavius Josephus Van Vorhis</td>
<td>Surgeon and lawyer; Assistant Surgeon, 86th Indiana Regiment (Civil War); Superintendent, City Hospital; Member, Indianapolis Common Council; Indiana senator; drafted bill to create State Board of Health – “Father of Health Legislation”</td>
<td>Member and donor, People’s Church of Indianapolis; Grand Army of the Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William John Wallace</td>
<td>Lawyer; First Republican mayor 1857-1858; City Attorney; Member, Indianapolis Common Council; Marion County Clerk; Director, Indianapolis Street Railroad Company; Director, Indianapolis National Bank</td>
<td>Indiana Sanitary Commission (Civil War); Trustee, Crown Hill Cemetery; charter member Scottish Rite; Trustee, Oddfellows Mutual Aid Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Charles Webb</td>
<td>Unitarian/Universalist Minister Wesley Chapel (Meridian Street Church) 1877-1879 – moved to Philadelphia</td>
<td>American Bible Society; Evangelical Alliance of Philadelphia – “applied Gospel principle to social problems of the day,” advocate for associated charities, house-to-house visitation, tenement and sweat shop reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Watson Woollen</td>
<td>Lawyer; Marion County District Attorney; Author</td>
<td>First Presbyterian Church; Member and co-founder, Indianapolis Bar Association; Donated 44-acre garden to city; Indiana Audubon Society; Indiana Forestry Association; Indiana Academy of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Yandes</td>
<td>Lawyer (Fletcher, Butler &amp; Yandes), real estate developer</td>
<td>Trustee, Indianapolis School Board; major donor, Wabash College, First Presbyterian Church, Indiana Missionary Society, and foreign missionary societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Philanthropy &amp; Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elias Cornelius</td>
<td>Owner and president, E.C. Atkins manufacturer of saws and tools; Owner, Hecla Consolidated Mining Co. of Indianapolis; President, Manufacturers Natural Gas Co.</td>
<td>Trustee, First Baptist Church; Commercial Club, Columbia Club, Indianapolis Board of Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkins 1833-1901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman Bamberger</td>
<td>Owner, Herman Bamberger Hats, Caps and Furs</td>
<td>Trustee, Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation; Americus Club; Trustee, Cleveland Orphan Asylum; Board of Governors, Hebrew Union College; Trustee, Indianapolis School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837-1901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapin Clark</td>
<td>Officer, State Asylum for Deaf and Dumb; Owner, C.C. Foster &amp; Co. (lumber); president Indiana Lumbermen’s Mutual Insurance Co.</td>
<td>Elder, Treasurer, and Trustee, First Presbyterian Church; President, Indianapolis Board of Trade; President Indiana Manufacturers' Association; Grand Army of the Republic; Art Association; Columbia Club; Commercial Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster 1847-1916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Peter Frenzel</td>
<td>President and Director, Merchants National Bank; co-founder, Indiana Trust Co. and Western Savings &amp; Loan Association of Indianapolis; President, Indianapolis Street Railway Co.; Director, Indianapolis Brewing Co.; Director, Consumers Gas Trust Co. (Citizens Gas Co.); Marion County Treasurer; Delegate, 1896 National Democratic Convention</td>
<td>Indianapolis Männerchör; Major donor for new Männerchör Hall; Treasurer, North American Sängerbund; Commercial Club; University Club; Member, Board of Police Commissioners; Trustee, Indianapolis School Board; co-founder, Indianapolis Foundation; Treasurer, Anti-Prohibition League; Advisory Board, Indianapolis Teachers College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-1933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore P.</td>
<td>Finance chairman, Indianapolis Common Council; President and Director, Indianapolis National Bank – resigned amid 1893 bank failure scandal and imprisonment for embezzlement and fraud (charities were among those defrauded)</td>
<td>Member, Meridian Street Methodist Episcopal Church; Sunday school teacher; Trustee, Crown Hill Cemetery; Trustee, Asbury (DePauw) University; Trustee, YMCA; Treasurer, Odd-fellows Mutual Aid Association; Trustee, downtown fire relief funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haughey 1826-1914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Philanthropy &amp; Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Andrews Hendricks</td>
