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CHAPTER I

LOST WOMEN IN SOCIOLOGY

Introduction

Progressivism and feminism were intertwined as social movements. (Nancy Dye, 1991, p. 8)

Some differences are playful; some are poles of world historical systems of domination. Epistemology is about knowing the difference. (Donna Haraway, 1990, pp. 202-203)

The history of women and social change has long been "ignored, misrepresented, or repressed" because politics and social protest have traditionally been interpreted almost exclusively from the masculine perspective (West & Blumberg, 1990, p. 4). Now, however, there is an emerging feminist analysis of social reform and protest which has led to new theoretical and methodological approaches to the issue. The inclusion of formerly hidden women into the political analysis of social change illustrates the feminist contention that the personal is political and the political is personal.

Using the archival data of Unitarian minister and Progressive Era reformer, Caroline Bartlett Crane, (1858-1935), this study investigates the relationship between Progressive era (1890-1920) social reform and the origins of American sociology with a view to the vital contributions of women in these endeavors. Until recently, the role of women has been virtually invisible in accounts of Progressive reform. While this is no longer the case, considerable questions re-
main concerning what women accomplished, why they participated in social reform and how they succeeded in placing their social ideals within the center of a political system in which they were marginal (Tilly & Gurin, 1990; Frankel & Dye, 1991).

In this study I examine the origins of North American sociology at the University of Chicago and observe the claims and that were advanced by the first generation of sociologists to legitimate the social construction of the discipline of sociology. Professional sociologists and social activists, though with different strategies and tactics, attempted to combine Christianity, the social gospel, Social Darwinism and socialism into a new and unique ideology. Within this milieu, I focus on Caroline Bartlett Crane, a student in the sociology department of the University of Chicago in 1896, to illustrate how the larger goals and vision of the pioneers of academic sociology were accomplished, not only in academe, but also in the so-called real world at the local level.

This research also addresses Crane's role in the mobilization of club-women for the purposes of municipal reform at the local and national level. I illustrate the dialectics of praxis in social reform, and assess the reform efforts of Progressive women in the little researched area of municipal sanitation. In order to address recent critiques of white middle-class women Progressive reformers, I utilize the private as well as the professional papers of Crane to examine the personal motivations and inspirations behind the public actions and accomplishments. Finally, I analyze the relationship
between images, ideology and agency in order to observe how women changed society from the political margins, and discuss the implications of political and social reform efforts in the past for contemporary political concerns.

Not only were women nearly invisible in conventional accounts of the Progressive period, but the role of women in the origins of the social sciences has also been obscured (Deegan, 1988, 1991; Platt 1992; McDonald 1994, 1995). This research attempts to address these questions and redress past oversights with a socio-historical examination of the gendered nature of agency and structure in the Progressive era. This makes it possible to recognize and acknowledge a legacy of women and reform in the past for women concerned with social thought and action today.

In addition, this case study investigates the relationship between politics and the academy, and offers lessons for feminists, and others, interested in reconnecting social knowledge and social action today (Hartman & Messer-Davidow, 1991; Maynard & Purvis, 1994).

Feminist Debates: Epistemology/Methodology

There is no consensus that a feminist theory is even possible. Sociologist Janet Chafetz promotes one definition of feminist theory—a theory can be considered "feminist if it can be used to challenge, counteract, or change a status quo that disadvantages or devalues women" (quoted in Wallace, 1989, p. 10). Others contend that there is no one feminist theory, but feminist theory is multi-cen-
tered and undefinable, divided according to its attachment to one of several male theories, making it kind of a bandage on the misogynist canon of Western social thought (Grant, 1993, p. 1). Barbara Ryan (1992, p. 154) argues, as well, that there is no one feminist theory or movement. She contends that since the movement developed from several ideological perspectives, feminism has always consisted of diverse orientations. This is both a strength and a weakness, and makes the issue of differences a major challenge for feminism today, just as it has been in the past.

Contesting views abound concerning feminist theory, sociologist Charles Lemert contends (1994, p. ix) "feminist thought [is] the single most creative and challenging source of social thought there is." He argues that it can no longer be seen as preoccupied exclusively with women's interests, as it has always been at odds with academic discourse and against the unspoken authority of mainstream social thought, feminist theory entails nothing less than a rethinking of authority. Lemert maintains that feminist theory today is not any one thing and why, accordingly, it is so intimidating to those who have read it just a little or not at all. He insists that it is one of the most important fields of social theory today (1994, pp. x-xi).

Trends and Debates in Feminist Theory

A century ago, many women (and men) privileged differences between men and women. The second wave of feminist thought in the mid
1960's feminist thinking focused on the denial of differences (among women and between women and men). This perspective, in turned, evolved to a view that privileged gender differences, again. The original focus of the second feminist wave was on androgyny and/or women's common identity (e.g., deBeauvoir, 1953; Millett, 1970; Firestone, 1970) of oppression under patriarchy. This gave way, in a sizeable segment of feminist thought, to a rejection of androgyny and led to a woman-centered perspective that viewed female/male differences, not as the cause of women's oppression, but rather as the seeds of women's liberation (Eisenstein, 1983, p. xi).

However, the "undiffererentiated, undertheorized sisterhood" (Snitow, 1990, p. 16) of the second wave soon gave way to other differences, when lesbians, radical women, and minority women expressed their rejection of a feminist movement dominated by educated, white, heterosexual women. If this were not enough, the sex-wars over the issue of pornography erupted in the feminist movement in the early 1980's. Conflicts developed around the axis of identity/difference, theory/methods, liberal/radical, academe/politics and equality/essentialism. These concerns mirror conflicts faced by women in the past who were influential in the foundations of modern feminism (Cott, 1987).

Equality vs. difference is probably the oldest debate in feminist thought. It has haunted feminists from the first women's movement in the last century, and is still problematic today. Feminists debated the issue when the Equal Rights Amendment was first advanced
in 1923, and women still question whether equality with men means eq-
uitly for women (Cott, 1987). The question was a serious factor in
the defeat of the ERA in 1982 (Mansbridge, 1986), and the debate
continues today both between feminists and anti-feminists, and with-
in the women's movement, as well. Much of this debate rests on the
question of whether women are essentially different from men, and
therefore due special privileges. Do they require exclusive pro-
tection, or should they be treated as equals in society and before
the law? Women in the Progressive era played with images of gender
differences to both facilitate and oppose social reform.

In an important effort to define gender for contemporary fem-
inist scholarship, historian Joan W. Scott, suggests that gender be
understood as a social, rather than a biological depiction. Scott
(1986) emphasizes the social construction of gender, and notes the
power relationships implicit in the dynamics of gender. Crane's era
exemplifies tensions and transitions in gender roles, and Scott's
contentions regarding the situated and political nature of the con-
cept of gender, help clarify these changing symbols and beliefs re-
garding gender in the Progressive period.

Scott questions, "why (and since when) have women been invis-
ible as historical subjects, when we know they participated in the
great and small events of human history" (1986, p. 1074). She con-
cludes that

political processes will determine which outcome prevails--political
in the sense that different actors and different meanings are contending
with one another for control. We can write the history of that process
only if we recognize
that man and woman are at once empty and overflowing categories. Empty because they have no ultimate, transcendent meaning. Overflowing because even when they appear to be fixed, they still contain within them alternative, denied, or suppressed definitions.

Political history has, in a sense, been enacted on the field of gender. It is a field that seems fixed yet whose meaning is contested and in flux. (p. 1074)

Ann Snitow (1990) reflects on the controversial divide in feminist thought between the need to recognize a common identity as woman and the need to abolish the category. She argues that the tensions between the need to "act as women and needing an identity not overdetermined by our gender is as old as Western feminism" (1990, p. 9). Critics of the social (de)constructionists have questioned whether they have undermined their own categories. What, they ask, is left to study "if there is no category called women" (p. 16). Snitow argues, however, that the tensions regarding differences in feminist thought are a dynamic force that links women. She believes that while the "dynamic feminist divide is about difference; it dramatizes women's differences from each other and the necessity of our sometimes making common cause" (1990, p. 30). Crane and women in the Progressive era often faced and debated these same issues, and Crane's archival papers offer intriguing insights into this continuous dilemma for feminist theorists.

The debate between theory and practice has also been a long standing problem in the movement. Although feminist theorists have long stressed the necessity of a feminist theory [now theories] for feminist political action, many activists have viewed theory as eso-
teric at best, and useless at worst. Needless to say, the effort to integrate theory and practice has met with only partial success. Early socialist-feminist and radical-feminists attempted to incorporate theory with action, but with mixed, generally disappointing results. Presently, theory and action remain, for the most part, separate and equally impotent. Feminist theory has become entrenched in academe, where it has little impact on the feminist movement, and feminist political action is relatively nil, as well. Progressive women reformers, such as Crane, offer lessons concerning the relationship between social thought and action today.

Catherine MacKinnon argues that the contemporary feminist movement's focus on consciousness raising, which emphasized the commonalities between women, created a new political practice and type of theory: "a form of actions carried out through words" (1993, p. 369). However, feminist philosopher Nancy Tuana cautions that the critique of the concept of women is the paradox at the heart of feminism. She asks how feminists can recognize the importance of differences between women without losing sight of what they have in common, she insists that feminists must abandon the quest for a unitary theory: one theory or method are not enough (1993, pp. 281-282).

Beyond the theory or theories debate in feminist work, there is also contention regarding methods. Shulamit Reinharz (1992) insists on feminist methods rather than a feminist method, she contends that "instead of orthodoxy, feminist research practices must be recognized
as a plurality. Rather than there being a woman's way of knowing, or a feminist way of doing research, there are women's ways of knowing" (p. 4).

Sandra Harding (1987) asks whether there really is a feminist method and if so how this methodology may challenge/complement traditional methods. She contends that it is hard to answer this question because much feminist research tends to conflate method, methodology and epistemology.³

However, Joyce Nielsen (1990), argues that not only is there a distinctive feminist approach to research, it is a "potentially revolutionary academic subdiscipline," which by its very nature is controversial (p. 1). She believes that feminist methodology is not only rooted in the older positivist approach, but also in a newer, emergent postempirical perspective. Nielsen insists that the feminist approach "is part--perhaps the best part--of a larger intellectual movement that represents a fundamental shift away from traditional social science methodology" (1990, p. 1). Feminist critique has led to the questioning of scientific based knowledge claims, and so may be considered as more significant and potentially more reconstructive than other critical theories (1990, p. 18). Nielsen proposes that feminist theory can provide a potential dialectical fusion between objectivism and relativism, and so transcend the dilemma created by the postmodern crisis in knowledge.
Sociologists tend to privilege the present over the past as an arena for social research. However, Theda Skocpol (1984) maintains that sociohistorical analysis can illuminate how the past is relevant to concerns in the present. She concludes that "excellent historical sociology can actually speak more meaningfully to real-life concerns than narrowly focused empiricist studies that pride themselves on their 'policy relevance'" (p. 5).

This case study will examine the contention that Progressivism was really a women's movement, despite the fact that women had little formal political power (Lebsock, 1990, p. 36). Historian, Ann Firor Scott (1991) maintains that women's organizations, which Crane utilized, served as "the very heart of American political and social development" (p. 3). However, despite the fact that women's organizations were apparently so crucial to social reform, Scott laments how little we actually know about the process (1991, p. 152). Crane's papers provide an important corrective to this problem.

There has been a vast amount of material, such as the Crane archives, left by reformers of the Progressive period for social researchers, but historian Katherine Kish Sklar (1988) argues that scholars have only begun an investigation of the power of women in this era. She contends that "the papers of individual women are often the richest and most accessible sources for the study of women's power in the Progressive Era, but many have only recently been collected, and most have never fully been exploited" (p. 177).
Sklar (1988), also believes that the analysis of "the relationships between national organizations and local units" are also a potentially valuable strategy for future research (p. 181). She maintains that an analysis of the social and political power of women reformers must include personal, as well as organizational papers.4

Since the lives of women were often not recorded in the official records of the day, alternative analytic tools and modes are necessary. Elizabeth Hampsten (1982) illustrates how to glimpse the private world of women through their letters, diaries and other reminiscences. This not only allows us to study the lives of women who may not otherwise be accessible, but makes it possible to see the world through their eyes. A subjective perception of what meaning women impute to their actions, or Verstehen, is especially necessary in sociohistorical analysis.

Although many sociologists do not consider the library and archives as a real source of data, Skocpol (1984) considers secondary data analysis the best choice for interpretative sociology. Barney Glaser and Anslem Strauss (1967) and William Gamson (1990 [1975]) also contend that the analysis of documents, may at times, be superior to field research. The use of documents makes data available that may be impossible to acquire by other methods, it is usually less expensive, and the data are accessible to return to as often as necessary. There are drawbacks to the use of documentary data, as in all other types of data collection. The data may be incomplete, inaccurate or even completely absent. There are also his-
toriographical problems inherent in the use of historical documents, but with care these sources can be an appropriate, and even superior, source of research data.

**Archival Research**

The archival method presents both particular opportunities and challenges for the social researcher (Brooks, 1969; Burke, 1981; Hill, 1993). Unlike data available in library research, material in archival collections is unique and unlikely to be found anywhere else. Material in archives may exist in various forms, which makes it difficult to catalogue. Data often reaches a particular archive in an arbitrary, uneven and fragmentary fashion. Retrieval of information, is therefore more complex than in typical documentary research. Archival data are much more closely regulated than material in library settings. The archivist virtually controls the research process. For this reason, archives have been equated with Erving Goffman's (1959, 1967, 1974) total institutions and archival research has been compared with Goffman's notion of ritual interactions (Hill, 1993). Michel Foucault's (1979) contentions concerning the connection between knowledge and power are also relevant due to the imbalance of power between archivist and researcher, the restricted access to knowledge and the complete, constant surveillance exercised over the researcher during the use of archival material (Thompson, 1996).

The process of selection and interpretation work together in a
dialectical manner throughout the entire research project. This makes archival research a dynamic, often exciting process. However, there are inherent problems in archival research even beyond the obstacles of missing, incomplete or inaccessible data. Michael Hill (1993, p. 64) cautions the archival researcher to be aware of the seductive concreteness of the material, multiple communication channels in a singular data source, the instability of truth, the need to bracket the present in order to understand the past, and the potential for intentional fabrication in archival data. Although many of these concerns haunt more conventional social research as well, they are particular issues in sociohistorical archival research.

One advantage of archival research, is that with careful citation other researchers are able to verify previous studies and build on the work of prior social researchers. Also, Hill (1993) argues that archival research is especially useful for the process of recovery of potentially important, yet little known individuals, institutions and social movements in the past, whose stories may not readily be available in more traditional documentary sources. He claims that the backstage data available in archival collections "can enlighten politically disenfranchised minorities and unmask the mystery that covers discriminatory practices" (p. 63).

This is a task of interest to many in the social sciences, and Hill insists that it is crucial that researchers in the social sciences do not relegate archival research exclusively to historians (1993, p. 4). He argues that it is a great mistake to leave the hist-
tory of the discipline of sociology to historians as institutional patterns, intellectual history and individual biographies of social scientists are best comprehended and interpreted by the use of the sociological imagination (Mills, 1959). However, since the process of the recovery of lost individuals, institutions and intellectual connections suggests a lack accessible data, the challenge for the social researcher is clear. New questions, unorthodox data sources, and a willingness to encounter dead-ends are necessary, but the chance to (re)discover forgotten individuals and lost intellectual foundations in the social sciences make the challenge worthwhile.

Method

The research will be conducted using a qualitative, socio-historical case study of the Caroline Bartlett Crane (1857-1935) Collection in the Regional History Collections and Archives at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan. In addition, I will use a number of secondary sources to triangulate primary data and provide a social context for Crane's papers.

Billy Franklin and Harold Osborne (1971) contend that it is difficult to define a case study because "it is not a specific technique. Rather, it is a method of organizing data for the purpose of analyzing the life of a social unit—a person, a family, a culture group, or even an entire community" (p. 184). A variety of study materials, such as personal documents, and life histories, may be used. Despite concerns regarding validity and over generalization,
the case study remains a prime method to access and assess data at a complex level. The case study approach is an excellent research design for the examination of social life in general, through a detailed investigation of the particular. (For further analysis of the validity issue in case study research see, Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg, 1991; Ragin & Becker, 1992; Hamel, 1993; Yin, 1993.)

Epilogue

Women in history are no longer silent and invisible. However, this does not mean that there are no longer challenges for scholars interested in women and social change, past and present. There is much catching up to do, and revision and reconceptualizations inevitably lead to diverse interpretations, contentions and counterviews. Therefore, the portrait of women's roles in social thought and social change, especially the role of women in the Progressive Era, becomes simultaneously clearer and more complicated. A sociohistorical case study of one exceptional, yet rather typical woman of the era, provides a valuable contribution to this ongoing process.

Barbara Nelson argues that the purpose of historical case studies and comparative historical analysis is "to advance theoretical understanding in an implicitly inductive matter" (1990, p. 126). The goal of this research is not theory testing or building. Rather, it is an attempt to add to the expanding feminist sociohistorical discourse which, in part, uncovers the silences of the past. Not all silences are equally addressed in this research, however, as issues
of class and race were often elided by the primarily white, middle-class women who were involved in Progressive social reform, and the Crane archives are no exception. Often the silences and absences in the historical record are as telling as the observed social patterns. Although race and class are seldom overtly addressed in the Crane archival collection, it is possible to read between the lines and assess the tensions between race, class and gender in the Progressive era.

Descriptive sociohistorical case studies and archival research facilitate an appreciation of sociohistorical patterns over time. Skocpol's (1984) call for narrative, specific causal explanations, rather than grand theories fits well with this perspective. Skocpol (1984) states that

the primary aim is not to rework or reveal the inapplicability of an existing theoretical perspective, nor is it to generate an alternative paradigm to displace such a perspective. The primary aim is to make sense of historical patterns, using in the process whatever theoretical resources seem useful and valid. (p. 17)

One of the hallmarks of feminist theory is the close connection between theory and practice. Feminists contend that feminist theory "reveals the social dimension of individual experience and the individual dimension of social experience" (Schneider, 1990, p. 229). This case study, in which I utilize Crane's archival data to "see the general in the particular" (Bauman, 1990, p. 10), is an excellent case in point. Elizabeth Schneider (1990) notes that

feminist theory involves a particular methodology, but it also has a substantive viewpoint and political orientation. Recog-
nizing the links between individual change and social change means understanding the importance of political activity, not just theory. Theory emerges from practice and practice then informs and reshapes theory. (p. 229)

Liz Kelly, Shelia Burton and Linda Regan suggest that, "[f]eminism for us is both a theory and practice, a framework which informs our lives. Its purpose is to understand women’s oppression in order that we might end it" (1994, p. 28). They contend that the goal of feminist research is to "create useful knowledge" (p. 28). Crane and her cohort of progressive women reformers would feel very comfortable with that philosophy and goal, as they worked for praxis in the application of scientific knowledge toward social reform.

Ann-Louise Shapiro (1994) urges a feminist historical consciousness which "recovers lost stories" and decenters the narrative (p. 2). Skocpol (1992) found it necessary to decenter her own narrative in her investigation of the provision of social services in the Progressive era. While she was searching for causal explanations in traditional theoretical frames of the period, she found the real story was being written by women on the margins of the political system. None of the current political theoretical perspectives, which by their very nature excluded women, were adequate. Only by looking at what was not there, and who was excluded from the picture, was she able to draw some conclusions concerning the paradox of the unexpected failure of male-centered reforms and the unlikely success of women-centered reform efforts.

This study is guided by a feminist approach to socio-historical research. It is informed by my particular social and political con-
cerns regarding the gendered nature of agency and structure and social knowledge and social activism. However, I attempt to read and (re)interpret the historical data in my study from the perspective of the past, as well as that of the present; from the viewpoint of those who did not already know the end from the beginning.

Summary

In this chapter I introduced the topic of the study: the role of women in Progressive Era social reform and the history of sociology, as seen from the perspective of Unitarian minister and Progressive social reformer, Caroline Bartlett Crane. I introduce the feminist theoretical and methodological debates which frame the research, and state my theoretical and methodological position within this particular research process. In Chapter II, I outline the historical background of the life of Caroline Bartlett Crane and the Progressive period (1890-1920) of American society.

I examine the relationship between early sociology at the University of Chicago and Crane’s ideology for social reform in greater detail in Chapter III. Domestic images of Progressive reform, Crane’s mobilization of club-women for reform activities and current critiques of Progressive era reformers, are the focus of Chapter IV. The trope of separate spheres is examined in Chapter V through an investigation of Crane’s private family life which illustrates her personal motivation and private inspirations for public activism. Finally, in Chapter VI, I place current feminist debates
into perspective through a retrospective analysis of the legacy that could be claimed from women and reform in the Progressive era.
CHAPTER II

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF CAROLINE BARTLETT CRANE

Introduction

Men and women are natural allies. (Caroline Bartlett Crane, 1894, p. 21).

The female of the species may still be pictured as more deadly than the male but her attack, we find, is not upon man but upon the common enemies of man and woman. (Mary R. Beard, 1915, p. vi).

This chapter illustrates the relationship between the individual and the social, between biography and history (Mills, 1959). It is not possible to understand the life and work of an individual such as Crane without a close examination of the period in which she lived. This is especially true of the Progressive Era in American society, a time in which social mores were in transition and many were ambivalent about rapid and convulsive social change.

Caroline Bartlett Crane

When Caroline Bartlett Crane came of age and began to search for her place in society in the waning decades of the 19th century, she found a world, not unlike our own, in which the rapidly changing positions of women in society reflected and reinforced the more general political and social turmoil of the times. Urbanization, industrialization and immigration changed the landscape and image of American society, and individuals such as Crane found themselves
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faced with unprecedented opportunities and obstacles.

Despite widespread concern regarding profound social problems associated with the rapidly changing society, many also held the optimistic belief that these problems could/would be solved as a better society inevitable evolved and emerged, with a little help from right-minded social reformers. Crane, along with many other women of the time, redefined the traditional role of women in society and seized the chance to expand these roles, not only to achieve her own personal goals, but also to assist in the Progressive crusade to improve society for everyone.

When Crane was born in Hudson, Wisconsin in 1858, she entered a world of expansive frontiers, a world in which the social and physical boundaries were thought to be virtually limitless. Especially in the West and Midwest, the lack of traditional institutional restraints and controls created opportunities that were less possible in the more civilized Eastern regions of the country. In this setting, customary women's roles were easier to transcend, and from childhood, Crane followed a less conventional course than many females in her era.

Crane's father, rather than her mother, was her role model. She excelled in school, and chose an academic, instead of a domestic course for her life. Strong-willed and decisive, Crane decided early on to follow a very non-traditional path for a woman of her time. She determined, while still in her teens, to become an Unitarian minister. Her family was not amused, but they encouraged her continued
education and assumed that she would outgrow the desire to enter the liberal ministry (Rickard, 1994, p. 15).

As one of the vanguard of college educated women, Crane enrolled in Carthage (Illinois) College in 1876. She rejected the less stringent curriculum designated for women at this coeducational institution, and graduated at the top of her class in 1879. According to her own recollections, Crane's college education prepared her for her public work, and her first speech on temperance given during her college years, fore-shadowed and launched her into her public career (Crane, 1925).

When Crane graduated from college, she met with the same dilemmas as most of her counterparts in the "first generation" of college women who graduated from colleges between the 1860's and the 1880's (Solomon, 1985, p. 95). These exceptional women were very conscious of the fact that they were pioneers, and took their opportunity to receive a higher education seriously. However, most found themselves educated for professions that wanted nothing to do with them. They were all dressed up, with nowhere to go! Although Robert Wiebe (1967, p. 121) laments the fact that universities at that time were preparing young men for professions that did not yet exist, the problem was especially crucial for young women in that era.

Many women reacted to this predicament in a similar manner. Some married, and used their education to be better wives and mothers. Those who did not marry, and many college women in that cohort did not, were left with few options. Some women filled the time af-
ter college with travel, often to Europe. Others retreated into illness as they attempted to cope with an uncertain future and societal pressures to fulfill the proper female role in a society in which these roles were in a state of transition and confusion.

A few found opportunities to pioneer within previously male dominated fields. Many eventually created innovative careers for themselves within the public sphere, by both embracing and expanding traditional women's roles. The personal and professional lives of Caroline Bartlett Crane, Jane Addams and many other women of that era, epitomize these social tensions.

After graduation from college, Crane struggled to locate her position in the world as an educated woman. Due to parental objections, she did not immediately pursue a theological degree but turned to teaching: the traditional female profession. Crane's career in teaching lasted only two years before she was forced to resign due to illness. She then became a newspaper reporter and a city editor, both professions which were unusual for women of that period. During Crane's stint as an assistant city editor in the frontier town of Oshkosh, Wisconsin she carried a loaded pistol for protection as she went about her work (Rickard, 1994, p. 36).

Robert Crunden contends that next to political activity, journalism was the "most visible progressive profession" (1982, p. 87). Crane's detour into journalism provided rich experience for her eventual work in the clergy and Progressive reform. Indeed, Crane insisted that she received her theological training in a newspaper of-
Also, Crane was converted to the suffrage cause when she went to interview Lucy Stone and Susan B. Anthony for the local newspaper, at an Association of Woman’s Suffrage Association meeting in 1885. Crane also met Anna Howard Shaw at this time. Dr. Shaw was not only a medical doctor, but also a minister and an active advocate for women’s suffrage. The young reporter confessed to Shaw that she too wished to become a minister, and Shaw (who was president of the National Association of Woman’s Suffrage Association from 1904-1915) remained a mentor to Crane throughout her life. Crane marched beside Shaw in the clergy section of the large suffrage parade in Washington D.C. on the eve of President Wilson’s inauguration in 1913, and presided at her funeral in 1919.

In her late twenties, Crane finally overcame parental objections, and with her father’s (her mother had recently died) long-sought blessing, she left journalism to begin, at last, a career in the ministry. Crane was accepted as a candidate for Unitarian ministry by the Iowa Unitarian Conference, as only the western branch of the Unitarian church accepted women into the ministry in the 1880’s. The Iowa Unitarian Conference was in the vanguard of the movement for women in ministry, and the Iowa Sisterhood was the label attached to this small group of women who pioneered in their efforts to enter the clerical profession (Rickard, 1994, pp. 46-47).

Crane studied theology under the guidance of several male Unitarian ministers, and eventually became ordained in 1889 when she
came to Kalamazoo, Michigan to be the minister of the local, nearly extinct, Unitarian church. She was one of the first ordained woman to occupy a pulpit in Michigan. As an advocate of the social gospel and practical Christianity, Crane immediately envisioned her church as a vehicle for social improvement (see Correll, 1988; Hopkins, 1940; May, 1949 for an explication of the social gospel in Progressive reform). She called for a civic religion and according to a contemporary article in her local newspaper, Crane incorporated advanced sociological ideas into the church on a practical basis ("A Place to Fill"). The People's Church was very successful under Crane's leadership and offered a wide variety of social services to the local community (see Chapter III).

Even beyond the local efforts for social reform, Crane traveled to Europe in the 1890's to study social settlements there, and in 1896 enrolled in sociology classes during the summer term at the University of Chicago, in a further attempt to understand and ameliorate the profound social problems of the time (see Chapter III).

Shortly after her return to Kalamazoo, Crane's personal and professional life experienced some crucial changes. Her personal life changed on New Year's Eve 1896, when she shocked her rapidly growing congregation with her unexpected marriage to Dr. Augustus Crane, a local physician ten years her junior. Many, including Susan B. Anthony, were concerned about the impact of marriage upon her career (Susan B. Anthony to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 21 January 1897, Crane Collection).
However, Crane not only continued in her clerical function, she also started the Unity Club at People's Church to pursue the more formal study of sociology at the local level (Brown, 1972, p. 292). Crane's group began a course of study called "The Sociology of Kalamazoo" in which they conducted a sociological survey that focused on the city and the municipal services offered. Crane established the group much along the lines that were acknowledged and encouraged by Chicago doctoral student, I. W. Howerth in the May, 1897 issue of *American Journal of Sociology* in which he wrote:

> The present widespread discontent in regard to social conditions...and the growing belief that better conditions may be realized if we set about it intelligently, make the study of the actual facts of society one of the chief demands of the times... Theoretical study should not be discouraged, of course, but the formation in a few cities of study clubs to pursue local social investigations marks the beginning of a movement which also deserves the encouragement of everyone interested in social reform. (p. 852)

In 1898, Crane, abruptly resigned from her clerical duties because of ill health. Her new husband advised her to take two years off from her busy schedule to recuperate. She canceled all speaking engagements and did not pursue a public role during that period. The reason for her resignation at the peak of her clerical career and public recognition was unclear. One early biographer, tactfully avoided the issue and merely referred to her "prolonged illness" (Bennett, 1915, p. 10).

Another biographer noted that "Caroline, through her life, was plagued by a nervous disorder which usually occurred when she was exhausted and overworked" (Rickard, 1985, p. 10). This may be the
case, but another possibility also seems equally plausible. Jane Ad-
dams (1898) discussed the pull between the family claim and the so-
cial claim for young educated, ambitious women. The family claim
pulled them into the domestic sphere of the home, while the social
claim gave them access to the public sphere. As long as they remain-
ed single, there was more freedom to pursue the public arena, but
marriage put them firmly back into the private domain.

Crane may have been caught in this dilemma. She was becoming a
well known public figure, but continued to believe that the women's
sphere was the home. One reporter, who interviewed Crane at the home
of Susan B. Anthony, noted that few women had impressed themselves on
their times more than Crane (Rittenhouse, 1896). Another, remarked
that although Crane was in public life herself, she contended strong-
ly for women's adherence to the purely feminine side of life ("A Not-
ed Woman Preacher," 1897). This ambivalence in Crane may have ac-
counted for her illness during times of tension in her life over pub-
lic roles and private social expectations.

After her prescribed rest period was over, Crane resumed her
career. However, from now on her reform work was in public house-
keeping, a new field she virtually created for herself in an apparent
effort to combine a professional life within a sphere considered ap-
propriate for a married woman. Crane believed that the sanitary and
charity aspects of municipal affairs were similar to housekeeping,
she felt that women were especially suited for this type of work (see
Chapter IV).
She (Crane, 1904) argued in the "Women of New York" that

> the cleanliness, health and beauty of the city are the natural concerns of women, because the city is the larger home for us all. We are the natural municipal housekeepers, but we are content to help, and do not ask to lead.

Using an ideology of domesticity, Crane could both claim authority to act in the name of womanhood, and calm male fears of women's incursion into what had previously been almost exclusively male concerns. This is yet another example of how women's "separate sphere" was constructed socially "both for and by women" (Kerber, 1988, p. 18).

Eventually Crane would acquire widespread recognition in the profession of municipal or civic sanitation (Brown, 1972, p. 295). She was featured in numerous newspaper and magazine articles, often in company of Jane Addams and other well known reformers. For example, Good Housekeeping (1909) featured a photo layout of Crane, Addams and other prominent women ("Woman and her Larger Home," 1909).

Crane was also highlighted with a photograph and the lead chapter in Helen Bennet's American Women in Civic Work (1915), which also noted such women reformers as Jane Addams, Frances Kellor and Anna Howard Shaw, among others. Crane was included in Woman's Who's Who of America, 1914-1915, (1914). Barbara Kuhn Campbell (1978) conducted a statistical analysis, The "Liberated" Woman of 1914: Prominent Women in the Progressive Era, on the 9000 American women who were included in the Women's Who's Who of America, 1914-1915. Campbell's study investigates the characteristics of women in reform in the Progressive Era, and provides an interesting composite frame in which to place the personal life and professional career of Crane in the company
of her peers.

Again, just as Crane appeared to be at the peak of her success in municipal reform efforts, with national and even international requests for her services as an expert in her field, her life took another shift. In 1913, Crane (at 55 years of age) and her husband adopted two children, and the focus of Crane's work moved more toward her own home and family. She greatly limited her work in her larger social home as she expended her energy and enthusiasm on motherhood.

Reflecting the maternalist (Gordon, 1990, 1994; Koven & Michel, 1993) focus of her time, in which the care of children was seen to be the principal task of women, Crane (1927) states:

I do not think marriage interferes necessarily with a woman's career in the ministry, it might, indeed, be helpful. I think motherhood (if one proposes to be a first-class mother) interferes considerably with almost any kind of career--even with the career of authorship within the four walls of home. That is my own experience. (p. 1)

Still, Crane remained active in Progressive causes. In addition to her work in municipal sanitation, poor-house reform, the city beautiful movement, the home education movement, the pure food movement, penal reform, suffrage and temperance, Crane also served as President of the Michigan Women's Committee of National Defense during World War I.

In the 1920's, Crane was named as an editor for the Women's Journal and wrote numerous articles concerning municipal reform issues. Her interest in urban and housing reform was underscored when her entry into the nationwide "Better Homes in America Contest" won first prize in 1925. Called "Everyman's House," Crane's winning de-
sign was intended to promote affordable housing, but Crane went beyond this mandate to create a home geared toward convenience and efficiency for a mother and her children. Crane published *Everyman's House*, (1925) to describe this prize winning house. Good housing was important to Crane not only for aesthetic reasons, but also because she believed that the social and physical space of the house held the family (in her view, the most important social unit) together.

Although Crane was involved in numerous Progressive reform movements throughout her life, so much so in fact, that her life and work provide a microcosm of the times, still a certain theme emerges. Despite the scope of Crane's work all of her efforts promoted the ideal she had of herself privately, and the image she projected in public. Crane considered herself to be a very womanly woman who stepped into the public sphere in the cause of women's (and men's) interests. Her efforts at social housekeeping were but an extension of women's domestic duties in the home and family (Crane, 1904).

While she did not doubt women's rights to social and political equality, like many other women reformers of the era, her emphasis (unlike feminists who would come later) was on women's duties (Rosenberg, 1992, p. 63). Crane's vision of the world reflect Ellen Du-Bois's (1991, p. 163) contention of two different generations of women in social reform. The first (Crane's) focused on the symbolic nature of woman as mother, while the next sought reform for woman as worker, as feminism and progressivism were woven together in a dialectical relationship of continuity and change in the Progressive
The Progressive Era

As the end of the nineteenth century approached, the Gilded Age of seemingly unlimited expansion, vast individual wealth and immense corporate growth began to appear tarnished around the edges. Many Americans started to perceive the huge social dislocations behind the enormous wealth and power increasingly concentrated in corporate America. The Progressive Era (1890-1920) which followed was a self-conscious attempt by many individuals to correct the excesses of the earlier period, and restore order and stability to society (see Crunden, 1982; Davis, 1967; Wiebe, 1976).

Historical debates concerning just how progressive the Progressive Era truly was are beyond the scope of this chapter. However, I wish to acknowledge that questions concerning the nature of progressive reform such as whether progressivism was a popular or an elitist movement, whether it was conservative or radical, and concerns with the motivations, goals and actual achievements of progressive reformers still prevail. Perhaps, even more cogent for the nature of this project, is the question of whether the progressive movement, however much it may have impacted society in general, was actually progressive for women. These issues are still under contention (DuBois, 1986; Gordon, 1990, 1994; Tilly & Gurin, 1990; Frankel & Dye, 1991). This study may shed some light on these controversial matters.

Various ideological and material strains converged in the for-
mation of the progressive movement. Protestant Christianity, socialism, Charles Darwin's evolutionary theory, Herbert Spencer's social Darwinism, the social gospel and scientism all contributed to the notion that it was not only possible, but inevitable to make improvements in society (see Chapter III). With the proper scientific information, reformers could transform disparate, desperate individuals and selfish special interests into a social community based on the good of all. The application of scientific knowledge with Christian brotherhood could transform society from one in which the powerful would benefit at the expense of the weak, into one in which everyone knew their place, exploitation was reduced and stability, and even progress, was ensured. The newly emerging social sciences, especially sociology, were crucial in forming the link between religious, moral concerns and scientific knowledge in progressive reform (see Bannister, 1987; Bulmer, 1984; Crunden, 1982; Faris, 1967, Ross, 1991).

Reformers believed that with appropriate social data, experts could lead social reform. After a careful investigation of the problematic situation, reformers could inform political leaders and the public of the extent of the problem and propose appropriate solutions. Knowledge would lead to action, and action to social and political reform. Robert Crunden (1982) critiques this aspect of progressive reform. He contends that reformers believed that the exposure of evil was an end in itself, and that once acknowledged, citizens would repent and society would be improved (1982, p. 165). For
example, he suggests that once the Pure Food and Drug Act was passed in 1906, reformers felt their task was ended. The symbolic nature of the legislation was more important than the substance of actual enforcement of the act, and so while in reality meat inspection was little better than it had been in the past, reformers were satisfied with their symbolic victory.

Crane's work both confirms and contradicts Crunden's contentions. Crane's civic gospel often resembled the social gospel she advocated. Her municipal surveys were a enigmatic combination of missionary zeal and empirical surveys. She did, indeed, believe that if she carefully investigated a situation, and brought the situation to the public and the proper authorities, the situation would be rectified. After her surveys were completed, she held mass educational meetings (which could be said to resemble revival meetings) in the cities she surveyed.

However, she was not so naive as to assume that once a situation was recognized, the proper solution would automatically follow. She left precise instructions for actions to improve municipal problems that she uncovered in her surveys, and kept track of the actual improvements made in the cities and states she surveyed. Crane also published reports of her sanitary municipal surveys to publicize her findings in order to facilitate and encourage further municipal reform. Finally, the Pure Food and Drug Act is a case in point. Crane was never satisfied with the passage of that legislation, and spent years in personal investigations and efforts to lobby for the im-
Reform efforts in the Progressive Era covered a wide range of concerns in the interest of a more equitable and better society for all. Progressive Era social reform was much more expansive and extensive that the typical historical focus on suffrage and temperance would suggest. Women and women's interests were at the center of much Progressive reform. This fact was nearly invisible, however, in traditional historical examinations of the Progressive Era, which focus almost exclusively on the economic and political activities of the period, in which women had little formal access and influence (Lebsock, 1990; West & Blumberg, 1990; Frankel & Dye, 1991).

Twice Told Tales

Conventional analysis of the period (Faulkner, 1931; Link, 1954; Mowry, 1958; Wiebe, 1967) generally present reform in the era from a masculine perspective. They tell the story of male political and corporate leaders, and feature the efforts of male reformers and muckrakers. In light of this, it is ironic that sociologist E.A. Ross of the University of Wisconsin assured Crane that she was "one of the muckrakers in whose accuracy I have absolute confidence" (Edward A. Ross to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 13 March 1913, p. 1, Crane Collection).