<td>Lawyer (Baker, Hord &amp; Hendricks); Commissioner, General Land Office; Indiana General Assembly; Indiana Governor; U.S. Representative; U.S. Senator; U.S. Vice President</td>
<td>Senior warden and major donor, St. Paul’s Episcopal Church; Literary Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819-1885 (cousin to Victor K. Hendricks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor K. Hendricks</td>
<td>Owner, Victor K. Hendricks &amp; Co.; partner Hendricks-Vance Co./Hendricks &amp; Cooper wholesale boots and shoes; Director, Marion Trust Co.</td>
<td>Fourth Presbyterian Church; Art Association; Contemporary Club; University Club; Indianapolis Board of Trade; Trustee, Crown Hill Cemetery; Director, Union State Hospital Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-1909 (cousin to Thomas Andrews Hendricks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William A. Krag</td>
<td>Partner, Schnull &amp; Krag’s Standard Coffee Co. Wholesale Grocers – moved to San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843-1909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lieber</td>
<td>Co-Owner, Lieber Brewery (Indianapolis Brewing Co.); co-founder, Consumers Gas Trust Co. (Citizens Gas Co.)</td>
<td>Grand Army of the Republic; Indianapolis Board of Trade; U.S. Consul to Dusseldorf, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834-ca.1910 (returned to Germany to retire)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles M. Martindale</td>
<td>Lawyer (Martindale &amp; Hughes); drafted bill to establish Marion County Board of Children’s Guardians; Editor, <em>Indianapolis Journal</em></td>
<td>Deacon, Elder, Trustee, and Sunday School Superintendent, First Presbyterian Church; Columbia Club; Contemporary Club; Dramatic Club; Literary Club; Marion Club; Rotary Club; VP, Navy League of Indianapolis; President, Indianapolis School Board; Trustee, Marion County Board of Children’s Guardians; Trustee, Crown Hill Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857-ca. 1930 (son of E.B. Martindale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah Bishop Martindale</td>
<td>Lawyer; Circuit Court Judge; Indiana State Senator; Editor, <em>Indianapolis Journal</em>; Real Estate Developer; Owner, Denison Hotel; member, Indianapolis Common Council; Director, Indianapolis Street Railroad Company; Director, Indianapolis Belt Railway Company; Director, American Central Life Insurance Co. of Indianapolis; President, Indianapolis Fire &amp; Marine Insurance Co.; President, Union Insurance Co.; Co-founder, Atlas Engine Works</td>
<td>Treasurer, Trustee, and Sunday School Superintendent, First Presbyterian Church; Trustee, Crown Hill Cemetery; Trustee, Indianapolis School Board; President, Indianapolis Board of Trade; Co-founder, German Protestant Orphans Asylum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828-1901 (father of Charles Martindale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Philanthropy &amp; Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walls Murphy</td>
<td>Partner, W.J. Holliday &amp; Co. (wholesale mill, mine, and industrial supplies); Co-founder, Consumers Gas Trust Co. (Citizens Gas Co.)</td>
<td>Vestryman, St. Paul’s Episcopal Church; Co-founder and president, Indianapolis Board of Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel N. Morris</td>
<td>Lawyer (Morris, Newberger &amp; Curtis)</td>
<td>Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation; Americus Club, Art Association, Columbia Club, Nathan Morris House (Jewish settlement house) named in his honor for his charity to the poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W. Sloan</td>
<td>Partner, Browning &amp; Sloan Druggists; physician</td>
<td>Vestryman, (Episcopal) Christ Church; President, American Pharmaceutical Association; co-founder Indiana State Pharmaceutical Society; Scottish Rite; Knight Templar of the York Right; Commercial Club; Grand Army of the Republic; volunteer fireman; Indianapolis Board of Trade; Trustee, Indianapolis School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur L. Wright</td>
<td>Owner, A.L. Wright &amp; Co. wholesale carpets and wall paper; Member, Indianapolis Common Council; Marion County Treasurer; Director, Belt Railroad; Director, First National Bank; Director, Industrial Life Association</td>
<td>Elder, Grace Methodist Episcopal Church; Indianapolis Board of Trade; President, American Wall-paper Manufacturers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bruce Wright</td>
<td>Lawyer; Director, Indiana, Bloomington and Western Railway Co.; Director, Industrial Life Association</td>