Despite the fact that the wide ranging efforts of women reformers in that time had been recorded by dedicated women early in the
century (see Beard, 1915; Bennett, 1915; Breckinridge, 1933 [1972]), most traditional accounts of the Progressive period either ignored women entirely, or confined the contribution of women to a token examination of such famous women as Jane Addams and/or Susan B. Anthony.

Ironically, while women such as Addams or Anthony are considered to be the prototype of women in Progressive reform, in reality Crane resembles much more closely the typical woman reformer of the era (Campbell, 1978, p. 48). Indeed, Campbell featured Crane in her "profiles of reformers" (1978, pp. 130-132). While Wiebe may well be correct when he contends that the new middle class was at "the heart of progressivism," he misses the fact that middle class women as well as men (or perhaps even more so) were the engine of Progressive reform (1967, p. 166).

This oversight has now been rectified; some might say with a vengeance. Recent works, (e.g., Blair, 1980; Cott, 1987; Fitzpatrick, 1990; Frankel & Dye, 1991; Scott, 1991; Schnelder & Schnelder, 1993; Tilly & Gurin, 1990) feature the role of women in Progressive reform. This has greatly facilitated a more balanced perception of politics and social reform in the early decades of the Twentieth century. This is crucial not only to recover a lost feminist legacy, but as the past shapes the present, a fuller understanding of women's politics in the past provides a better perspective in which to place feminist politics and practices today.
Conclusion

Despite the rapid gains made in the discovery of women's perspectives and participation in Progressive reform, DuBois warns that "more than any other period in American reform history, the Progressive Era eludes interpretation" (1986, p. 34). There is a growing recognition that the Progressive Era was crucial in the formation of our current political and social life, however many questions remain concerning the nature and accomplishments of progressive reform, as well as concerns regarding the role of women in these reform efforts.

The quest for professionalism, scientific efficiency, rationalization, evolutionary progress and community over individual interests were some of the major hallmarks of the Progressive Era. While these trends are widely recognized; what to make of them remains inconclusive. Are progressive reforms elitist or democratic, are they a form of social justice or social control, and just what is social progress and who actually benefits?

Suzanne Lebsock suggests that an examination of how women (usually through their organizations) influenced electoral politics from the outside may offer some insights into the riddle of progressive reform. For example, she notes, concerning the question of the growing importance of experts and professionalization, that women saw no contradictions in putting science to work for moral ends as they sought to pull together the public and private spheres in society (1990, p. 48). Crane's work illustrates this contention.

Rosalind Rosenberg (1992) asserts, as well, that a study of
women in progressive reform is instructive for debates still facing the women's movement today. She notes that issues of similarity and difference (between men and women and among women), as well as the debate concerning women as helpless victims or social agents, which still haunt feminists are addressed in the Progressive period. She suggests that women's shared identity before suffrage, led to women's pivotal role in the formation of the modern welfare state. Rosenberg concludes that women could transcend class differences as they argued for the vote in order to achieve their municipal housekeeping goals, and calls their legacy in progressive reform a victory for a disenfranchised group (1992, pp. 34, 58, 62). However, there is a growing critique concerning both the elitist and racist motivations of white middle-class women Progressive era reformers, as well as an emphasis on the unintended consequences of their reform activities (e.g., Davis, 1967; Giddings, 1985; Gordon, 1988, 1990, 1994; Frankel & Dye, 1991; Sklar, 1995b).

There is no one story concerning women in Progressive reform. Crane's life and work exemplify the many strands of social reform in the era. Her activities mirror the reform efforts of many other women and dispute the contention that (a) women were politically powerless without the vote; (b) the suffrage and temperance movements were the only games in town; and (c) only the few women leaders whose fame survived to the contemporary period were active in public life. On the contrary, Crane's career illustrates that many women in the Progressive era were marching for suffrage, cleaning the streets,
searching for pure food, fighting for social justice and in general attempting to band together to improve society according to their vision for a better, cleaner, safer, more healthy world. While some of these visions now seem dated, and hopelessly idealistic or moralistic, many of their ideas and concerns are still central to contemporary social issues and debates.

Although Crane was certainly a leader for progressive reform in her time, her interests and achievements were not unique, but rather quite typical of women in reform at the turn of the century. Many historians have noted the drop in social reform efforts after 1920, however, Crane continued to work for her reform projects until her death in 1935. Despite their accomplishments, and there were many, much of the work women reformers in Crane’s era instigated still remains to be done. If Crane were alive today she would likely be involved in the social issues (women’s rights, prison reform and environmental/consumers concerns) which concerned her throughout her long, productive life. No doubt, Crane would be giving Ralph Nader some competition as the social conscience of contemporary consumer society. Her legacy in social reform deserves to be remembered to clarify the past, to comprehend the present and to conceive of the future.

Summary

In this chapter I place the life of an individual woman, Caroline Bartlett Crane, within the larger social context of her time.
Lives cannot be studied in a vacuum, but must always be grounded in the social world which creates them and which they help to create. I argue that it is crucial to acknowledge the long neglected role of women in Progressive reform in order to achieve a more comprehensive view of the period.

Crane struggled, as did many other progressive women in her time, against the male-dominated social structure. In a period in which the role of women was in transition and under contention, often Crane's rhetoric was not in agreement with her actions. Like many other prominent women in her era, she contended strongly for women's adherence to the private/feminine side of life, although she was in public life herself. The tensions between Crane's public career and her private life reflected the ambivalence of the social norms in the era. Her attempt to lead women into new arenas for social reform required diplomacy, finesse and strength. The following chapters will document Crane's career in social reform and address the dialectics between agency and structure in fuller detail.
CHAPTER III

SALVATION, SANITATION AND THE SOCIAL GOSPEL

Introduction

Sociology is not a synonym for Socialism. (Albion Small and George Vincent, 1894, p. 76)

The latest god in the world's pantheon is science. (Albion Small, 1896b, p. 564)

Sociology is not theology. (Charles Henderson, 1897, p. 11)

Just over a century ago, in a fin de siècle era characterized by rapid social change and turmoil, a new academic discipline was established in America. The field of sociology was constructed in a dynamic academic debate with both established fields, such as philosophy, theology and history, and other emergent contenders for the study of society. As noted in the previous chapter, the "Progressive Era" (1890-1920) in American history was a period of both unprecedented prosperity and poverty. Social progress and social pain coexisted in equal measure, and many individuals felt called to help mitigate the social inequality and injustice which accompanied industrial development and economic growth in society (Crunden, 1982; Davis, 1967; Wiebe, 1967).

Protestant Christianity, socialism, Darwin's evolutionary theory, Spencer's social Darwinism, the social gospel and scientism vied for ideological hegemony in the volatile Progressive era. While each doctrine had its own adherents, some attempted a synthesis of these
philosophies as the best hope to redeem a troubled society on the brink of confusion, if not revolution.

There was a growing conviction that the combination of scientific knowledge with Christian brotherhood could transform society, and replace selfish special interests with a community in which a scientific approach to morality would create the best of all possible worlds for everyone in society. The nascent social sciences, especially sociology, were instrumental in the transition from an older moralistic concern for social reform, toward a more modern, secular scientific approach (see Bannister, 1987; Bulmer, 1984; Crunden, 1982; Faris, 1967, Ross, 1991).

The Birth of Sociology

It is, perhaps, not surprising that sociology emerged in this period. The Progressive era reflected the widespread belief among many Americans that American society could and should be improved. The prevailing progressive belief in social progress, guided by a scientific approach to society, provided a perfect rationalization for the development of the new social sciences to provide this scientific guidance for social reform. Robert Crunden (1982, p. 65) contends that progressivism contributed directly to the development of sociology.

In this context, the first graduate department of sociology in the nation was formed at the University of Chicago in 1892 (Faris, 1967, p. 11). The early pioneers in the field debated issues of
religion vs. science, ideology vs. objectivity, and academic scholarship vs. practical reform. The earliest sociologists at the University of Chicago used their unique opportunity to define the goals of the discipline and parameters of the field in a way that set the tone for sociology and social reform for the next century and beyond (Bannister, 1987, p. 38). Steven Diner (1980) claims that these new professors were both products and agents of social change (1980, p. 8).

An examination of the earliest years of sociology at the University of Chicago highlights the claims and counter-claims projected among sociologists. They aspired to combine socialism, Christianity, and the social gospel into a new and unique ideology that would allow them to carve out a specific and valued place for sociology in society and academe. In their classic sociology text, Albion Small & George Vincent (1894) argue that "Christian ideals and precise social science are complementary" (p. 19). They also contend that "Systematic socialism has both directly and indirectly promoted the development of Sociology" (1894, p. 40). They conclude that considering the role that Socialism has played in nineteenth century thought, Sociology appears to have come into existence less from choice than from necessity. In the Hegelian idiom, conventionality is the thesis, Socialism is the antithesis, Sociology is the synthesis. (p. 41).

The Social Gospel and Sociology: Rationale for Reform

The "social gospel" movement which emerged in this period, reflected an attempt by Christianity to adapt to industrial society
The notion that the role of Christianity should be the salvation of society, rather than individual souls elicited a responsive chord in many Protestant religious leaders of the time, as they sought to grapple with both the severe social problems of the era and godless socialism. Faced with the labor problem and the rise of socialism, advocates of the new social gospel sought to establish the kingdom of God in this world, rather than the next. Proponents of the social gospel felt that clergy should study social science in order to be able to apply the "Golden Rule," and use the findings of sociology to solve social problems (Hopkins, 1982 [1940], pp. 107-108).

For this reason, the ranks of early sociologists were filled with present or former clergy interested in the utilization of sociology and the social gospel in social reform. Hopkins contends, "[i]n the 1890's sociology and reform were quite compatible partners and the social gospel was a happy ally of both" (1982 [1940]), p. 257). Indeed, Crunden calls the first generation of sociologists a "private club for Protestant clergy interested in mitigating the impact of industrialism on America" (1982, p. 81). He maintains, however, that this clerical background often left them vacillating between the "desire to be active and relevant and a desire to be professional and detached" (1982, p. 81). This may be a proper conclusion if one exclusively concentrates on male clerical sociologists in the social gospel movement, however a different picture appears if the activities of women ministers are also considered.
Where Are the Women?

Accounts of the social gospel movement in the formation of sociology and social reform miss women's contribution to this ideological debate. However, the archival material of Caroline Bartlett Crane, suggests a pivotal role for women in this milieu. This alternative perspective offers a fuller comprehension of the ideological and sociological links between Progressive era reform and the emergence of academic sociology in that period. While many male social gospel advocates in academe were engaged in endless debates regarding the proper balance between social theory and social action, between moral advocacy and scientific detachment, women reformers, such as Crane, combined them with ease.

Debates and Dilemmas in Early Sociology

When the University of Chicago was established in 1892, through the philanthropy of John D. Rockefeller, Sr., the setting was ideal for the emergent new discipline of sociology. As president of the new university, William Rainey Harper was determined to make his institution not only successful, but innovative. He formed the university to promote research, publication and graduate training, hired the best faculty possible and encouraged the establishment and professionalization of the social sciences (Bulmer, 1984, pp. 15-21).

In 1892, Harper hired Albion W. Small, a Baptist minister and president of Colby College, to head a sociology department in the new university. He was joined that same year by Charles R. Henderson,
also a former Baptist minister, to teach in the sociology department and serve as university chaplain. Eventually, George Vincent and William I. Thomas completed the original department. These men, especially Small, Vincent and Charles Henderson, brought a social gospel emphasis to the new discipline. They envisioned the task of the sociology as an "ethical science" (Ross, 1991, p. 125) which would help identify and solve social problems. The new science of sociology would direct social reforms through knowledge. The theological background of these men was crucial. Faris (1967) notes that the wild enthusiasm which not long before had generated a serious intention to Christianize the entire world in a single generation became transferred in these men to the more secular but similarly inspiring aims of higher education and the creation of a new science of social behavior. (p. 26)

The new science was created out of a secular desire to save the world. Sociologists would use the new discipline to facilitate a transformation from conflict to harmony in society.

The university was a coeducational institution from the beginning. Marion Talbot was hired in 1892 to be assistant dean of women and assistant professor of sociology. As a member of the first generation of college women, Talbot fought for higher education for women. Since most of the established professions were closed to women, she promoted the social sciences as an ideal place for women to find a position within the professions and academe. Although, early sociology was clearly a man's world, another woman was important to the development of sociology. Most of the initial Chicago sociologists were involved with the social settlement of Hull House, and Jane Ad-
dams (founder of Hull House) "became a virtual adjunct professor of sociology at Chicago" (Rosenberg, 1982, p. 33). Indeed, Deegan (1988) contends,

but it was Addams and Hull-House who were the leader and leading institution in Chicago in the 1890's, not the University of Chicago. Not only was she the charismatic head of a rapidly expanding social movement, but she was also considered one of the leading sociologists of her day. (p. 5).

The department also reached out into the community through an extension program for mass adult education. Edward Bemis and Charles Zeublin were associated with the extension program in sociology, and they, as well as many of their colleagues in the sociology department, continued to promote the cause of sociology and social improvement through the Chautauqua movement, founded by George Vincent's father.

Time and place were crucial to the rapid development of sociology at the University of Chicago. The fact that there were no traditional academic constraints to the development of sociology within the university, as well as the location of the university within the rapidly growing city of Chicago, added special stimulus to the swift advancement of sociology at the University of Chicago.

The Social Construction of Sociology

When Albion Small announced in 1895, on the first page of the first professional journal in the field The American Journal of Sociology, that the "Era of Sociology" had arrived, he made an assertion that foretold years of claims and counter-claims concerning the sub-
stance and scope of the field. The first American sociologists claimed the title even though they took their advanced degrees in other disciplines. Faris argues that since none of the original faculty at the University of Chicago had been trained in sociology, there was "a large amount of uncertainty about what the task was to be--what sort of sociology was to be created" (1967, p. 9). In the wake of other social thinkers before them, the American academics who developed the field of sociology, as distinct from other fields of study, saw sociology as perhaps the only way to save a modern rapidly changing society. They struggled with tensions between religion and science; ideology and objectivity; scholarship and reform, not to mention the ever contentious issue of methods.

They were also concerned with specialization and professionalization in the field, as they attempted to draw lines between the social sciences, with sociology ultimately on top. The role of professionals and amateurs in the field was also debated, as the new sociologists sought to legitimize their role in the acquisition of social knowledge which would help direct social reform.

Professionalization in the discipline was encouraged by the formation of the American Journal of Sociology in 1895. It was published by the University of Chicago Press with Albion Small as the first editor. Small also helped form the American Sociological Society in 1905, and his classic text, An Introduction to the Study of Society (1894), written with George Vincent, influenced the teaching of sociology for many years. Despite the urge to carve out a spe-
cial, and superior, place for sociology within academe, Small worried about excessive specialization and encouraged unity within sociology and between the social sciences. Just as sociologists sought social unity in society, Small advocated interdisciplinary contacts for both faculty and students.

The lines between the disciplines were fairly fluid in the earliest days of the field. The sociology department, under Small included anthropology (Starr), sanitary science (Talbot), the training of ministers in the 3D’s--delinquents, defectives, and dependents--at the Divinity School (Henderson), and (Small, Vincent and Thomas) sociology, itself (Bannister, 1987, p. 38). Small eventually hoped to unite all of the fields "by making sociology the capstone of the social sciences" (Bannister, 1987, p. 51). This goal proved unworkable, however. Indeed, rather than unity, sociology at the University of Chicago began to separate in the early 1900's, eventually causing an official split between social knowledge and social reform, not to mention the virtual segregation the department according to gender (Rosenberg, 1982; Deegan, 1988; Fitzpatrick, 1990).

Divisions, rather than unity, flourished within the discipline as well. Sociologists debated both the nature of society and which methods were most useful to discover the character of the social world, as they attempted to impress their own visions on the new field in order to improve society, establish the field and insure a professional place for themselves within academe. The rivalry between Small at Chicago, and Franklin Giddings at Columbia, permeated
the field in the 1890's. Small also feuded with Lester Ward, the father of American sociology. Mixed motives, dynamic personalities/egos and a academic vacuum led to a lively contest to define social issues, establish the parameters of the field and advance the role of sociology, not to mention sociologists, in society. Bannister argues that "the creation of American sociology was a highly personal and often passion-filled affair" (1987, p. 9).

The original sociologists proposed that sociologists, as experts, should direct and promote positive social change to forestall social upheaval and rectify disruptive social problems. What was good for society was also good for the fledgling field of sociology. Early scholars attempted to demonstrate the social value of sociology through its unique approach to social problems. From the start, sociologists at Chicago were concerned with an academic approach to modern, urban social problems. The University of Chicago, and the professional sociologists attached to the university, were to use their special knowledge of social conditions for the public good. How best to fulfill this mandate was a matter of much public debate and personal ambivalence.

Although succeeding generations of sociologists have looked back with embarrassment at the meritorious philosophy and moral reform efforts of the first wave of sociologists, the pioneers struggled with the issues of objectivity, academic scholarship and social activism. While nearly forgotten or discounted now (with the exception of W.I. Thomas), the first sociologists formed a link between the
Religious moralistic ethics of the early moral reformers and their scientific heirs in the famous Chicago school of the 1920's and beyond (Deegan, 1988).

Small and his department attempted to wed the new scientific social analysis with social gospel, in order to be able to use their knowledge to address social issues. They were concerned not only with the tension between religion and science, but also with the balance between social activism and academic social science. Small "built a bridge between his old religion of Protestantism and Christian ethics and a...religion of science and reform" (Fitzpatrick, 1990, p. 54). Ambivalence remained, however. Small and Vincent argued that "any sociology is superficial which calculates upon stable equilibrium in unchristian society, but Christian purpose and aspiration cannot furnish technical skill or information" (1894, p. 19).

Small urged objectivity and encouraged students to take part in direct observation of the city, which he considered to be a social laboratory, to combine scholarly pursuits with social responsibility. Professional sociologists were to use their scholarship not merely for the sake of knowledge, but also to promote social health. Scholars could activate social change through their role as experts, who had gained their knowledge through scientific methods. Professional methods would distinguish the professional social scientist from the amateur. They maintained a distinction between social science and social reform, and believed that the task of sociology was to train professional sociologists and professionalize reformers. Small and
Vincent (1894) write that:

sociology is just now passing through a state of struggle for the application of scientific principles of investigation, in place of loose criticism and silly utopianism. Sociology is not, therefore, a resort for social visionaries, so eager to reform social evils that they cannot stop to take advantage of available knowledge of social conditions. (p. 32)

Claims of scientific detachment, necessary for the position of authority and expertise maintained by the new sociologists, made an active role in social reform problematic. Some, such as Henderson, Thomas and Zeublin, were more directly involved in social advocacy, while others preferred to function as social reformers in the more dispassionate role as expert advisor.

Whatever their view of social activism, however, the first sociologists approached social change in a conservative manner. Small and Vincent (1894) contend that sociology is constructive, not destructive. They state that:

a primary duty of the teacher of Sociology is to approach the study in such a spirit that his influence will make against every destructive tendency. To discharge this duty successfully the teacher must impress the pupil with the belief that his primary task is not to reform society, but to understand society. The student should be liberated from any bondage to the political superstition that whatever is right. At the same time he should be shown that if institutions are defective they are the reflection of defective social knowledge, and that much information must be gathered about many things before safe substitutes for prevailing social conclusions can be derived. (p. 19)

Whatever their medium, the earliest sociologists had two primary goals; they attempted to establish legitimacy for their new field within academe, and they wanted to spread their world-view throughout society. They did this through both professional education within
their discipline and by the education of the general public. Small and Vincent's (1894) text was intended to be used both in college classes and by the Chautauqua literary and scientific circle. Henderson wrote *The Social Spirit in America* (1897) for the use of Chautauqua society, to facilitate the study of sociology by the general public. Even the professional journal *American Journal of Sociology* was intended to serve both an internal professional purpose and a larger public function. Small (1895) writes that the journal will thus be primarily technical. It will be devoted to the organization of knowledge pertaining to the relations of men in society into a sociology that shall represent the best American scholarship. On the other hand the Journal will attempt to translate sociology into the language of ordinary life, so that it will not appear to be merely a classification and explanation of fossil facts. (p. 13)

As the field became more established, however, the goal of public education in sociology would fade. This tendency toward professionalism and specialization were already apparent in Small and Vincent's first text in 1894. Although intended for both students in sociology and a lay audience, Small and Vincent (1894) scold,

> it is apparent that many people are dabbling with Sociology who lack both the talent and the training requisite for investigation of social principles. One of the chief aims of this manual is to disturb the conceit that anybody who pleases may be a sociologist. (p. 52)

**Legacy**

The first professional sociologists were in a time of transition between moralism and voluntarism on the one hand and scientism and professionalism on the other. Many tried to bridge the gap by
having a foot in each camp. Henderson, for example, approached social problems empirically, but also based his work on religious principles and remained dedicated to social uplift. Each embraced to a greater or lessor extent the new scientific methods and focus for the study of society. While their views may seem remarkably timid and traditional today, they were radical in their day.

The first generation of professional sociologists raised issues concerning social problems and social control. Their influence is evident, despite the distance their successors have sought, on their students and heirs in the Chicago school of the 1920's. The social disorganization theory and the ecological methods of Robert Park, Ernest Burgess and Edwin Sutherland began with W. I. Thomas and his colleagues in the original sociology department at Chicago. Clearly, they set the stage for future social scientific thought and began a debate that continues to this day concerning the connection between social science, sociologists and public policy. Ironically, foretelling the latest identity crisis in sociology by about a century, Albion Small, in an editorial called, "The Epitaph of Sociology" which appeared in the January, 1896 issue of AJS, (Small, 1896a) asserted that

a final definition of sociology has been a long felt want. The lack is now supplied. The Bibliotheca Sacra projects its view into the near future and reads from the portents that Sociology is A Passing Fad. This settles it. Let the definition be the epitaph!

Meanwhile the craze will survive in the minds of a few less discerning people than the discoverer of its futility. In the reckless spirit of those other gross and sordid souls who refuse to be diverted from their ordinary avocations by the la-
test prediction of the end of the world, we shall pursue the illusion that the study of actual men in actual social relations will continue to reward the student, and through him bless mankind at large, during a considerable portion of the twentieth century. At all events we shall not suspend publication before current subscriptions expire. (p. 509)

Perhaps the apparent fortitude of sociology in the face of 100 years of debate over identity and definition in the discipline, will comfort those concerned with sociology's latest "identity crisis" (Powell, 1995, p. 28).

Caroline Bartlett Crane

The science of sociology is in an extremely inchoate and tentative state, and...head professors do not yet agree as to some of the first principles thereof. (Caroline Bartlett Crane, 1896, p. 382)

I do not come to you...as by any means an authority on sociology. I simply wish to talk to you on the value of local study on that subject. (Caroline Bartlett Crane, ca.1897)

Sanitation and sociology must go hand in hand in their effort to improve the race. (Marion Talbot, 1896, p. 81)

The People's Church

As a Unitarian minister, Crane's first reform activities centered around the church she led in Kalamazoo, Michigan. From the beginning of her pastorate in 1889, Crane combined the social gospel and sociology in social reform. The church was based on no creed. The desire to do good was the only requirement for church membership. Crane contended that the true church should be interested in the local study of sociology. She also believed that women were naturally religious and so should help determine and resolve social problems
which she felt resulted from municipal evils ("Duties of Citizenship," 1894).

Crane felt that the church should minister to the entire community, especially the poor and working class. To facilitate this goal toward social betterment and progress she opened the church up seven days of the week, developed programs which included; a free public kindergarten (the first in Michigan), a gymnasium, classes for intellectual development, classes in manual arts for men and household science for women, free meals, evening classes for working women and a reading room ("Miss Bartlett's Church," 1896). In a sermon in 1898, Crane reminded her congregation that "this church knows nothing of the false distinctions between sacred and the secular." She went on, "the kindergarten fits here as truly as the preaching service but for the same reason--that both may help mind and soul to an expanding and beautiful life" (Annual Program, 1897, p. 54).

The church, which was renamed the People's Church in 1894 to reflect its liberal philosophy and broad institutional social scope, fulfilled many of the same social functions that were also being addressed by settlement houses of the same period (Addams, 1938; Davis, 1967). In a trend similar to other voluntary reform efforts in this period, Crane believed that the programs established by the People's Church were an experimental attempt at public service. When the program was successfully established, the city government often took over in what Paula Baker (1984) calls the domestication of politics.
Although Crane clearly believed that reform began at home, her interests went well beyond the local level. She traveled to Europe three times in the 1890s, and while in London investigated and participated in the work of the Salvation Army in the slums of London because of their plan for the social salvation of mankind. The Salvation Army did the world's first social survey in the early 1890's; and Crane, while not enthusiastic about their evangelical theology, was impressed with their philanthropic spirit and their methods. She also investigated the Toynbee Hall settlement as she attempted to find social solutions for the problems of urban America in the streets of London ("Travel Journal," 1891).

**Crane and University of Chicago Sociology**

In a further attempt to understand and ameliorate the profound social problems of the time, Crane, in 1896, enrolled in sociology classes during the summer term at the University of Chicago. Crane was a well established and respected women by the time she enrolled in sociology classes at the University of Chicago. Crane was not unique in the graduate courses at the University of Chicago. There was a wide age disparity among graduate students. Also, sociology attracted more women students than the other social sciences at Chicago, despite the fact they were usually not offered fellowships in a discipline which would train women, but not hire or place them after they completed their education (Fitzpatrick, 1990, p. 80). Indeed, the fear of a feminization of the discipline seemed to grow in
a direct relationship with the ever increasing desire for professionalism (Rosenberg, 1982; Bannister, 1987; Deegan, 1988; Fitzpatrick, 1990; Ross, 1991).

Crane enrolled in three graduate classes in the sociology department. Two, "Social Institutions of Organized Christianity" and "Economy and Governmental Agencies of Welfare" were taught by Charles Henderson. The purpose of the first course was to classify, analyze and estimate the agencies of the church for social amelioration. A tension between an older religious ideology and a newer scientific perspective is evident in Crane's class notes (see Bannister, 1987; Ross, 1991 for overviews of this transition in sociology). Even though Henderson and Crane believed they had combined theology and sociology in both theory and practice, the struggle to integrate them into a cohesive discipline is evident. Crane writes in her class notes that the Christian conception of religion is intensely social. In the class they proposed to study scripture and the history of the church to trace the efforts of religious organizations for social welfare. However, the class was also instructed that it was more important to study existing conditions and Crane's class notes emphasize the value of personal investigations.

Crane and Henderson's particular social interests overlapped very well in this course. Crane was already greatly extending the religious role of the church to secular social and reform issues in her local congregation. Henderson (1896) was also very interested in the role of religion in public assistance. He wrote that
the churches of America are awakening to a consciousness of their social responsibility for the possession of vast resources of wealth and influence. New conditions confront them, especially in cities. . . . In this new situation we turn to older communities in order to learn from their dearly-bought experience. The experiment which promises most instruction for Protestants . . . is the German Inner Mission. This term covers the work of many independent voluntary associations of members of the Evangelical state church on behalf of the dependent, the feeble and the anti-social elements of society. (pp. 583-584).

Nearly the first half of the course was devoted to the history of the church and its historical connection with social welfare. Once the social historical context had been established, the case was made, using Small and Vincent's text (1894), that sociology was valuable to the church because it gives an analysis of social facts, and sets a criteria of social well-being. According to Crane's class notes, sociology seeks to help, as well as to explain. Sociology reveals facts, and indicates ways of social helpfulness--how to carry into effect the benevolent spirit of the church. Sociology discovers the concrete good to be worked out in your town. Small and Vincent (1894) articulated the appropriate division of labor in social reform as they wrote that

the task of [s]ociology . . . is to investigate. Men enlisted in this work usually have little time, and perhaps little talent, for direct participation in the work of applying social principles to concrete social tasks. They are none the less large contributors to the final solution of the social problem. (p. 85)

This early admonition by Small and Vincent was not only a harbinger of the eventual split between sociology and social work, but also encouraged other individuals and organizations, outside of academic sociology, to undertake actual reform projects. Both individuals,
such as Crane, and organizations, such as the church, eagerly stepped into the void.

The Institutional Church

The course then concentrated on the extension of the work of the institutional church for social betterment. In this course, Crane was making a formal study of the work in which she was already involved. The activities mentioned as within the range of the institutional church covered many of the same projects that Crane had already put into effect in Kalamazoo. These efforts included; caring for physical health (especially that of children), teaching cooking, hygiene, sanitation, housekeeping, providing a gymnasium, and intellectual classes and social clubs. Against objections to this type of church by more orthodox religious perspectives, Crane noted that in opposition to the argument of desecration or sacrilege, Dr. Henderson would take the baptistery for a bathtub, if necessary. Her notes concluded that the church is set in the community to serve as it can, subject to limitations.

Crane, in class notes, made a reference to a forthcoming article in the "Journal of Sociology" which addressed this type of church. I believe the article in question to be E. M. Fairchild's "Function of the Church" which appeared in the September, 1896 issue of American Journal of Sociology. In this paper, Fairchild (1896) contended "[T]he rise of sociology is the salvation of the church, because by the application of the sociologic method the function of
the church as a social institution can be accurately defined" (p. 220).

**Sociology and Social Control**

The remainder of the course addressed more secular social issues; psychology, insanity, hysteria, and hypnotism were addressed. Mobs, fads, fashions and custom were special areas of concern. The educated professional was implicitly contrasted with the irrational mob, characterized as uneducated city dwellers incited by unwise leaders and the popular press. In an echo of the mission of the social gospel, religion was posited as a valuable means of building up self-control and independence.

Overall, the course appeared to promote public assistance both as an outgrowth of Christian ethics, but also perhaps even more importantly, as a means to diffuse a potentially violent social situation by the use of scientific investigation of needs and a systematic response to grave social distress.

The second sociology course Crane took with Professor Henderson that summer, "Economy and Governmental Agencies of Welfare" proposed to prepare the individual for social leadership and answer the burning question of the day, namely; why a separate science of sociology? According to Crane's class notes, the class would study not only why sociology was necessary, but also how it differed from other social and proof sciences. Crane wrote that even though economical and political factors come first, social questions are not purely econom-
ical or political. Sociology is a separate science (as well as an art) because it combines economic and political factors with others to create new problems of knowledge; because this combination presents new practical problems. Finally, at the individual level, a combination of economic and politics was necessary because a citizen must live life as a unit; not first as a political economist, then a biologist, then a reformer. Apparently, from this perspective, sociology would unify all of these tendencies into a holistic approach to the social world for both individuals and society.

The course also proposed to study the ethical ideal of society with a special focus on the disadvantaged classes in order to seek the highest possible development of all essential elements of human nature and the widest diffusion of the good of being. Crane's notes indicated that the central principle of the church is philanthropy, so the church should teach goodness and how to do good.

The last section of the course would investigate one of the primary concerns of the social gospel, namely "The Social Question." It would address how to help men, especially the great mass of producers enjoy more of the growing advantages of civilization. Crane noted that the labor question was only part of the social question, even for laborers. The real problem, in Crane's view, was not the raising of the few out of and above their class, but the raising of the class. The focus of the course then turned more directly to social ethics, sociology and social control. The foci of the class reflected Small & Vincent's cautious admonition that Sociology must
be constructive, not destructive (1894, p. 19). Social reform must be approached, but with care, so as not to rock the social boat.

**From Thought to Action**

After Crane returned to Kalamazoo from her sociology classes in Chicago she continued to put her ideological visions and practical sociological training into practice. She started a local group for the local study of sociology in the city of Kalamazoo, and she also helped set up similar clubs in other cities. In a speech in Milwaukee, to promote a newly formed sociological club there, Crane insisted that she came not as an expert on the subject, but simply to talk about the value of the local study of sociology. She quoted Professor Small that an understanding of society must proceed social reform. She argued ("Sociology as a Study," ca.1897), that sociology teaches us to go personally among all classes of men and women, to feel with them and for them; to observe their customs and conditions and to draw inductions from what we find. Today the greatest geologist sends his student not to books, but to rocks . . . . Thus it must be with him who would study sociology in the scientific way. It is vastly more useful to study our own social environments than conditions which are foreign to us. You are undertaking here, as we last year undertook to do in Kalamazoo, to study things at first hand.

Crane was not alone in her attempts to found local clubs for the study of sociology. Professor Zeublin, of the University of Chicago extension program, was also actively advising the group from Milwaukee.

Crane resigned from her formal clerical duties in 1898, and
when she resumed a public role two years later her emphasis shifted to municipal sanitation and public health (see Chapter II). As Crane moved from her clerical role to her civic role, from social gospel to civic gospel, she traded the church for the city as her arena of action. The study of sociology alone, was not enough. When adverse sanitary conditions were discovered during the sociological study of the city of Kalamazoo, Crane formed a group of women to help rectify the situation (see Chapter IV).

Eventually Crane would undertake scientific sociological surveys of over 60 American cities in her quest to improve public health. In one of the numerous letters written between husband and wife during her many travels (see Chapter V), Crane's husband noted that she was a pioneer in her field and celebrated the good accruing from her studies in sociology for the benefit of the communities she surveyed (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 13 May 1908, Crane papers). Crane's choices illustrate the power of a gender consciousness which emphasized women's special identity to both empower and limit women simultaneously (Dye, 1991, p. 8).

By 1910, this minister to municipalities was well on her way to national recognition as she "spread the feminine gospel of order and cleanliness" ("Woman as Municipal Housekeeper," 1910). In 1912, responding to a request for a social survey in Kansas, Crane proposed to teach classes at the university and use the city as a laboratory for students (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Richard Price, 17 June 1912, p. 1, Crane Collection). Crane lectured at the University of Wiscon-
sin in 1914 on "sanitary and sociologic surveys" to instruct other women in this field ("The City Sanitarian," 1933, p. 3). However, in a retrospective of her career done in 1933, Crane reported that her own training for her work in municipal reform was largely informal, but I contend that the legacy of her training in sociology at the University of Chicago is very evident in her life and work.

Despite her national repute in the field of municipal sanitation, Crane insisted that, "I am first and foremost a preacher--and always shall be. My work of investigation is the basis of addresses to public mass meetings in every city I visit. I feel that it is a 'ministry'..." (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Belle C. LaFollette, 14 January 1911, p. 2, Crane Collection). Crane's social gospel/sociological philosophy may best be summarized by this statement: "I would rather purify a city’s water supply than to christen all the babies. I would rather establish adequate meat and milk inspection than build a cathedral ("Rev. Mrs. Crane Speaks," 1903).

Conclusion

Sociology is ... the synthesis of all that has been learned about society. Sociology is ... the science of social ideals. (Albion W. Small and George E. Vincent, 1894, p. 54)

Many people look upon sociology as merely the study of some poetic Utopianism. With others it is ... the study which teaches merely how to help the poor and elevate the degraded. I should define it rather as that science which above all others seeks to investigate broadly all human relations in a practical way. (Caroline Bartlett Crane, ca.1897)

Crane combined her personal talents and inclinations with her training in sociology to make a name for herself as she pursued her
larger goal to make the world a better place. In this way, she re-
represented the mirror image of the earliest academic sociologists.
They also pursued personal and greater social goals in their attempt
to authenticate their professional roles and establish sociology as a
tool to improve social conditions in society.

The personal and professional life of Caroline Bartlett Crane
illustrates the close connection between the first academic sociolo-
gists and their lay counterparts in society who attempted to address
the great social issues of the day. Much of the knowledge of these
alliances has been lost through time (Deegan, 1988; Platt, 1992).
Crane worked in consultation with Henderson and Zeublin. She shared
speaking platforms with them and served on the boards of various civi-
ic associations, such as the American Civic Association and National
Consumer's League, with these early sociologists.15

The tensions between religion and science, professionals and
amateurs, and academics and activism, were evident in this period.
It was also clear, however, that it was impossible to draw strict
boundaries between them in this era. They played off each other in a
dialectical relationship which make the sociology of that time uni-
que. The points of convergence, and the places where interests did
not mesh, between Crane and the (mostly) men of the early Chicago
school, provide an intriguing picture of social ideology and reform
in America at the turn of the century. The divergence between male
and female concerns in early sociology and Progressive era reform,
suggest that had women's contributions been given greater credence,
sociology, social work and social reform may have developed in very different directions.

Summary

This chapter investigates the relationship between Progressive era social reform and the origins of American sociology with a gaze at the contributions of women in these endeavors. I examine the connections between social reformers and professional sociologists, both within and outside of academe. I observe the efforts of the first generation of sociologists to legitimate and delineate the field in the social construction of the discipline of sociology, as they attempted to combine Christianity, the social gospel and socialism into a new and unique ideology. I focus on Progressive era reformer, Caroline Bartlett Crane, Unitarian minister and student in the sociology department of the University of Chicago in 1896, to address the relationship between theology, sociology and social reform from a woman’s perspective.
CHAPTER IV

IMAGES, IDEOLOGY AND NETWORKS IN PROGRESSIVE ERA REFORM

Introduction

Please! The Women's Civic Improvement League has undertaken to keep Main Street clean. We ask YOU to help us. Please do not throw anything--paper, fruit skins, peanut shells or any other litter,--in the street; put it in the waste-paper can at the corner. And, Gentlemen, please do not spit on the sidewalk, or in the gratings, or anywhere but in the gutter. Now, please don't throw this in the street! (Women's Civic Improvement League Leaflet, 1904)

The failure of public officials to do their duty is--our failure to do ours. (Caroline Bartlett Crane, 1906b, p. 1)

The Progressive Era (1890-1920) in the United States presents an ideal opportunity to examine social thought, social images, capitalism, and the American character at a crucial point in the history of American society. Americans were self-consciously aware that they were living in an exciting and volatile period. Images of Progress, growth and prosperity proliferated in society. The 1893 World's Fair held in Chicago and the 1901 Pan American Exposition in Buffalo, New York, are but two examples of the shrines Americans erected to modernity, progress and new, apparently unlimited, frontiers.16

The language used to describe these monuments to American ingenuity and expertise is telling. Two commentators, writing nearly a century apart, extol the power of the Pan American Exposition in very similar terms. According to Sean Cashman, in his book America in the
the most spectacular building of the Pan American Exposition at Buffalo in the summer of 1901 was the central Electric Tower. It stood at the head of the Court of Fountains, rising 375 feet, the high C of the entire architectural symphony. Julian Hawthorne wrote in *Cosmopolitan Magazine* how the shaft of the Electric Tower . . . assumes a magical aspect, as if it had been summoned forth by the genius of our united people. . . and it makes a tender nuptial with the sky and seems to palpitate with beautiful life. (p. 6)

Cashman goes on to note that

the whole exposition in general and its tower in particular were intended as a potent symbol of America's industrial prowess. . . . Thus it embodied representation and reality of industrialism, imperialism, and republicanism, all at once. . . . The Electric Tower was to be the climax, representing the crowning achievement of man . . . . (pp. 6-7)

Phallic symbols representing virility and masculine prowess abound in descriptions of Progressive era American capitalism. However, the American character of the period appears to be gendered. Other, less masculine, metaphors and images also sought public attention. A good number of Americans, many of them women, recognized the dark underside of the capitalist celebration of industrialization and urbanization. Many Progressive era reformers used a more humble symbol to represent the era. Rather than grand buildings and soaring towers, reformers (especially women) used the lowly, domestic image of the broom to represent the sweeping changes they envisioned for society.