<td>Elder and Trustee, Second Presbyterian Church; President, Rail Road Men’s Christian Association (affiliate of YMCA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3
Indianapolis Women Philanthropic Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Husband’s Name</th>
<th>Woman’s Philanthropy &amp; Community Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Ann Blaker 1854-1926</td>
<td>Louis J. Blaker 1851-1913</td>
<td>Profession: Superintendent, Indianapolis Free Kindergarten. President, Indianapolis Teachers College; International Kindergarten Union; Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce; Board of Children’s Guardians; Indianapolis Orphans’ Home; Flanner House; Jewish Community Center; President, Indianapolis Council of Women; Chairman, Women’s Committee for the Relief of Flood Sufferers; Red Cross volunteer during WWI; Marion County Council of Defense during WWI; Trustee, COS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Giddings Julian Clarke 1865-1938</td>
<td>Charles B. Clarke Lawyer, Indiana State Senator</td>
<td>Profession: Journalist. Founder, Irvington Woman’s Club; Indianapolis Woman’s Club; President, Indiana Federation of Clubs; General Federation of Women’s Clubs; President, Indianapolis Local Council of Women; President, Legislative Council of Indiana Women; Woman's Franchise League of Indiana; Member, Marion County Board of Charities; Member, City Plan Commission; Red Cross volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Hays Eckhouse 1857-1941</td>
<td>Moses Eckhouse 1845-1899 Owner, Eckhouse Brothers wholesale liquor dealers</td>
<td>Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation; VP, Hebrew Ladies Benevolent Society; President, National Council Jewish Women, Indianapolis Section; National Director, National Council Jewish Women; National Council Jewish Women; Co-founder, Nathan Morris House; Treasurer, Jewish Foster Home; Board of Managers, Flower Mission; Children’s Aid Association; Eleanor Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrietta Elizabeth Ellinwood 1877-1957</td>
<td>Lyman Watson Ellinwood 1874-1919 General Manager, John Deere Plow Co.</td>
<td>President, Mothers’ Aid Society; General Relief Committee for Flood Sufferers; Woman Rotary Club; League of Women Voters; Social Workers Club; Trustee, Indianapolis Association for the Prevention and Relief of Heart Disease; Central Christian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelia Cole Fairbanks 1852-1913</td>
<td>Charles W. Fairbanks 1852-1918</td>
<td>Contemporary Club; Art Association; President General, National DAR; President, Fortnightly Literary Club; Indianapolis Local Council of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Elizabeth Barrows Fletcher 1833-1889</td>
<td>Stoughton A. Fletcher, Jr. (See Appendix 2)</td>
<td>Manager, Home for Friendless Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Husband’s Name</td>
<td>Woman’s Philanthropy &amp; Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriett McIntire</td>
<td>Chapin C. Foster (See Appendix 2)</td>
<td>First Presbyterian Church; Organizing Regent, Indiana DAR; Manager, Widows' &amp; Orphans' Friends Society; Board of Managers, Flower Mission; Contemporary Club; Indianapolis Woman's Club; Propylaean; Social Science Association; Free Kindergarten Society; Indiana Historical Society; Red Cross volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newell Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-1924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Thomas Fox</td>
<td>James E. Fox</td>
<td>Afro-American Council; Congress of Colored Women; National Association of Colored Women's Clubs; Founder, Woman's Improvement Club; Indiana State Federation of Colored Women's Clubs; Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Literary Society; Alpha Home Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-1917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia H. Wright Goodhart</td>
<td>Benjamin F. Goodhart 1834-1917 Fletcher Trust Co.</td>
<td>Plymouth Church; IBS; Executive Committee, COS; President, Indianapolis Bible Society; Flower Mission; Parlor Club; Free Kindergarten Society; President, Board of Children's Guardians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Chambers McKinney Graydon</td>
<td>Alexander Graydon III 1791-1868</td>
<td>Second Presbyterian Church; IBS; Indianapolis Bible Society; Civil War Nurse; Manager, Widows' &amp; Orphans' Friends Society; Manager, Home for Friendless Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802-1891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Sierra Merrill Graydon</td>
<td>William M. Graydon</td>
<td>President, Ladies Aid Society of Fourth Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833-1917 (sister of Catharine Merrill; mother of Julia Moores Graydon Jameson)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Taylor Wright Hadley</td>
<td>William Hadley 1823-1889 Taylor, Wright &amp; Hadley wholesale grocers</td>
<td>Society of Friends; Manager, Widows' &amp; Orphans' Friends Society; Manager, Home for Friendless Women; Manager, Bertha Ballard Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826-1898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Lavinia Scott Harrison</td>
<td>Benjamin Harrison 1833-1901</td>
<td>First Presbyterian Church; Ladies Sanitary Commission (Civil War); IBS; Manager, Widows' &amp; Orphans' Friends Society; Free Kindergarten Society; Manager, Home for Friendless Women; President General, DAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-1892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Moore Haughey</td>
<td>Theodore P. Haughey (See Appendix 2)</td>
<td>Meridian Street Methodist Episcopal Church; Manager, Home for Friendless Women; Indianapolis Woman's Club; Board of Managers, Flower Mission; Social Science Association; COS visitor; Indianapolis Local Council of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835-1911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Husband’s Name</th>
<th>Woman’s Philanthropy &amp; Community Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane Thomson Hendricks 1842-1923</td>
<td>Victor King Hendricks (See Appendix 2)</td>
<td>Art Association; DAR; Flower Mission; President, Indianapolis Woman’s Club; Contemporary Club; Propylaeum; Red Cross volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna Gertrude Henry 1874-1942</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>MA (1914), PhD (1917) Indiana University. Profession: Founder, Charity Organization Society of Anderson; Director, IU Social Service Department. Fortnightly Club; Mothers’ Aid Society; Treasurer, Marion County Tuberculosis Association; Indiana Council Charities and Correction; Indianapolis Council Social Agencies; American Association of Medical Social Workers; Indianapolis Community Fund; U.S. Surgeon General’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaline MacFarlane Rieman Holliday 1853-1929</td>
<td>John Hampden Holliday (See Appendix 2)</td>
<td>First Presbyterian Church; President, Church Women United; Art Association; Indianapolis Woman’s Club; Propylaeum; Manager, Widows’ &amp; Orphans’ Friends Society; DAR; Flower Mission; Board of Children’s Guardians; President, Free Kindergarten Society; Trustee, Indianapolis Teachers College; Trustee, Butler College Settlement Association (Christamore House); Society of Colonial Dames; Co-founder, Society of Indiana Pioneers; Over the Teacups Club; Red Cross volunteer; Indianapolis Advisory Committee of the Social Service Dept of Indiana University; Donor, land for Holliday Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Partridge Grosvenor Hufford 1845-1937</td>
<td>George W. Hufford Principal, Indianapolis High School</td>
<td>Plymouth Church; Indianapolis Woman’s Club; Free Kindergarten Society; Trustee, Indianapolis Teachers College; Social Science Association; Indianapolis Local Council of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Moores Graydon Jameson 1870-1935 (niece of Catharine Merrill; daughter of Mary Sierra Merrill Graydon)</td>
<td>Dr. Alexander Jameson -1934</td>
<td>Fairview Presbyterian Church; Catharine Merrill Club; Dramatic Club; Indianapolis Woman’s Club; Irvington Woman’s Club; Irvington Athenaeum; COS Friendly Visitor; Red Cross volunteer; Social Workers Club; Demia Butler Literary Society; Secretary, Bridgeport Nutrition Camp Committee of the Marion County Tuberculosis Association; Jameson Camp named in her honor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Butler Jameson 1831-1910 (daughter of Ovid Butler)</td>
<td>Dr. P.H. Jameson (See Appendix 2)</td>
<td>Disciples of Christ; President, Christian Woman’s Board of Missions; Manager, Home for Friendless Women; Contemporary Club; DAR; Fortnightly Literary Club; Monday Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Husband’s Name</td>
<td>Woman’s Philanthropy &amp; Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Sanders Jameson Judah 1851-1930 (daughter of Maria and P.H. Jameson)</td>
<td>John M. Judah (See Appendix 2)</td>
<td>Founder and President, Memphis Woman’s Club; Flower Mission; Art Association; Contemporary Club; Dramatic Club; Indianapolis Woman’s Club; Propylaeum; Indianapolis Suffrage Society; Woman’s Sanitary Association; Society of Colonial Dames; Red Cross volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha Greene Lockwood 1863-1914</td>
<td>Virgil Homer Lockwood 1860-1932</td>