Women reformers used housekeeping metaphors to shape images and justify their mission of social housekeeping. Following many of her peers, Caroline Bartlett Crane used the older notion of true womanhood to defend her position as a new woman in public areas of soc-
Both the soaring towers and the lowly broom must be examined if we hope to comprehend the complex nature of American society in the Progressive period.

Many social reformers in the Progressive era utilized the ideology of the social gospel in their quest for social reform (see Chapter III). Crane, and many of her counterparts in academic sociology, believed that the application of Christian moral values to scientific social principles would facilitate reform and mitigate the worst effects of capitalistic inequality and injustice in society. Progressive reform in general and early American sociology in particular was greatly impacted by images of brotherhood and social salvation propagated by the social gospel movement. Images of the kingdom of God in this world rather than the next, caught the social imaginary of many social reformers, and elevated reform to a moral, as well as a social, mission. Women, with their putative caring and pure nature, were seen as especially well suited to this task. The social gospel ideology and early sociology combined to provide a rationale for social housekeeping and placed women's concerns at the heart of progressive reform.

Women in Municipal Sanitation

As argued in previous chapters, the contributions of women to Progressive era social reform, historical social thought and the social gospel movement have generally been overlooked, as most conventional scholars observed the past almost exclusively from a male-
centered perspective. The municipal sanitation movement is no exception, as accounts of that period either ignore or minimize the participation of women in Progressive movements for public health (Duffy, 1980; Melosi, 1980, 1981).17

Contemporary social thinkers now argue that it is crucial to regard "women's experience as basic, not incidental, to how we view the past" (Kerber & DeHart, 1991, p. 241). Elizabeth Clemens (1993) affirms that Progressivism "was a women's movement" (Lebsock, 1990, p. 36), despite that fact that women had little formal political power. Clemens (1993) attempts to account for this paradox, and concludes that "women's groups were a source of political change because they were marginal to the existing electoral system, but not so marginal that they were ignored by other political actors" (p. 792).

This chapter is part of an expanding acknowledgment of club-women's particular contribution to progressive social and political reform.

It now seems clear that women were central figures in progressive reform. Not only was social reform an extension of women's domestic sphere into politics, but Nancy Dye (Frankel & Dye, 1991, p. 3) suggests that reform in the era came directly out of contradictions inherent in the ideology of separate spheres.18 Ironically while capitalism and industrialism created the notion of separate spheres for men and women, women were increasingly unable to fulfill their mandate to protect their private homes and families without becoming involved in public political reform in a more modern, industrial society. A maternalist approach to social reform, in which reform was
based on notions of motherhood and/or womenhood, prevailed in the
Progressive era (Gordon, 1990, 1994; Kerber & DeHart, 1995; Koven &
Michel, 1993; Skocpol, 1992, 1995).

However, as Jill Conway (1987) argues, this adherence to a
ideology of special womanly virtue was at best a double-edged sword.
It gained women reformers access to politics, but ultimately limited
their impact as it kept them constrained within a stereotype of fem-
ininity. Even so, Karen Blair (1980) emphasizes the dialectical na-
ture of the dilemma when she notes, "[t]he seeds of Domestic Feminism
lay in the very ideal to which women aspired, for to maintain the
viability of ladydom necessitated its transcendence" (p. 4). It is
crucial to recognize the ambiguity of the ideology of "separate
spheres" in a time in which the notion was both instrumental and
prescriptive for women (Kerber, 1988, p. 26). Nancy Cott argues, as
well, that "'[w]omen's sphere' was both a point of oppression and
the point of departure for nineteenth-century feminists" (1987, p.
20). Even beyond that, this distinct female political culture was
in a state of transition during the passage from the nineteenth to
the twentieth century (Baker, 1984; Sklar, 1995b).

Caroline Bartlett Crane and the "Ladies of the Club"

Women's organizations were widespread in the Progressive era.
Not only did they serve as "the very heart of American political and
social development," but they also provided careers for many women at
a time when similar options were unavailable elsewhere (Scott, 1991,
In spite of the importance of these women's clubs and associations for social reform, however, scholars maintain that we still know very little about them (Lebsock, 1990; Scott, 1991; Skocpol, 1992). Historian Anne Firor Scott (1991) contends that despite the existence of masses of data, scholars have only recently begun to pay serious attention to this phenomenon which appeared in every part of the country, transformed the lives of thousands of individual women, provided a support system for virtually every woman of professional or political or even literary ambition, and, ... provided a safe setting in which women could begin to question the dominant ideology ... (p. 111)

Scott (1991) also laments how little we know about the actual process of social reform despite the fact that numerous sources for reconstructing the accomplishments of women's clubs are available (1991, p. 153).

The archival material of Progressive era reformer, Caroline Bartlett Crane (1858-1935) illustrates how the process looked from the inside. Although seldom remembered today, she is an exemplar of her era. As a noted social reformer in her day, at both the local and national level, in the area of municipal sanitation, her career illustrates how ideals and methods proposed in the academic arena were enacted in practice (see Chapter III). In this way, her work in municipal reform both reflects and further illuminates the social reform efforts of women, and women's club work, in the Progressive era.

The vast network of women's clubs in the Progressive period were preceded by benevolent associations and ladies literary societies founded for newly educated women, with time on their hands. Helen Hooven Santmyer's fictional account of this era, "... And
Ladies of the Club" (1982) captures the spirit of the times. One of Santmyer's (1982) characters in the novel explains her idea to some new young women college graduates in a small Ohio town.

For some time we ladies at the College . . . have been discussing the possibility of organizing a literary club in Waynesboro, a women's club, not a female circle, to meet at intervals and promote an interest in culture . . . Purely literary. All controversial subjects would be barred. (p. 18)

Soon, however, women moved from an emphasis on culture and self-improvement to community improvement. The General Federation of Women's Clubs (GFWC), founded in 1890, sanctioned the transition from personal self-enhancement to public activity (Schneider & Schneider, 1993, p. 98). The GFWC encouraged municipal sanitation on the basis of a Domestic Feminism which advocated women's unique moral values in the service her own home and the wider community.19

In the spirit of her times, Crane argued in 1894, in a speech before the Ladies Literary Club of Kalamazoo, that it was now time for the club women to stop their study of Cairo and Rome, and begin to concentrate on Chicago, or even Kalamazoo ("Duties of Citizenship," 1894). At the Third Biennial of the General Federation of Women's Clubs held in 1896 at Louisville, Kentucky, a resolution was passed urging women to investigate local conditions in their own communities in keeping with the GFWC's official projects of Practical Sociology, Practical Sanitation, Twentieth-century Problems and Practical Art (Blair, 1980, p. 101). Crane not only attended, but also gave a speech at this meeting.

Crane called on the formal training she received during socia-
ology classes in 1896 at the University of Chicago and the more informal instruction she received through her networks of women's clubs to established social clubs to study sociology in the local community. Crane's group, The Unity Club, conducted a sociological survey and presented a series of papers that investigated the city of Kalamazoo and the municipal services offered. The survey was done in consultation with Professor Charles Henderson of the sociology department at the University of Chicago. Henderson shared Crane's social gospel ideology and social reform philosophy.

As a Pragmatist (Deegan, 1996a; Feffer, 1993), Crane believed in the value of education and democracy in social reform activities. She was convinced along with her mentors in academic sociology that a scientific understanding of society must precede social reform ("Sociology as a Study," ca.1897). Crane argued that, "the club is the natural school of the adult woman; sociology in some form is the leading topic today" (1904, p. 63). She believed that what women learned through their club experiences should have practical applications for society. Crane's relationship with club women was not unique, but rather typical of women's organizations nationally.

Schneider and Schneider (1993) contend that when club members moved their sights from study to action, support from like-minded women was ready all across the country. For middle- and upper-class women, club membership had become commonplace. . . . [Club membership] had indeed reached a critical mass, a potentially powerful lobby. True these lobbyists had no vote, but within their families and in the public arena they had a voice (p. 98).
"A Woman's Place is in the Home"

Women's clubs and organizations functioned somewhat as a halfway house and gave women the opportunity to expand their private feminine sphere into the more masculine public arena in a socially approved manner. In fact, many individuals in the period held the prevailing belief that women were especially suited for social uplift and reform. The notion that all reform efforts, but especially municipal sanitation, were well within the natural domain of women, was widely accepted by men and women alike. The point is well illustrated in the introduction to historian Mary Beard's book published in 1915, Women's Work in Municipalities. Clinton Woodruff states, "[w]omen by natural instinct as well as by long training have become the housekeepers of the world, so it is only natural that they should in time become effective municipal housekeepers as well" (Beard, 1915, p. x).

Although the notion that women's sphere was in the home was widely accepted, even by ambitious women such as Crane, this sphere was greatly expanded to include the outside influences that would impact upon the home and family. How was a woman to raise a healthy family if the food supply was tainted? How was she to promote health if the water supply was bad and sewage untreated? How was she to keep a clean house when the streets outside her home were dirty? Indeed, Jane Addams (1960 [1910], p. 104) charged

...many women to-day [sic] are failing to discharge their duties to their own households properly simply because they do not perceive that as society grows more complicated it is
necessary that woman shall extend her sense of responsibility to many things outside of her own home if she would continue to preserve the home in its entirety. (p. 104)

Crane agreed and contended that the sanitary and charity aspects of municipal affairs were like housekeeping and the time was past that women were to be seen as mere auxiliaries in the battle for public health ("Duties of Citizenship," 1894).

Suffrage and Sanitation

Crane (1896) echoed a common theme in progressive reform movements when she argued that suffrage would make women better municipal housekeepers ("If Women Vote," n.d.). However, she also insisted that women did not need to wait for the vote in order to improve society ("Woman can be power without voting," 1912). Women could impact local and even national politics through their association with other like-minded women in their numerous civic organizations. While this was certainly true, Beard contended that many women became "ardent suffragists" because of disillusionment when their municipal housekeeping efforts were hampered by their lack of direct access to politics (1915, p. 47). The vote was considered to be a means to an end, rather than an end in itself.

Along with many of her contemporaries in progressive reform, Crane was involved in more than one progressive movement. Although, eventually considered to be America’s Housekeeper for her work in municipal sanitation, Crane also belonged to suffrage and temperance groups.21 She spoke before these groups and served on the boards of...
various progressive organizations. She was a part of "an extensive interlocking directorate of women leaders in the reform and suffrage movements" (Rosenburg, 1992, p. 56).

Crane worked and corresponded with women such as Jane Addams, Anna Howard Shaw, Susan B. Anthony, Carrie Chapman Catt, Florence Kelley and Charlotte Perkins Gilman; and she knew them socially. They often combined the professional and the social. Crane sometimes stayed at Hull House during visits to speak in Chicago, and she entertained many of these women in her own home during their visits to Kalamazoo.22

Crane's papers provide an privileged glimpse into the process of social reform. As a leader in progressive reform efforts, Crane used images of dirt in the streets to represent dirty politics. When Crane spoke before a mass meeting of a number of city clubs in Chicago, in 1907, on "Clean Streets in Chicago," she meant that the streets should be cleaned in both a physical and political sense, and she depended on the women in various women's clubs in her battle against both kinds of pollution ("Cleaner Chicago Prospect Bright," 1907). Her efforts to address both the health and morals of the community open Crane to the critiques of later, more scientific social investigators (see Deegan, 1988). However, her work should not be dismissed so easily. While there was a moral component to her survey investigations, still she made great efforts to use empirical evidence and the best current technical and scientific information that was available to complete her community surveys. In
this way, her work provides one more model for the later scientific investigations of the "Chicago School" of Robert Park and Ernest Burgess (Bulmer, 1984; Deegan, 1988).

Crane virtually created a new profession for herself which she felt had peculiarly feminine requirements--municipal housekeeping was simply housecleaning on a large scale ("Who but a woman?," 1910). Who, then but the ladies of the club as her natural allies (Scott, 1991) in this endeavor?

**Women Clean the Streets**

When, in 1902, Crane could not find an expert to speak to the group concerning the local meat supply, she gathered a group of prominent local women to accompany her on an unannounced tour of local slaughter-houses. They were appalled by the diseased animals and unsanitary conditions they found, not unlike Upton Sinclair's later shocking tales in *The Jungle* (1906).23 They notified the public through club meetings and newspaper accounts. When local butchers were reluctant to comply with the club women's request for a more sanitary meat supply, Crane and her group of women threatened to boycott offending establishments. They also formed a women's committee and urged the city government to act. Crane eventually helped write and pass model legislation for municipal meat inspection (Crane, 1909). From this modest start, Crane eventually became nationally known for her interest in meat inspection reform (see Chapter V).
In 1904, Crane formed the Women's Civic Improvement League in Kalamazoo to help facilitate her interest in civic reform. She drew from many existing groups to form her new organization. Some of these groups included the Ladies's Literary Association, the Twentieth Century Club, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the Black women's Celery City Club and various religious groups. The goals of the new organization were to foster public health, the general welfare and the development of out-of-door art (Crane, 1906a).

All women were invited to join, however men were only welcomed on a limited basis ("Constitution of the Kalamazoo Women's Civic Improvement League," 1904). Crane ("Caroline Bartlett Crane: Women's clubs," newsclipping, ca. 1904), explained this decision in a tongue-in-cheek quote to a local newspaper.

The gentlemen will be invited to participate, too, as associate members. Of course, we cannot grant them the ballot, but they will be most cordially upheld in using their manly influence for any and all the public measures we may decide to work for; and they may pay twice the regular fee!

A junior civic league was also formed for children in schools to instill good citizenship ideals into the next generation. Crane argued that children were future citizens, and education should include instruction in citizenship. She asked "why should not the school itself become the civic and sociological laboratory" (Crane, 1906b, p. 2)? To this end, Crane wrote songs for children promoting good citizenship and the women in the WCIL gave prizes to the junior leagues in schools for gardens (a favorite project) and civic essays by children.
Sociologist Charles Henderson and Caroline Bartlett Crane shared an environmental approach to social problems. Both envisioned a practical sociology in which research would lead to action. They also shared the notion that there should be a division of labor in social reform. Since women [read: middle/upper class white women] were the only "leisure class" in America, it was their duty to lead social reform (Henderson, 1897, p. 41). Their shared belief in the reciprocal relationship between moral character and external conditions lead directly to Crane's approach to social health and welfare.

One of the first projects of the newly founded WCIL proved to be the beginning for Crane's eventual renown in public housekeeping. Crane and the club-women, took on the task of cleaning up the streets of Kalamazoo. This project, which was later abandoned due to lack of official city support, led to national and even international media attention for Crane and Kalamazoo. Not all of the club women found media attention attractive, however. The women had convinced the city council to allow them to clean six blocks in the main business section as an demonstration of how the streets could kept cleaner, at less cost, using the system promoted by Colonel Waring, than the current method employed by the city. The women were to act as inspectors to supervise the white-winged workmen, but, when the club women heard that the yellow press intended to record the event, they all suddenly became indisposed. Crane quickly filled in, and for three months she, alone, inspected the city streets (Bennett, 1915, pp. 9-10). Clearly, sisterhood had its limits for the ladies of the
Crane’s group went beyond civil sanitation, and also branched out into charity work, in an attempt (along with many others in their era) to systematize the organization of local charity (Baker, 1984). The poor and the unemployed were the special focus of the league. Visiting nurses and housekeepers were hired and an unemployment bureau was formed. Tramps and disorderly homes were discouraged and savings accounts and useful employment were encouraged. Children were removed from abusive homes and husbands who deserted their wives were urged to return. Occasionally, these activities put the group in the middle of controversy: for example, a man who accused the group of stealing his children, threatened Crane’s life ("Parents lose the custody," 1905). Controversy also followed a Detroit Free Press newspaper account which announced that Crane’s group was advocating divorce! ("Secures divorces for women who haven’t money to do it," March 11, 1906).

Even beyond these pressures, however, was the constant effort of fund raising to support the group’s charitable functions. Most of this work fell to Crane, and in 1908, feeling overworked and under appreciated, Crane resigned from her duties in the WCIL.

Crane Hits the Road: Sanitary Surveys Across the Nation

It is perhaps no coincidence that Crane’s resignation from the local club occurred at the same time she began to extend her sanitary surveys from the local and state to the national level. Crane’s
first out of state sanitary survey was conducted in Erie, Pennsylvania in 1908, and in 1909 she made a six week social and sanitary inspection of the state of Kentucky. Her work was later written up and widely praised in the *Kentucky Medical Journal* (August, 1909). Mary Beard, in an early account of women in progressive municipal reform, maintained that a sanitary survey must precede municipal improvement, and she proclaimed that Crane was one of the "leading experts in municipal sanitation" (1915, pp. 86-87).

Crane utilized her background in academic sociology classes at the University of Chicago, and her club training in her sanitary sociological surveys. She used direct observation of the city in question, a survey questionnaire, as well as local city records and newspaper accounts to make an evaluation of municipal sanitary conditions. Typically, she would examine the water supply, sewers, street sanitation, garbage collection and disposal, milk supply, meat supply, markets, bakeries, food factories, schoolhouses, tenements, almshouses, hospitals, jails and any other municipal aspect concerning public health (Bennett, 1915, pp. 2-3).

After the survey was completed, Crane would reveal the results to city officials and citizens at a mass meeting (sometimes the crowds numbered in the thousands at these meetings) on her last night in town. Crane, then, completed a written report of her survey results when she returned home. Crane was careful to emphasize the positive aspects of each particular city before she began her suggestions for municipal improvements. Despite her tact, however, it
was often impossible not to offend inept or corrupt city officials. In the Kentucky campaign, Crane was threatened with a libel suit by one irate official, but it was dropped when the courageous president of the State Federation of Women's Clubs stood by Crane and corroborated her findings ("Biographical Sketch," ca. 1933). Strong local, and occasionally national, ridicule sometimes came her way, but for the most part her social surveys were accepted with great enthusiasm and demands for her services spread.

Crane's extensive use of social surveys put her in the mainstream of sociology and social reform in the period, an era in which social surveys had become so common that Gordon maintains they could be called a "social movement" (1994, p. 170). Crane's methodology and social reform exemplify the transition in sociology, methodology and social research in that period. She was a transitional figure in the movement in sociology toward ever greater professionalism, quantification and objectivity (Bannister, 1987; Bulmer 1984; Faris 1967; Ross, 1991).