<td>First Presbyterian Church; Art Association; Fortnightly Literary Club; Indianapolis Local Council of Women; Portfolio Club; Sketching Club; Woman’s Research Club; Secretary, Indiana Child Labor Committee; Woman’s Department Club; Director, Consumers’ League; Director, Children’s Bureau; Children’s Aid Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Nicholson McKay 1843-1934 (daughter Helen married Brandt Steele, son of artist T.C. Steele)</td>
<td>Horace McKay 1841-1914 Indianapolis Common Council</td>
<td>Plymouth Church; Co-founder, All Souls Unitarian Church (1909); Co-founder, Indianapolis Woman’s Club; Co-founder, Indianapolis Suffrage Society; College Corner Club; Indianapolis Public Library; Social Science Association; Indianapolis Local Council of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Louise Lodge McKee 1832- (son James R. married Mary S. Harrison, daughter of Benjamin Harrison)</td>
<td>Robert S. McKee 1823-1903 Partner, McKee &amp; Branham Shoe Co.; Director, Indiana National Bank</td>
<td>First Presbyterian Church; Co-founder, Woman’s Sanitary Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luella Frances Smith McWhirter 1859-1952</td>
<td>Felix Tony McWhirter 1853-1915 Founder, People’s Bank &amp; Trust Co.</td>
<td>Art Association; DAR; Present Day Club; Society of Colonial Wars; President, Indiana Women’s Christian Temperance Union; President, Indiana Federation of Clubs; Indianapolis Local Council of Women; President, Woman’s Department Club; VP, Indiana Dry Federation; VP, Woman’s Franchise League of Indiana; Woman’s Division Republican State Committee; Indiana Representative to National Congress of Mothers; Red Cross volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Husband’s Name</td>
<td>Woman’s Philanthropy &amp; Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine Merrill</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Profession: English Department, Butler College. Fourth Presbyterian Church; Civil War nurse; Home for Friendless Women; Indianapolis Woman’s Club; Catharine Merrill Club; Contemporary Club; Parlor Club; Social Science Association; Co-founder, Woman’s Sanitary Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth Presbyterian Church; Civil War nurse; Home for Friendless Women; Indianapolis Woman’s Club; Catharine Merrill Club; Contemporary Club; Parlor Club; Social Science Association; Co-founder, Woman’s Sanitary Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline T. McClung</td>
<td>George Merritt 1824-1912</td>
<td>Society of Friends; Contemporary Club; COS Vice President and Friendly Visitor; Free Kindergarten Society; President, Woman’s Sanitary Association; Women’s Industrial Association; Indianapolis Equal Suffrage Society; Indianapolis Local Council of Women; National Council of Women; donated land and initial buildings for Alpha Home for aged black women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merritt</td>
<td>George Merritt &amp; Co. woolen manufacturers;</td>
<td>Society of Friends; Contemporary Club; COS Vice President and Friendly Visitor; Free Kindergarten Society; President, Woman’s Sanitary Association; Women’s Industrial Association; Indianapolis Equal Suffrage Society; Indianapolis Local Council of Women; National Council of Women; donated land and initial buildings for Alpha Home for aged black women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831-1927</td>
<td>Director, Indiana National Bank; Executive</td>
<td>Society of Friends; Contemporary Club; COS Vice President and Friendly Visitor; Free Kindergarten Society; President, Woman’s Sanitary Association; Women’s Industrial Association; Indianapolis Equal Suffrage Society; Indianapolis Local Council of Women; National Council of Women; donated land and initial buildings for Alpha Home for aged black women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine Morris</td>
<td>John Irwin Morrison 1806-1882</td>
<td>Society of Friends; IBS; Manager, Widows’ &amp; Orphans’ Friends Society; Manager, Home for Friendless Women; Manager, Home for Friendless Colored Children; temperance advocate; Founder, Salem Female Seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison Morrison</td>
<td>State Senator; State Treasurer; Professor</td>
<td>Society of Friends; IBS; Manager, Widows’ &amp; Orphans’ Friends Society; Manager, Home for Friendless Women; Manager, Home for Friendless Colored Children; temperance advocate; Founder, Salem Female Seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812-?</td>
<td>and Trustee, Indiana University</td>
<td>Society of Friends; IBS; Manager, Widows’ &amp; Orphans’ Friends Society; Manager, Home for Friendless Women; Manager, Home for Friendless Colored Children; temperance advocate; Founder, Salem Female Seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet M. Noble</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Profession: English Department Chair, Butler College. Society of Indiana Pioneers; Catharine Merrill Club; Contemporary Club; Indianapolis Woman’s Club; Treasurer, Irvington Woman’s Club; Indianapolis Local Council of Women; Woman's Franchise League of Indiana; Woman's Division Republican State Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1919</td>
<td></td>
<td>Profession: English Department Chair, Butler College. Society of Indiana Pioneers; Catharine Merrill Club; Contemporary Club; Indianapolis Woman’s Club; Treasurer, Irvington Woman’s Club; Indianapolis Local Council of Women; Woman's Franchise League of Indiana; Woman's Division Republican State Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate F. Parker</td>
<td>Robert P. Parker -1879</td>
<td>Plymouth Congregational Church; COS Registrar; Flower Mission; Dime S&amp;L; Secretary, Board of Children’s Guardians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1924</td>
<td>Lawyer, Parker &amp; Elam</td>
<td>Plymouth Congregational Church; COS Registrar; Flower Mission; Dime S&amp;L; Secretary, Board of Children’s Guardians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Arabella Canfield Peelle</td>
<td>Stanton J. Peelle  (See Appendix 2)</td>
<td>President, Free Kindergarten Society; Indianapolis Woman’s Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-1915</td>
<td></td>
<td>President, Free Kindergarten Society; Indianapolis Woman’s Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(moved to Washington DC in 1892)</td>
<td></td>
<td>President, Free Kindergarten Society; Indianapolis Woman’s Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Husband’s Name</td>
<td>Woman’s Philanthropy &amp; Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Wright Sewall</td>
<td>Theodore Lovett Sewall</td>
<td>Founder, Girls’ Classical School; Co-founder, Indianapolis Woman’s Club; Art Association; Co-founder, Contemporary Club; Founder, Propylaeum; Co-founder, Indianapolis Equal Suffrage Society; Local Council of Women of Indianapolis; President, National Council of Women; International Council of Women; Western Association of Collegiate Alumnae; delegate on Henry Ford Peace Ship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-1920</td>
<td>1853-1895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Graydon Sharpe</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Flower Mission; DAR; Home for Friendless Women; Indiana Historical Society; Indianapolis Public Library; Art Association; Matinee Musicale; Portfolio Club; Robert Dale Owen Memorial Commission; Red Cross volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878-1935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Trueblood</td>
<td>James Trueblood Minister</td>
<td>Minister, Society of Friends; Indianapolis Bible Society; Manager, Home for Friendless Women; President, Home for Friendless Colored Children; VP, WCTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818-1891</td>
<td>Society of Friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drusilla Wilson</td>
<td>Jonathon Wilson 1809-1886</td>
<td>Society of Friends; President of Managers, Widows' &amp; Orphans' Friends Society; Manager, Home for Friendless Women; Trustee, Whites Manual Labor Institutes (Wabash, IN); Kansas State President, WCTU; Meridian Union WCTU; Founder, Friends Boarding Home for Girls (Bertha Ballard Home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815-1908</td>
<td>1871-1886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lived in Lawrence,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4
Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis Statistical Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifications</th>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class I: Cases worthy of relief</strong></td>
<td>Should have continuous relief, not indoor</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Orphans</td>
<td>Should have temporary relief, not indoor</td>
<td>Insufficient income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aged</td>
<td>Should have intermittent relief, not indoor</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incurable</td>
<td>Should have indoor relief</td>
<td>Desertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Temporary illness or accident</td>
<td>Not requiring relief</td>
<td>Old age, blind, deaf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Class II: Cases needing work rather than relief**