At the peak of her career in municipal sanitation, Crane charged $100 a day for her services. While Crane took great pride in her achievements and fame, the driving force behind her efforts remained a desire for social reform. By 1910, Crane was well on her way to national recognition. Despite her personal recognition and public acclaim, however, club-women were the crucial impetus behind her success in municipal reform.26

Usually, club-women extended the invitation for Crane to per-
form a sanitary survey of a community. Women, often had to overcome apathy and even resistance on the part of city officials before Crane's inspection could be sanctioned and funded. Crane, not wanting to be seen as a meddler, refused any invitation without official approval. She often came at the combined invitation of club women and the state board of health. Although she felt that municipal sanitation was well suited to women, Crane did not wish her campaigns for public health to be seen as solely women's concerns (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Isabel Higbee, 21 September 1910, p. 4, Crane Collection). However, one club woman, the President of the Minnesota federation of Women's Clubs, voiced doubt whether men could be trusted to actually accomplish these vital tasks. She writes, "I am giving the men to understand that it is their affair but I have a big mental reservation and am most watchful" (Isabell Higbee to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 20 October 1910, p. 1, Crane Collection).

Crane advised the club women on how to fund the surveys and promote and publicize her visits. Crane's correspondence indicates that arrangements did not always go smoothly, and ruffled feathers were sometimes in evidence as various women and clubs vied for Crane's time and attention. In fact, in one letter to her husband, Crane lamented that her experience with a "certain suffragist here will send me home an anti" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 9 March 1911, p. 2, Crane Collection).

Crane's network of club women both facilitated and complicated her work. Many of the women she worked with were affiliated with the
most influential men in the community. This both advanced and hindered her sanitary surveys. These were women who were well-connected and well respected in their communities. This gave them access to power and authority beyond their own, but also led directly to complicated conflicts of interest.

For example, in Crane’s sanitary survey of Rochester, Minnesota she was forced to confront her hosts, Dr. and Mrs. Charles Mayo, with the unhappy news that the water supply to their clinic was tainted. Crane writes of her dilemma to her husband, "[t]he Mayos don’t want a word to go out against the water which is used in their great hospital and in all the hotels that house their patients. I think, also that they have stock in the water company" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 23 October 1910, pp. 6-7, Crane Collection). Not only had the good doctor and his wife accompanied Crane on her survey of their city, but they also entertained her in their home and were responsible for her visit to survey their city. Nevertheless, Crane honestly reported her findings, and the water supply to the Mayo Clinic was improved with no hard feelings. This example underscores the ambiguous impact of networks in the transition of reform efforts, from voluntary to expert and scientific, in the Progressive era.

The club women’s endeavors in Crane’s sanitary surveys went well beyond organization and fund raising, however. In a 1912 speech before the General Federation of Women’s Clubs in San Francisco, Crane outlined the cooperation between state boards of health and
state federations of women's clubs in the field of municipal housekeeping. She goes on to cite the extensive role of club women in her own work. She states:

[under the general supervision of the State Federation, the federated clubs in the various cities made all the local arrangements, collected and forwarded to me in advance certain required data. . . . The clubs also collected from city officials and other persons, signed replies to more than a hundred questions concerning their city's income, expenditures and resources . . . and a great quantity of general statistical information which it was important for me to have before undertaking a personal study of local conditions. The women who have personally undertaken this part of the work have told me that it gave them invaluable insight into the problems of municipal administration. . . . On the tours of inspection I was accompanied by local (and sometimes state) officials, and by members of the board of education and various organizations . . . and always by committees of the women's clubs.

Crane's relationship with club-women is ambiguous. She both used them as unpaid research assistants and enhanced their ability and confidence to impact social reform in their community long after Crane's official visit was over. In the spirit of other women's reformers in the period, Crane and her club-women counterparts intended the results of her surveys to be used for community betterment in the city in which it was collected, not simply to increase social knowledge, a function that research data would increasingly be seen to fill in the social sciences (Deegan, 1988, p. 35).

**Toward Praxis**

How some middle-class women "transformed philanthropy into reform" in their effort to empower themselves as they influenced society, is a significant social, political and historical question
concerning the paradoxical Progressive era (Sklar, 1988, p. 177). Crane's life and work provides some insight into this challenge. Her career also illustrates the process in which politics became domesticated in American society (Baker, 1984), and accentuates the contradiction of women's success in social reform. In the name of women's special interests and abilities, women successfully promoted many reforms. However, these very victories eventually resulted in their exclusion from the political realm as their activities were increasingly taken over, often with their encouragement and approval, by the government. Many of Crane's reform activities in Kalamazoo met this same fate, often with her blessing.

As organized women moved from tradition to science, and embraced the methods of the new social sciences in their efforts for social reform, they "surrendered to government functions that had belonged to the woman's sphere" (Baker, 1984, p. 644). Paula Baker maintains that this new found faith in science and experts devalued voluntary work, and led to the recognition that "municipal housekeepers" could not solve grave social problems on their own at the local level, but needed the help of government to attack the root causes, rather than merely the symptoms (1984, pp. 640-641). In the process they enhanced social reform, but became politically fragmented as the lines between public and private became increasingly blurred in the Progressive period.

Ironically, Crane eventually became a victim of her own success, as well. In her role as a national expert on municipal san-
sanitation, she set the stage for ever more scientific and professional social surveys in the future. That role soon fell to academic social researchers affiliated with a professional institution as the crusade for social reform was replaced by a quest for objective social knowledge (Bannister, 1987; Bulmer, 1984; Faris, 1967; Ross, 1991).

Whither Club-Women

In a speech before the General Federation of Women's Club meeting in 1896, Crane argued that "[t]he most extraordinary phenomenon of to-day [sic] is women's progress along the lines of associated activity" (Crane, 1896). She believed that women together could accomplish much more than a woman alone. Not unlike many other women of her time, however, Crane was ambivalent about women and club work. She cautioned often about the dangers of excessive work in reform efforts. In fact, she blamed her own breakdown in health early in her career to the "folly of overwork" (Crane, 1900). Perhaps, to forestall criticism against club women leveled by many (especially worried men) in society, she warned club women not to neglect their own homes in an attempt to save their larger home, the social world.

Still, Crane both exemplifies and expands the notion of "Domestic Feminism" when she states in an article on club women for The Journal of the Michigan State Medical Society (April, 1908b).

[T]here is an ancient idea, still in fairly good health and reputation, that woman's sphere lies strictly within the precincts of the home; that the whole duty of woman is comprised in the operations of housekeeping and home-making, which in-
clude looking after the physical and moral welfare of the fam-
ily.

Just as these traditional occupations have been escaping from
the home into the outside world, so new shapes from the outside
world have invaded the home, attacked the home; have, in truth,
rendered it impossible for even the most domestic and devoted
woman to keep a really clear and wholesome home.

The germ-laden dust from dirty streets invades our homes; im-
pure water, infected milk, diseased beef, bring poison to the
best appointed family board; and so on, and so on. And women
are beginning everywhere to see these things, and to all sug-
gestions, polite or otherwise, that they should mind their own
business and keep in their own sphere, they are gaining courage
to answer after the manner of one woman who, when reproached in
this fashion for pernicious activity in the interests of pure
milk, replied: 'Sir, I would have you understand that woman's
sphere extends not only outside of the home but inside of the
baby.'

Women are no longer content to take what derelicts of life are
tossed to their care, and patch and ameliorate, a little here,
a little there. They want to help attack the causes of human
misery at their deep foundations, and to do vital, reconstruc-
tive work. And doing this they will come full circle back
again to the sphere of the home; the home which is indeed to
be the battleground of this great war in which men and wom-
en must fight always together (Crane, 1908b).

This speech sounds much more revolutionary that the concept of Dom-
estic Feminism, as typically exemplified by Crane and her era, would
allow.

Domestic Feminism: Progressive or Regressive?

Cott (1987) calls attention to the shifting images and ideolo-
gical tensions among women in the Progressive period. In one early
sociological investigation of the changing role of women in the per-
iod, the tensions between feminist ideology, as expressed by a desire
for women's suffrage, and the more traditional ideology of domestic
feminism, especially as represented in the municipal sanitation movement were examined. Sophonisba Breckinridge noted that by 1910 The General Federation of Women's Clubs claimed over 800,000 members. However, there were wide divisions between members regarding these women's issues. The question of women's suffrage was not even presented at a Biennial meeting of the GFWC's until 1910, and there was much opposition to suffrage within the large organization (Breckinridge, 1972 [1933], pp. 30-32). This indicates that there were not only ideological differences between women's organizations, as maintained by Susan Marshall (1985) in her insightful analysis of Progressive era suffrage and anti-suffrage organizations, but also within women's organizations, themselves.

The conservative tone acknowledged by Breckinridge (1972 [1933]) in the early 20th century women's organizations may help explain the cautious appeal for women's suffrage advanced even by progressive women such as Crane. Ellen DuBois (1978; 1987) points to the radical implication of suffrage on the commonly held ideal of separate spheres. This perceived threat to the status quo may in large part explain the conservative rationale given for women's suffrage by "Domestic Feminists" of the era (Kraditor, 1965). The ambiguous, and increasingly conservative, ideological climate of the era underscores the necessity of clothing the rhetoric of women's rights in the wardrobe of Domestic Feminism. Indeed, by the 1920's the General Federation of Women's Clubs reversed its earlier emphasis on social reform in favor of the home economics movement (Rosenberg,
1992, p. 100). Crane’s career illustrates the contention that the relatively conservative rhetoric of domestic feminism may have been based as much on expediency as ideology.

Indeed, many of these women were perceived as so dangerous to society that they were listed in the infamous 1920’s “Spider Web” conspiracy charts which charged many woman reformers and women’s organizations in that era with communist tendencies (see Cott, 1987). Crane was accused of these charges, along with many of her contemporaries. She strongly and successfully defended herself, and her colleagues, against these unfounded accusations. However, the fact that the actions of these women reformers were apparently seen as dangerous to the conservative status quo, should compel contemporary critics to see these women in a new, and possibly more favorable, light.

Consciously, or not, Crane and other reformers often used private, domestic images to promote women’s issues in the public sector. The tensions between these two extremes surfaced over and over again in Crane’s personal and professional life. These ambiguities make it difficult, today, to interpret and evaluate the goals, motivations and even the accomplishments of these women.

The reluctance of feminists today to acknowledge the early women involved in the progressive era reform movements of municipal sanitation because their efforts appear timid and/or hopelessly tied to a ideology of women’s sphere, is short sighted. This critical view misses the fact that these women accomplished a great deal, de-
spite severe social and political handicaps. Their efforts foreshadow the new social movements of today, such as the consumer and the ecology movements.

Ironically, while domestic feminists often gave lip service to a somewhat docile public posture, many women reformers in that era were not afraid to attack either corrupt government officials or big business. In a GFWC address in 1912, Crane directly challenged both the government and big business in the name of the homes and lives of our people (Crane, 1912). An emphasis which recognizes the ambiguity of ideology and rhetoric in that period, combined with a closer examination of the actions and accomplishments of actual women reformers in the municipal sanitation movement, facilitates a greater understanding of women and reform in the Progressive era.

Conclusion

Cott (1987) eloquently notes the ideological paradox facing women reformers in the Progressive era. She writes that "although the gender differences marked out were conventional--defining women as mothers, housekeepers, and caregivers--turning these stereotypes to serve goals of equal access and equal rights minimized their constraints" (p. 30).

Contemporary scholars are correct to note the maternalist emphasis of early social feminists privileged gender at the expense of race and class. This is certainly a valid critique. Crane, and many other women reformers, typically subsumed race and class differences
under the mantle of motherhood-womanhood in social reform and the rubric of universal brotherhood in the social gospel movement. The ties which connect individuals into the community were uncritically valorized over the very real racial and class inequalities which divide society. However, a closer examination of white, middle-class women reformers in the Progressive era presents a more complicated reading of the period. Scholars, today, should hesitate to invalidate a whole generation of women reformers for their (to our contemporary eyes) elitist and racist sins.

An analysis of the life of a particular woman, such as Crane, in connection with her work with many women in her time, illuminates the power of domestic images in Progressive reform to both empower and constrain women. The image of woman as social housekeeper allowed women such as Crane to widely enlarge their field of interest, while it also encouraged women to remain within certain cultural and social boundaries. It is difficult to assess the relative benefits and impediments of the ideology of domestic feminism in Progressive reform, but it is likely they played off each other in a dynamic manner and account for the proliferation of reform activity by women in the Progressive era.

There are many parallels between feminist constraints and opportunities, then and now. While our vision is clouded by physical time and ideological distance, contemporary feminists should acknowledge the aspirations and achievements, as well as the shortcomings, of the currently somewhat disdained "Domestic Feminists" of the ear-
lier era.

Summary

This chapter examines social images and social action of women reformers in the Progressive era. I focus on Crane's use of the "Social Imaginary" in the mobilization of club-women for municipal reform. Although I acknowledge the power of the imaginary, I also illustrate the dialectics of praxis: the real problems women reformers faced in their attempts to use prevailing cultural images of women and the new academic sociological theories to improve municipal sanitation. Crane's career, bears witness to the past and gives lessons for the present/future, as it illuminates both women's associations and municipal reform. It, also, exemplifies the force of social images and depicts how social ideals and methods, proposed in the academic arena, were actually put into practice in the community.
CHAPTER V

PUBLIC VISIONS AND PRIVATE NIGHTMARES: A PRIVILEGED LOOK AT PROGRESSIVE ERA REFORM

Introduction

You are one of the great forces of your day and generation. . . . (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 1909, p. 1)

Oh, I need you so. They are all against me, it seems. (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 1909, p. 1)

As we approach the end of the 20th century, our thoughts turn both forward and backward. An examination of the Progressive era (1890-1920) allows us to explore the opportunities and constraints of social change in contemporary society from a sociohistorical perspective. While, conventional accounts of the Progressive era tend to neglect the contributions of women in Progressive reform. More recent feminist scholarship has reversed the traditional masculine orientation toward Progressive social reform (see Chapter II). Indeed, the growing literature on the period suggests that women were central to Progressive reform. However, little is still known about the private motivations and personal inspiration behind the public face of progressive social reform.

Private Thoughts and Public Action

Using the personal and public papers of noted Progressive era reformer, Caroline Bartlett Crane I address the irony, paradox and
dialectical nature of progressive reform. Crane was active in many aspects of Progressive reform, but she eventually became widely known as an expert in municipal sanitation and public health (see Chapter IV).

In previous chapters, I explored Crane's ideological impetus for social reform, analyzed her relationship with early social thinkers in the field, and observed how she put her ideological beliefs into practice with the invaluable assistance of a network of like-minded women in the vast number of women's clubs of the era. These areas of social reform have not been adequately addressed in sociological research (Deegan, 1988; McDonald, 1994; Scott, 1991).

In this chapter, I examine an even more obscure aspect of Progressive era reform: the private and personal side of reform. While it is widely acknowledged that the personal relationships of professional women in Progressive reform greatly influenced their life and work, still Barbara Kuhn Campbell maintains, "few historians have explored marriage relationships between particular husbands and wives" (1979, p. xii). Barbara Sicherman (1975) has argued, as well, that historians have typically neglected the subject of marriage and intimate relationships, and calls for more sociohistorical research in the area of the changing domestic sphere (1975, pp. 474-475).

This lacuna may be the result of the traditional perspective that public actions, rather than private reflections, are the true subject matter of sociohistorical research. It may also be the case
that public acts are more accessible to researchers than the private thoughts, feelings and deeds of individuals under study. Crane's archival material contains her public papers, personal recollections and private letters. This source provides a privileged view of the triumphs and troubles inherent in Progressive Era reform.

While an emphasis on the public side of women's role in progressive social reform is certainly important, in addition to attention to Crane's professional relationships, a close examination of Crane's personal relationship with her husband makes a crucial contribution to a fuller understanding of her career in Progressive reform. Closer scrutiny of the private sphere, facilitates a broader view of the inter-relationships between men and women in the Progressive Era. One study of the period concludes that while prominent married women reformers identified themselves on the basis of their own accomplishments, the attitudes of their husbands toward their reform efforts were crucial to their productivity and achievements (Campbell, 1979, p. 77).

Often analysis of the period presents the material from either a male or female perspective. I assert that a more useful approach explores the interface between men's and women's political culture (Sklar, 1995a, 1995b). Whether in the public sphere of politics or the private space of domestic life, an analysis which illustrates how doing gender was central to Progressive reform is essential for a more discerning examination of the role of women and men in social reform in the early Twentieth century (Kerber & De-
Methodological Approach: Or How to Peek "Backstage"

Much of this chapter is based on a selection of letters written between Caroline Bartlett Crane and her husband, Augustus, during the years of their courtship and marriage ca. 1894-1935. Crane traveled often during her career in social reform, and the voluminous correspondence between Crane and her husband leaves a remarkable record of the private side of progressive reform. Elizabeth Hampsten (1982) emphasizes the importance of a glimpse at the private world of women through their letters, diaries and other reminiscences. This not only allows us to study a side of women's lives that might not otherwise be accessible, but it also makes it possible to see the world through their eyes (see Alpern, Antler, Israelis, & Scobie, 1992; Barbre, 1989; Scott, 1984). Of course, it must be acknowledged that memory, representation, interpretations, and reinterpretations are, at the very best, elusive, fluid, fragile and partial.28

Victor Skretkowicz (1996) warns of the inherent danger of interpretations of textual material written in one era, by readers in another. He contends, that even beyond these problems of representation and reinterpretation, the analysis of letters present special problems. Skretkowicz (1996) notes,

a letter as a medium of expression, however, stands alone, even though it may be written simultaneously with others. It generates from within the author's cultural medium and experience, and is interpreted within the recipient's. Neither the editor nor the reader can pretend to either of these (1996, p. 1).
It is evident that private correspondence presents both special opportunities and constraints as a data source. One obvious solution would be to print the letters in sequence and in their entirety and allow the ultimate reader to draw her/his own conclusions. However, this is seldom possible. It is certainly beyond the scope of this chapter. Therefore, the reader is reminded that the letters were chosen and excerpted in a reflexive and purposeful, but somewhat arbitrary, manner. Consequently, they reflect a mediated examination of Crane's correspondence, and not some ultimate truth, even though they offer a privileged view into Crane's private thoughts and inner-most feelings.

Scholars in the future will not have the benefits of letters written and records saved in hard copy. In an age of telephones, disposable fax and e-mail, the private side of relationships will likely be more difficult to glean for the future sociohistorian. However, in Crane's era of twice-a-day mail service and the telegraph, a good written record is still available. Crane was a serious correspondent, and she expected (and usually received) at least one letter a day from her busy husband when she was on the road. Augustus Crane was also a fairly fervent letter writer, however on one occasion, his usual good humor deserted him and he wrote Caroline that if she expected to receive "poly-paged letters you should have married a woman," but he then went on to placate her claiming that he had written a long letter and sent it to the wrong place (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 14 June 1906, p.
It is especially interesting to compare the private letters with the public records (Sklar, 1988) of Caroline Bartlett Crane's reform activities. These letters also help evaluate the motivation behind reform, and the private ideology that fuels public reform action. The strategies, rationalizations and emotions in her private records aid in peering behind the public face of social reform, and shed some light on questions concerning motives, aspirations and achievements in progressive reform efforts.

Crane's private papers which have survived appear to be a fair representation of her role in the Progressive era. There does not seem to have been a specific purge of any particular papers either private or public, as both the triumphs and trials of social reform are faithfully recorded. There are both love letters and evidence of marital conflict, and while the papers which present Crane and her work in a positive light may be over represented, records which are critical or less flattering have also survived. On one extremely derogatory news editorial, Caroline wrote in the margin, "a brickbat for me." ("Mrs. Crane reformer and lecturer," March 14, 1909.)

The only apparent breach in the correspondence is during the period of Caroline's courtship, early marriage and recuperation after her abrupt resignation from the ministry in 1898. Augustus's letters to Caroline have survived, but there is only one letter from Caroline to Augustus in the archive dated between ca. 1894-1905. This unusual breach lends itself to numerous provocative conclusions, but the gap,
itself, may be as telling in its own way as the correspondence (which I am assuming existed at one time based on Caroline’s proclivity toward letter writing later in her life) would have been if it had survived.

Love and Marriage Progressive-Style

The marriage relationship in the Progressive period was a microcosm of the redefinition of male and female identity, and masculine and feminine roles that were being played out in the larger society during this time of transition and revision in social thought and action. The inherent nature of men and women was called into question, and the traditional rules of domesticity were under contention. Higher education and more career opportunities for women challenged the traditional domestic image of woman.

Many educated and professional women of the era opted to forego marriage, as marriage and a professional career were presumed to be incompatible (Solomon, 1985). One compromise was a new type of marriage relationship developed by the middle-classes in the nineteenth century. Companionate marriage, in contrast to marriage in the Victorian era, was based on love and companionship between the marriage partners, rather than the hierarchial nature of marriage in earlier periods (Lebsock, 1984; Schneider & Schneider 1993).

Crane was caught between conflicting currents of thought on this issue. Caroline did not seek out matrimony, but rather spent her energy and concerns on her clerical career and social reform.
efforts. She was a highly successful and well-known woman when, after much soul-searching, Caroline married Dr. Augustus Crane in 1896. Material from that period indicates that she was ambiguous, at best, about combining marriage and her career. Years later, in a strangely evocative letter to Augustus (whom she called Warren or simply HIM), Caroline recounts a dream in which Augustus "held me, kissed me against my will...pursued, haunted me," and appears to connect this dream to the "stormy, dreadful years" of their courtship (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 18 November 1908, p. 4, Crane Collection).

One intriguing letter exchange later in their marriage again alludes to a troubled courtship and celebrates a triumphant marriage. Caroline affirms that the dress rehearsal letter written by Augustus (2 March 1913) "made me live over the dreadful storm period of our engagement and the delirious success of the real thing" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 7 March 1913, pp. 1-2, Crane Collection). It is apparent that despite Caroline's initial reservations, from the time of their unusual wedding on New Years Eve 1896, until the end of Caroline's life in 1935, the marriage appeared to be a match made in heaven.

In this sense, Crane was more fortunate than many other professional, educated women in her cohort, in which the divorce rate was more than double the rate for more average women in the population at the time (Campbell, 1979, p. 80).
Love, Honor and Obey?

Caroline's friend and colleague from Chicago, the Reverend Jenkin Lloyd Jones performed their highly unorthodox marriage ceremony. In a move that seems oddly ahead of their time, the couple wrote their own wedding vows, and from the first appeared to structure their union to their own personal, rather than societal, expectations. Their simple, yet often eloquent, wedding vows are a strange combination of modern and conventional views concerning marriage. However, the traditional vow to love, honor and obey is conspicuously absent. In four short hand-written pages Caroline and Warren exchange their wedding vows. Yet, even in this most private moment, they also acknowledge the larger social world, they pledge, "we do join our lives and open our hearts to the tides of joy and sorrow that sweep 'round [sic] the world" ("Wedding Vows," 1896. p. 3).

The fact that Caroline was ten years older than her new husband must also have caused some comment in the community, however her relatively late age (she was thirty-eight) at marriage was quite typical for her educational level and professional cohort where the average age at marriage was over twenty-six years of age (Campbell, 1979, p. 76).

"Women's Work" & "Men's Work" in Progressive Reform

According to the letters exchanged between Caroline and her husband during her career in social reform, it is apparent that Au-
gustus gave Caroline both emotional and technical support. As a trained physician, Augustus Crane was well placed to take advantage of the new discoveries, progress and prestige in the field of medicine during that era. Robert Wiebe contends that "the new doctors descended upon the cities and towns with a scientific gospel" and in the process created a new field of public health (1967, p. 115). He neglects, however, to acknowledge that many of the new physicians in public health were women (one of the few fields of medicine open to them), and that the quest for healthier communities was often lead by women, many of them self-taught experts such as Caroline Bartlett Crane.

Caroline’s efforts to improve the food and water supply, sewage treatment, physical environment, and public facilities such as prisons, schools and poor-houses, can be seen to be a direct response to larger social concerns about public health and social justice. Augustus did little to work directly for public health, but greatly aided Caroline in her personal study and public investigations. In this way, he was typical of many of the professional husbands of prominent women of the era who introduced their spouses to their particular form of progressive reform (Campbell, 1979, p. 79).

There was also, occasionally, a down side to this propensity toward shared interests between some women reformers and their husbands. Campbell suggests that "discrepancies in talent" could strain marriages (1979, p. 80). It seems likely, as well, that a wife who became more famous than her husband, would also face personal and
public problems in that era. Letters between Caroline and Augustus suggest that they faced many of these issues in their marriage, and the private strategies they used to overcome these concerns augment the public features of social reform.

Even though their lifestyle appears somewhat unconventional even by current standards, Caroline and Augustus were concerned not only with their private relationship, but also with the public perception of their marriage. Ironically, on a trip to attend the National Divorce Congress in 1906, Caroline writes to Augustus and assures him that she "lives in his love and love letters," but worries about what people say about her leaving him so often (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 17 February 1906, p. 2, Crane Collection). In reply, Augustus appears more concerned that her growing prominence will keep them apart, rather than with public opinion (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 22 February 1906, Crane Collection).

On her way to Pennsylvania in 1908 for a meeting of the national American Civic Association (Crane was a member of the executive board) and her first sanitary survey in Erie, PA., Caroline writes that she "must not go away so much, what shall we do?" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 10 November 1908, p. 2, Crane Collection). He responds with a letter of reassurance, and encourages Caroline by asserting, "you are a force in the world" (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 11 November 1908, p. 1, Crane Collection).
Caroline, in turn, answers with a letter which is very suggestive about the personal and public nature of their relationship. She playfully laments the "choice lot of specialties I have collected, dirty streets, meat inspections, poor houses!" Caroline writes that she feels "too separated" lately, but knows that Augustus will help her through the "throes of meat inspection" when she returns. She ends with a wifely reminder for Augustus to purchase winter underwear so that she will not find her wild if not woolly husband unprepared for winter when she returns (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 16 November 1908, p. 7, Crane Collection).

Augustus writes that Caroline has his love and admiration. He notes that she is a "woman of power" and a "sweet charming women," both of which he loves (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 17 November 1908, p. 1, Crane Collection). Augustus called Caroline a star and wrote that he loved her in spite of her brilliance and because of it (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 14 February 1906, p. 2, Crane Collection). Caroline Bartlett Crane's biographer suggests that Augustus found Caroline's combination of a domestic private persona and more dominant public role to be sexually stimulating (Rickard, 1994, p. 168). Whatever the source, there are numerous references in their private papers which indicate that Caroline and Augustus shared a loving and sexually passionate relationship.

Often, their letters must have crossed in the mail. Augustus writes, "how interesting our life is. It is literally too full for
the time we have each day" (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 18 November 1908, p. 5, Crane Collection). And Caroline declares, "I live on your letters, dear" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 18 November 1908, p. 3, Crane Collection). Later, Caroline wrote of the zest she found in the study of a new community, and Augustus responded that she was a "doctor of civic maladies" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 20 November 1908, p. 3; and Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 23 November 1908, p. 3, Crane Collection).

Crane's relationship with her husband is especially evident concerning her first state-wide sanitary survey of Kentucky in 1909. When Augustus first heard about the proposed trip (while Caroline was out of town on another survey) he uncharacteristically refused to let Caroline accept the offer. In a petulant letter he wrote that he "can't give his consent" to the trip, and if she had already agreed, she was to tell them she could not go because of her husband. He also added that he would be humiliated by public sympathy, since it was already necessary for him to justify her shorter trips to others.

He concluded that he feared that she might not seem quite the same to him again, after this proposed trip, and he had even begun to question the whole issue of equal suffrage, which he used to favor (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 10 March 1909, pp. 3-4, 1, Crane Collection). Caroline responded that "your letter astonishes me." She placated him and suggested that they discuss the
issue when she returned home (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 12 March 1909, p. 1, Crane Collection).

Shortly thereafter, Crane was on her way to Kentucky, and Augustus was again singing Caroline's praises. He writes, "you are making history and have one of the greatest careers of the time, maybe ever. . .[I] must not stand in your way" (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 16 May 1909, p. 1, Crane Collection). Caroline responds with some of the most euphoric letters of her career. She writes of the "most tremendous day of my life," and exalts "yesterday I tasted power as never before in all my life, and it was sweet too." She also notes that her husband's last letters were "filled with passion for me, my cause--our cause" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 26 May 1909, p. 1; 31 May 1909, pp. 1-2; 1 June 1909, p. 2, Crane Collection).

In one letter, Augustus acknowledged that he was lonely during her absence, but he acknowledged her splendid work and reputation and declared Caroline had no rivals in her field. Their approach to teamwork is also evident in this letter when Augustus asserts that Caroline's great reputation, like great wealth was a great responsibility, and he concludes, "you have achieved one, I ought to achieve the other" (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 16 March 1910, p. 1, Crane Collection).

Although Caroline eventually became known as a municipal expert in public health issues, she always acknowledged her husband's contribution to her work, at least privately. She wrote Augustus during
her sanitary survey in Kentucky, that "yours is the wonderful mind" and conceded that she received the credit for ideas he gave her (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 12 June 1909, p. 2, Crane Collection). Clearly both Caroline and her husband encouraged each other and shared an interest in the career the other. Augustus (a pioneer radiologist) claimed he had done two things well in his life; married the best woman in the world and taken the best x-rays (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 17 January 1909, p. 4, Crane Collection). At the end of her successful statewide survey of Kentucky, Caroline admitted that she was proud of herself, and acknowledged to Augustus that "with your precious help" she had made thousands of friends and only a few enemies (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 8 June 1909, p. 1, Crane Collection).

She also promised never to be gone for such a long period, or to get mixed up in politics, again (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 12 June 1909, p. 3, Crane Collection). While she was not able to completely keep those promises, she did attempt to limit her time away from home to two months a year (Bennett 1915, p. 44). Indeed, in a letter written to refuse a proposed extensive sanitary survey of numerous western states and Hawaii, Crane chided Dr. MacCormack that she could not be gone from home so long; she maintained that he had obviously failed to note that she was married, and glad of it (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Ellen Fish, 4 November 1911, p. 1, Crane Collection).
The Brown Thrush

In an further attempt to steal some time together from the demands of their busy careers (and perhaps to occasionally elude Augustus's mother who lived with them), Caroline and Augustus Crane built a private vacation retreat at Gull Lake, a small lake near their home and medical office in Kalamazoo. Caroline and Augustus considered their cottage, "The Brown Thrush," to be their special refuge from a busy social and professional life.

As a woman who must balance many roles, in a time in which these roles were still under contention, the retreat to her summer place must have been crucial to Caroline. Many busy, professional women of Caroline's era, spent some time away each year in an attempt to deal with personal and professional tensions (Alpern, et al., 1992). Some shared their leisure with other women, and Caroline was involved with an extensive network of the prominent women of her day. But for Caroline, the "Brown Thrush" was a place to escape the world with her husband. In one letter, Augustus writes Caroline; "don't make any unexpected engagements. I have engaged you for all the summer" (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 27 May 1911, p. 1, Crane Collection). Later, during one of Caroline's endless attempts to improve federal meat inspection, Augustus laments, "I love you and wish you were home inspecting me" (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 5 March 1912, p. 3, Crane Collection).
**Progressive Visions and Personal Nightmares**

Although, in letters to her husband, Crane was often able to celebrate the small victories and heady triumphs of their shared visions for progressive reform, there were also periods of deep desperation. If on May 26, 1909, Caroline was acclaiming the most tremendous day of her life, by October 22, 1909 she was recounting her despair over the "most embittering day of [her] life" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 22 October 1909, p. 1, Crane Collection).

In her continuing interest to improve meat inspection, Caroline attempted to reveal what she believed to be collusion between meat packers and governmental inspectors at the American Public Health Association (1909) convention. Not only did the APHA executive committee refuse to examine Crane's documentation of alleged abuses, but press articles challenged Crane's credibility. Crane believed that her mission had failed and her reputation was damaged. As she was attempting to get her side of the story out to the public, against in her view, the wishes of some powerful government officials and meat packing interests, Crane met great resistance. She felt utterly defeated.

On her despondent train trip back home, in a nervous state of great emotional distress, Crane experienced hallucinations, visions and "sudden waves of unconsciousness" in which her lofty public dreams of a better world turned into private nightmares. Crane, who could neither eat nor sleep, prayed and sobbed "help me." Later, on
her journey, she wrote of her experience to her husband, but decided not to mail the letter. Instead, she gave it to Augustus personally, when she returned home so as not to unduly distress him concerning her state of mind (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 22 October 1909, pp. 4, 1, Crane Collection). In her extreme moment of anguish, Augustus was her life-line, even at long distance.

The spiritual crisis and physical exhaustion passed, and Crane continued to receive wide praise and renown for her work in Progressive reform. Nevertheless, this incident serves to remind us of the costs, as well as the victories, experienced by women reformers in the Progressive Era. This intense episode illustrates the discrepancy between the public and the private persona of public figures and the support network behind the scenes for prominent individuals. The personal relationship between Crane and her husband help clarify the reform efforts of women and men, both separately and together, in the Progressive era.

In private letters to her husband, Caroline shared her exhilaration at a good press notice or a well received speech. She also shared her frustration at political infighting during congressional hearings, meetings of reform organizations and women's suffrage conventions. Caroline expressed her indignation at the treatment women received from male spectators during a large suffrage parade in 1913. An angry Caroline wrote, "I don't think so well as I did of men as a class. I am afraid I rather despise them" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 4 March 1913, p. 3, Crane Collection). In
return, Augustus consoled Caroline regarding what he called the "suffering-yet parade" (Augustus Warren Crane, 5 March 1913, p. 1, Crane Collection).

While she was occasionally dubious about men as a class, Caroline's letters to Augustus also indicate an ambivalence in her views regarding women. In one letter in which she was distressed over quarrels and jealousies at the National American Woman's Suffrage Association convention (1911), Caroline lamented to Augustus that she was "so disappointed in women--some women. I certainly am not like that" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 23 October 1911, p. 1, Crane Collection).

However, she also wrote, after a speech on meat inspection at another suffrage convention, "[i]f I can get the women stirred up and I think I can, something will happen." She goes on to exclaim, "[t]here are so many big, splendid women. I am glad I know and love so many of them" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 5 July 1912, pp. 1-2, Crane Collection). Augustus writes back to commiserate with Caroline that the "failure of the federation to pass a suffrage motion expressed Mrs. Moore's opinion--not that of the federation" (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 7 July 1912, p. 1, Crane Collection). Clearly the fight for women's suffrage was not considered to be exclusively a woman's issue, but was perceived as an important social, political and moral goal by both Caroline and Augustus.

Caroline often acknowledged the importance of her private
correspondence for her public career. She wrote, "[s]weetheart, you ask, do I read your letters? I live on them--oh! if I did not have them, I could not endure the separation" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 31 October 1910, p. 1, Crane Collection). In another letter, Caroline wrote Augustus, "no other wife has ever received constantly such beautiful and wonderful letters as I receive from you" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane, 7 March 1913, p. 1, Crane Collection).

Conclusion

This chapter is not intended to portray Caroline Bartlett Crane as a weak or ineffectual woman. Indeed, this was not the case. Crane's frontstage (Goffman, 1959) persona exemplified her achievements, and she was widely considered to be a gifted orator and highly competent expert in her field. Rather, I hope to illustrate the emotional dilemmas, moments of doubt, as well as the sources of strength, behind the public acclaim and success.

Reform efforts, which attempt to challenge government and/or business interests are difficult enough, without the additional handicap of traditional perspectives which devalue or limit women. Crane's cohort of women reformers attempted and accomplished an incredible amount, often in collaboration with supportive partners, both male and female. Of course, Crane did not always receive her husband's unconditional support for her work. Frustration with her long absences from home and her growing fame sometimes provoked an
outburst from Augustus. During one trip, angry letters flew across
the country. When they finally settled their differences, Caroline
wrote, "I know how hard you have had it, but this [trip] has been a
great help for me in many ways, especially to restore my self-confi-
dence and make me feel that my career is not ending yet" (p. 3).
Augustus concedes, "As a genius I admire you--as a woman I love and
want you" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus Warren Crane and Aug-
ustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 8 August 1913, p. 2,
Crane Collection).

Caroline and her husband's mutual support and encouragement,
although fragile at times, sustained them both in equal measure
throughout their marriage and their individual careers. Perhaps
their relationship may best be summed up with some final words from
Augustus to Caroline, he writes, "may you wings never be clipped, but
may your flights never be far; for your mate has no wings, but [also]
no weights to hang about your neck" (Augustus Warren Crane to Caro-
line Bartlett Crane, 29 October 1911, p. 4, Crane Collection).

When Caroline married, Susan B. Anthony cautioned her that she
may have made a mistake. She wrote, "I cannot say whether I rejoice
over the act until the time when we can tell whether the marriage
proves to help you in your chosen profession. . . ." (Susan B. An-
thony to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 21 January 1897, p. 1, Crane Col-
lection). It is difficult to determine whether Caroline's marriage
enhanced or limited her career in social reform (ironically, it pro-
bably did both), but she seemed never to regret her decision to mar-
ry, nor to question her struggle for happiness and success in both
the private and public domains of life. After a long-distance mar-
itial dispute concerning her career was resolved, Crane wrote, "now I
can go back to work feeling that my husband is working with me and
through me, to our common end" (Caroline Bartlett Crane to Augustus
Warren Crane, 24 May 1912, p. 2, Crane Collection).

In the world of Caroline Bartlett Crane, the public and pri-
ivate were not so much separate spheres, merely different aspects of
the social whole. Augustus often acknowledged Caroline’s public
role and civic acclaim. He claimed, "you are the most useful citizen
in the United States and perhaps in the world. You have set a re-
formation in progress that cannot be stopped" (Augustus Warren Crane
to Caroline Bartlett Crane, 13 May 1912, p. 4, Crane Collection).
Still, he cloaks her public efforts with private motivations as he
states, "you are trying to bring to pass a state of affairs such that
you can set before your husband wholesome steaks and roasts. It is a
domestic endeavor" (Augustus Warren Crane to Caroline Bartlett Crane,
24 May 1912, p. 2, Crane Collection).