| - Out of work, able and willing | Persons refused aid | Stranded |
| - Insufficient work, able and willing to do more | Unworthy | Imprisonment |
| - By infirmity or family cares unfitted for all but special work | Not found, false address | |

**Class III: Cases not requiring, unworthy of, or not entitled to relief**

| - Owning property | Further investigation |
| - Having relations able to support | Should be disciplined |
| - Shiftless or improvident, permanently so | |
| - Vicious, permanently so | |
| - Prefer to live on alms | |
| - Confirmed inebriates | |
| - Tramps | |

Sources: Minute Books, BV 1170 and BV 1171; Annual Reports, Box 4 Folders 7 and 8; FSA Records
Appendix 5
Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis Circle of Charities, 1890

Source: Program, IBS Annual Meeting, December 1890, Box 5, Folder 7, FSA Records.

1. Charity Organization Society
2. Indianapolis Benevolent Society, “The Mother of Us All,” (Operates the Friendly Inn Wood Yard, the Free Baths, and the Industrial Committee)
3. Flower Mission
4. Flower Mission Training School for Nurses
5. Children's Aid Society and Free Kindergarten Association
6. Indianapolis Orphans' Asylum
7. Catholic Orphans' Asylum
8. German Protestant Orphans' Asylum
9. German Lutheran Orphans' Home
10. Home for Friendless Colored Children
11. Children’s Board of Guardians
12. Indiana Humane Society
13. Maternity Society
14. Summer Mission for Sick Children
15. Girls' Industrial School
16. WCTU Industrial Home for Young Girls
17. Students’ Industrial Union
18. Girls' Noon Rest
19. Working Girls Home
20. Home for Friendless Women
21. Alpha Home for Aged Colored Women
22. Home for the Aged Poor
23. Sisters of the Good Shepherd
24. German Ladies' Aid Society
25. Hebrew Ladies' Benevolent Society
26. Grand Army of the Republic Women’s Relief Corps
27. Society of St. Vincent De Paul
28. St. Vincent's Infirmary
29. City Hospital
30. City Dispensary
31. Bobb’s Free Dispensary
32. Township Trustee
33. Dime Savings & Loan Association
1879
“The Street Children of New York, Their Lodgings and Schools” – Emma Gear

1880
“Charities, Their Direction and Misdirection” – Sarah Wallace plus conversation led by Hannah Haughey
“Reforms in English Hospitals and Prisons, 1760-1838” – Evaline Holliday

1882
“The Charities of Today” – Mary Coburn plus conversation led by Jane T. Hendricks

1888
“Institutions for the Physically defective” – Mary Coburn Allen
“Institutions for the Mentally Defective” – Jane T. Hendricks
“Am I My Brother’s Keeper?” – Mary Stewart Carey

1890
“Herbert Spencer’s Sociology” – Anna Nicholas
“Herbert Spencer on Education” – Evaline Holliday
“American Philanthropy” – Mary B. Chislett

1891
“Working People’s Homes” – Mary A. R. Stuart
“Working Girls’ Clubs” – Alice C. McCulloch
“A Study in Heredity” – Anna Nicholas

1892
“The Children of our State” – Alice C. McCulloch
“Out-door Relief” – Hannah Haughey
“Development of Almsgiving” – Mary Newman Carey
“Conversation on Immigration” – Belle M. Sharpe

1896
“Child Saving” – Mary A. R. Stewart
“An Altruistic Experiment” – Eliza C. Bell
“Conversation on the Limits of Self-sacrifice” – Elizabeth M. Fletcher
1897
“Maud Ballington Booth” – Julia Graydon Jameson
“The Law of Service” – Margaret V. Marshall

1899
“Poverty” – Kate M. Bowles
“If I had a Million Dollars” – M. V. Marshall

1900
Twenty-fifth Anniversary – Lecture by Guest of Honor Jacob Riis

1902
Guest of Honor Miss Alice French (pseudonym Octave Thanet) – no title available

1903
“Functions of the State” – Marcia Hoagland
“My Neighbor” – Alice Runnels
“Modern Stewardship” – Evaline Holliday

1907 – Social Betterment Day
“Radical Experiments in Self-government” – Mary Allen Evans Woollen
“Indiana Pure Food Law” – M. Martindale

1910
“Professions for Women” – Merica Hoagland
“The Blazed Trail” – Harriet Noble

1911
“Poverty – A Crime” – Dr. Sarah S. Stockton (Central State Hospital)

1911 – Guest Day, Our Philanthropies:
“The City Charities” – Mr. Grout (Charity Organization Society)
“The County Institutions” – Alice Runnels
“The State Board of Charities – Mr. Demarchus C. Brown

1912
“Comparative Philanthropy – Corinne Goddard

1912 – Guest Day
“The Spirit of Modern Science – Dr. Charles P Emerson (Indiana University)

1914
“Eight Hours for Work” – Merica Hoagland
“Child Labor, a Phase of Child Life – Frances MacIntire Ross
Appendix 7  
Indianapolis Population by Decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>8,091</td>
<td>200.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>18,611</td>
<td>130.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>48,244</td>
<td>159.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>75,056</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>105,436</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>169,164</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>233,650</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>314,194</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>364,161</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>386,972</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>427,173</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>476,258</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>744,624*</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>700,807</td>
<td>−5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>731,327</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>781,926</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>829,718</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The creation of Unigov in 1970 consolidated separate legislative units within Marion County into the Consolidated City of Indianapolis.
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