Although Caroline felt that improvements in meat inspection
legislation was one of her most important public health goals, she
was never able to overcome the powerful meat lobby, and in her view
governmental collusion. She continued to investigate the issue and
speak out about meat inspection reform across the nation. In 1912,
she testified before a congressional committee in Washington, D.C.,
and again met much public abuse for her claims. Caroline was heart-
sick at the public harassment and her inability to find any source to publish her findings in order to get her message to the public. Dr. Harvey Wiley, of the Department of Agriculture, defended Crane in Good Housekeeping magazine (July, 1912), and Caroline eventually published the "History of Meat Inspection" in a series for Pearson's Magazine (March, April, May, June, July, 1913). Despite these successes, the issue was never resolved to Crane's satisfaction at the national level.

Epilogue: Or What Does It All Mean Today?

What lessons can we, as we near the end of the 20th century, learn from the women social reformers who struggled for social change a century ago? They were obviously much more optimistic than many individuals interested in a more just and sustainable world today. We have, for the most part, lost our innocence. We now know that solutions to social problems are even more complex than Progressive era reformers envisioned.29

Still, a little of their optimism, however misplaced it appears today, might temper the cynicism and hopelessness with which many visualize social change in our current era. Reformers in every period face unique opportunities and constraints, which often function dialectically in the quest for social reform. The contemporary age is no exception, and the efforts of social reformers in the Progressive era offer suggestive lessons for a constructive approach to social change today. Progressive women reformers realized important
achievements due to their ability to combine idealistic visions with pragmatic action. We would do well to emulate their example as we approach the vast challenges and exciting prospects of the next century.

Summary

This chapter examines the private side of Progressive era social reform. Using the archival data of Caroline Bartlett Crane, I explore the interface between public actions and private interactions which both facilitate and hinder social reform. On the basis of letters between Crane and her husband, I reconstruct her most intimate social support network, and evaluate the relationship between her public and private life. An examination of the personal, as well as the public papers, of a woman who was prominent in progressive reform illustrates both the personal motivations and private inspirations behind social activism. Also, I utilize Crane's experience in the Progressive era, as a microcosm for current concerns over opportunities and constraints for contemporary social reform.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION: BEYOND WOMEN LOST AND FOUND

Introduction

A group without a history is a group without an identity. (Kathryn Kish Sklar, 1992, p. 21)

I have not abandoned sociology: Sociology has abandoned feminism. (Anna Yeatman, 1990, p. 294)

Throughout this dissertation, I have argued that while women were traditionally invisible in the history of the Progressive Era, they were, in fact, crucial actors in Progressive social reform. The Progressive period was a time of rapid social, political and economic transitions when the appropriate roles for women were still under contention. The tensions between an impetus for social change and traditional gender expectations created a dynamic arena and vital catalyst for social reform in the era.

Crane’s efforts to combine personal and professional goals illustrate the historical connection between gender, society, sociology and social reform. Further, her career in social reform offers provocative insights into current debates concerning women and Progressive era social reform in the formation of maternalist welfare-state policies in the United States (Gordon, 1990, 1994; Kerber & Dehart, 1995; Koven & Michel, 1993; Skocpol, 1992, 1995).

The archival material of Progressive era reformer, Caroline Bartlett Crane (1858-1935) allows us to recover the life and work of
one formerly well-known, now largely forgotten woman. From her in-
dividual story, we can gain insights into the collective role of wo-
men in Progressive reform. Louise Tilly (1989, p. 458) argues that
a study of the losers (often women and other marginal individuals)
who were forgotten by history can tell as much about a historical
period than the official historical record, as seen through the eyes
of those who were deemed important enough to be recorded for history.

Trends in Sociohistorical Research

Initially, history was recorded from a male perspective. Then,
beginning with Gerda Lerner's pioneering efforts in the 1960's, fem-
inists began to compensate for the previous neglect of women's place
in history with research that helped to recover women in the histor-
ical narrative. It soon became evident that women were important,
if often ignored, actors in social history. Now, the emphasis in
sociohistorical feminist research has changed yet again from an em-
phasis on women exclusively, to one that investigates the relation-
ships and interactions between women and men in society (Kerber,
1995).

Linda Kerber (1995) calls for a dialogue between men and wo-
men, that still acknowledges silences, but also points the way to a
greater understanding of the social construction of gender. Kerber
aspires towards a synthesis between a male-centered and a woman based
approach to history in order to better comprehend "how gender serves
to legitimize particular constructions of power and knowledge" (p.
7). She contends that "women's history has moved away from the discovery of women to an evaluation of social process and institutions" (p. 7).

In keeping with this trend in sociohistorical research, this dissertation project is not only an attempt to rediscover an important woman lost from the historical record, but it is also an attempt to use Crane's story to investigate power, politics and knowledge in historical social thought and Progressive reform. Even though these highly contested concerns were not traditionally considered to be within the scope of women's interests, women's entry into the political and social arena in the Progressive era make this an especially compelling period to study in order to better comprehend both women's potential for social action and social constraints.

The Challenge of Social Biography

An examination of the personal and professional papers left by a unique, yet typical, Progressive Era reformer, such as Caroline Bartlett Crane, provides an excellent opportunity to view the period through the eyes of an individual who was actually involved in the process under study. Although Crane is only one woman, her records provide an unique opportunity to give progressive women reformers a voice in which to speak for themselves concerning their motivations, goals and accomplishments. This is an important contribution to a clearer sociohistorical picture of social reform in the Progressive Era.
Crane's voice pervades her varied and voluminous archival material. To my surprise, I found (along with many biographers of women) that it was impossible not to enter into a dialogue with Caroline, even though she has long been dead (Alpern, et al., 1992, p. 10). However, it is difficult enough to feel that you can get inside someone's head when you are speaking directly with them. When you are attempting to transverse time, and interpret the life and experiences of a woman from another time, the quest is even more daunting. Not only is it impossible to ask for direct answers to gaps and inconsistencies in the archival material, but it is also necessary to infer a great deal about what Crane's words and actions meant to her in the context of her own time.

To help mitigate these inherent difficulties with historical social biography, I have made an effort to become as familiar as possible, with the historical period under study, through an careful analysis of secondary sources, in order to place Crane's thoughts and actions into social perspective (see Chapter II). It was also useful to read works written by Crane's contemporaries, as well as other published records from that period in various newspapers, magazines and other printed accounts. I also attempt to bracket contemporary ideology and interpretation, as I examine data from a century ago.

Skretkowicz (1996) cautions that it is crucial in matters of interpreting literature, for the researcher to be aware of the inherent problems in how to read historical texts in order to "arrive
at the truths of the significances within the messages they contain" (p. 1) He notes that "[t]he investigator's nature, and the nature of the evidence, may not be at one" (p. 1). To compound the problem of [re]interpretation; the nature of the evidence may not be as evident as it would appear. Evidence is always open to various interpretation, and the researcher, for the sake of clarity, often seeks to impose arbitrary and artificial categories and labels on the texts, which would be entirely foreign to the author of the document. This caveat is critical in the reading and reinterpretation of all texts, especially historical documents, and this dissertation is no exception despite care to be sensitive to this dilemma.

Feminist Critiques of Progressive Era Reformers

Eliminate all persons of unworthy motives and doubtful motives and curious notions, and leave only for consideration the earnest, honest-hearted women who simply want to help and mean to help. (Caroline Bartlett [Crane], 1896, p. 382)

Social regeneration isn't a medicine entirely for the other person. (Caroline Bartlett [Crane], 1896, p. 383)

The maternalist approach to social reform, prevalent in the period, which valorized motherhood and womenhood, encouraged the "feminization of politics" in the Progressive era (Gordon, 1990, p. 107). However, many feminists today, critique a maternalist approach to social reform as one that privileges gender and elides race and class issues in reform efforts. They point to ulterior motivations and unintended consequences of Progressive era welfare-state reforms based on a maternalist ideology.
As a noted social reformer in her day, Crane's relationship with early academic sociologists and with the ladies of the club provides an interesting picture of the heady triumphs and inherent tensions for women in progressive social reform efforts. Crane's work with club-women also illustrates the potentials, limits and (im)possibilities for women to cross lines of race and class, and illuminates the contested, contradictory and situated nature of social reform.

While the Black women's club movement shared a middle-class orientation and many similar goals and beliefs with white club-women, there were also crucial differences which led them to separate organizations (Giddings, 1985). Predating the current split in feminism along class and race lines by about a century, women in the Progressive era splintered over issues of racial prejudice, class privilege, and the priorities of goals and missions in social reform. Then, as now, differences rather than similarities, predominated and muted the potential for women to work together to further common social goals (Giddings, 1985; Gordon, 1994).

Black women, after being excluded from the club-movement of their white sisters, formed their own clubs and founded the National Association of Colored Women (NACW) in 1896 (Giddings, 1985, p. 93). These clubs were formed not only in reaction to their exclusion by white women's clubs, but also to fill the particular needs of Black women, which included race and class issues in addition to questions of gender and social welfare. Today, these particular concerns would
exemplify a womanist, rather than a feminist approach to social re-
form.

In 1904, Crane formed the Women's Civic Improvement League in
Kalamazoo to help promote civic reform. She drew from many existing
groups to form her new organization. One group, in particular, the
Celery City woman's club, is of special interest since this was a
Black women's organization. Crane (ca.1909) was very interested in
this club. She noted,

... I counted some of the leaders as my friends. I have been
much pleased with the work done by this club in the way of
self-culture and kind offices to needy colored people, and
white people, too. ... However, I have always wished the
club to take up some line of systematic work for some of the
colored people in Kalamazoo who are not as fortunate as they.

Crane believed that their affiliation with the Women's Civic Improve-
ment League would facilitate this goal.

Crane's civic league, in addition to their work in municipal
sanitation, became involved in charity work, in order to organize
local charity more efficiently (Baker, 1984). There is always an un-
pleasant element of social control in even these informal, unoffi-
cial efforts to help the less privileged in society. However, Muncy
claims that middle-class women have always mediated between classes

Crane's papers present an ambivalent account of the relation-
ship between the middle-class women reformers and their charges. In
most cases, the intentions were a honorable attempt to uplift those
in need, but elements of noblesse oblige (McCarthy, 1982, 1990)
could also be seen to emerge occasionally. Crane's exhortation for
club-women to participate in civic work in a speech entitled, "The White Women's Burden" (1908a) is telling. However she also acknowledges in this speech that "[h]ow true is that word of Jane Addams that the poor and disadvantaged classes did not need to be ministered to more than we need to minister to them" (Crane, 1908a).

Association and Alienation in Progressive Reform

While Crane's career exemplifies the maternalist focus on social reform utilized by many women in the Progressive era, her work also calls this ideology/perspective into question. Even though she used the ideal of domesticity to foster social reform, she saw herself as acting on behalf of humanity in general, not exclusively for the cause of women and/or children. While much of women's social reform in the period focused on women and children, Crane's mission was much broader. Throughout her career she attempted to link both male and female political cultures in social reform (Sklar, 1995b).

Crane also formed a crucial link between reform and professionalism. Not unlike her academic male mentors in early sociology, she also attempted to carve out a professional niche for herself as an expert in scientific municipal sanitation. She popularized scientific knowledge and helped to create a female dominion in progressive reform as she became a "bridge between the producers/practitioners of scientific knowledge and the utterly naive laity" (Muncy, 1991, p. 21).

Crane's work with club-women certainly had a white, middle-
class core, which reflects the segregated nature of the period (Giddings, 1985; Gordon, 1994). Still, her work crossed race and class lines repeatedly. The notion of women's inherent responsibility for their larger social home, the community, provided an ideology for Crane which helped close gaps created by race and class—to a certain extent.

Crane's association with the Social Gospel movement also set the stage for her interest in both sociology and scientific social reform. The ideology of secular salvation and brotherhood (sic) encouraged Crane, as well as many of the earliest sociologists, to embrace issues of concern for the poor and working class (Feffer, 1993). Crane's earliest reform efforts included the establishment of an institutional church in Kalamazoo to address the special material and social needs of workers, both male and female (see Chapter III). Indeed, at the completion of the construction of a much larger church building needed to provide services to the community on a seven day a week basis, the church held a banquet to honor, not the donors who funded the new building, but the workers who actually constructed the facility! Crane's philosophy and work represent the school of "Chicago Pragmatism" which endorsed education, community and a caring model for social reform (Deegan, 1996a; Feffer, 1993).

The church also provided a room for a group of colored women to meet, and Crane encouraged interracial contact and equality. She wrote letters of protest against the Ku Klux Klan to her local newspaper, and withstood wide community disapproval when she invited a
mixed race group to her home for lunch following a lecture by Rev. Celia Parker Woolley, of the Frederick Douglass Settlement in Chicago. This suggests that contemporary feminist censure of Progressive women reformers for their latent race and class bias may be valid, but overstated, since ambiguity regarding these issues abound in Crane's life and work.

A sociological examination of Crane's life and career in social reform does not resolve the current theoretical debates concerning the relative importance of gender vs. class consciousness in the formation of the U.S. welfare state. Ideally, Crane appeared to favor an approach to reform that considered gender to be the most salient factor, however her focus in practice was much broader. Crane's archival material is an important addition to Skocpol's (1992) call for further research and scholarship into the gendered nature of the welfare state.

Skocpol contends that there must be more social analysis on the intersection of women's civic activities and the shifting political structures in Progressive era reform (1992, p. 354).

Crane's career in municipal sanitation not only provides a look at a little known area of reform, but is an excellent concrete example of Skocpol's notion of "historically grounded and institutionally contextualized" research, which will "allow for the possibility of unintended outcomes and changing configurations of causally relevant processes over time" (1992, p. 38).

However, despite a close analysis of Crane's life and work, it
is not possible to either confirm or deny contemporary critiques of
white, middle-class women reformers in Crane's era. Crane was both
ahead of, and a product of, her time. She believed in the potential
good in everyone, while sometimes privileging special qualities in
women. She fought for social justice and public health in the name
of all humanity, while using a maternalist ideology. She extolled
women's domestic cultural values, but encouraged women to expand
their domestic space well into the public sphere. She strove for
racial justice, while believing "...the African race is a much
inferior race, genetically..." (Caroline Bartlett Crane to May
Gannett, 18 April, 1927, p. 1). She battled for the socially dis-
advantaged of all sorts from a position of relative privilege.

However, she also self-consciously reflected on race and class
issues, and encouraged the large groups of club women she addressed
to do so as well. Even more remarkable, a century ago Crane decon-
structed the category women for a group of male clergy!

While these inconsistencies and ambiguities frustrate contem-
porary scholars, I take Linda Gordon's admonition seriously, and at-
tempt to read and (re)interpret Crane's legacy in social reform with
"foresight as well as hindsight... from the vantage point of par-
ticipants who did not already know the outcome" (1990, 29). Crane
represents a remarkable group of women, who despite their flaws and
limitations, activists of today may disclaim too quickly. Rather
than dismiss them out of hand, and render them invisible again, we
could embrace our heritage, and learn from both their strengths and
weaknesses, as we attempt to follow their lead and work toward a more just and healthy society today.

The Process of Recovery

Why is the process of recovery important for contemporary feminist scholars in the social sciences (Tilly, 1989, p. 458)? The losers in the history of a society, or a professional academic discipline, illustrate potential social, political and intellectual alternatives that we should consider seriously (Deegan, 1988; Tilly, 1989; Reinharz, 1992; Hill, 1993; McDonald, 1994, 1995). It is very easy for the work of forgotten forerunners to disappear, when the history of a discipline is written either by or from the perspective of the winners or their disciples in the field (Deegan, 1988).

A feminist intellectual history and heritage is lost if the history of the discipline of sociology is informed exclusively from the position of prominent individuals and institutions. Ann-Louise Shapiro (1994), in Feminist Revision History, outlines the benefits of a feminist historical consciousness. She notes that feminist theory points simultaneously to the way in which the exclusion of women has shaped professional practices and to the effects, within the knowledges of each discipline, of socially and historically constructed gender identities. Although feminists in the academy have attempted to refocus attention on the lives of women and to recover lost stories and alternative experiences, the goals of feminist theoretical work are considerably more far reaching. Feminist theories have called upon scholars to examine the way that knowledge is constituted: to unpack the processes that select and preserve evidence, to decenter the narrative, recognizing that the neglected or invisible people on the margins have, in fact defined the center; to interrogate the categories of analysis within each discipline; to demonstrate the way that gender works
to legitimize structures of power. (pp. 1-2)

Current theoretical and methodological debates in sociology would benefit from a closer examination of the early academic sociologists who have been dismissed or erased from the history of the discipline (Deegan, 1988). Also, the intellectual heritage of the discipline might look quite different if early women social theorists, who were not labeled sociologists were given credit for their contributions to the history of social thought (Deegan, 1988; McDonald, 1994, 1995).

Sociologists (Rossi, 1973; Hill, 1995 [1989]; Hoecker-Drysdale, 1992) have documented the fact that Harriet Martineau was the first woman sociologist, not just the translator of Comte, which until very recently has been her only claim to fame in sociology. Michael Hill (1995 [1989]) argues that Martineau's books Society in America, (1837) and How To Observe Morals and Manners, (1838) illustrate that she was both an original social theorist and a innovative methodologist.

Lynn McDonald (1994, 1995) also asserts that women such as Beatrice Webb, Florence Nightingale, and Harriet Taylor Mill, to name but a few, must be considered in any comprehensive history of social thought. Although their work has traditionally been discounted or subsumed under that of their male collaborators, McDonald documents their exclusion from the intellectual history of the social sciences.

Further, she contends that the exclusion of these early so-
cial thinkers has led to a distortion in contemporary feminist views of appropriate research methods for feminist investigation. Although many feminists today argue that qualitative research methods are the most (or only) appropriate approach to feminist research, McDonald (1995) and Fitzpatrick, (1990) note that early women social researchers often used empirical methods in their quest for social knowledge. Not only do we lose our intellectual heritage with the disappearance of women in historical social thought, but also a methodological legacy has been lost with the wholesale dismissal of women's theoretical and methodological contributions to early social science.

Lessons and Legacy

The Dilemma of "Difference"

A century ago, in 1896, Crane spoke at the Third Biennial of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The theme of the meeting was "Unity in Diversity," and it is remarkable just how much we still need to explore that issue today in feminist theory and action. While a call for a nostalgic return to the unmediated, even naive, notion of sisterhood promoted by feminists in the early days of the second wave of the women's movement is unwarranted, still some cohesion and affinity is necessary to accomplish the feminist goal of ending women's universal subordination.

Perhaps if we can rediscover and reclaim our feminist heritage, we will be able to put our current divisions as women into perspective and build on the past to create a better future. From our his-
torical legacy, perhaps we can begin to understand that common bonds between women may be stronger and more resilient than the differences which continue to tear us apart. It is possible that what we can learn from our elders, sisters and daughters, can weave us together into a fabric which can accommodate both diversity and commonalities.

However, the fact that the notion of difference, both between women and men and among women, has been the focus of heated debate for well over a century suggests that the dilemma will not be anymore easily resolved in the present, than it was in the past. Crane and her cohort, at various times and for strategic reasons, privileged, ignored and disdained the idea of differences between the sexes and within the category called Woman.

The contested nature of our feminist heritage in this matter suggests that Snitow (1990) may be correct in her ironic assertion that the "tensions regarding differences in feminist thought are a dynamic force" which may ultimately connect women in the necessity to sometimes find common ground (1990, p. 16). While it is uncertain if this hopeful connection will be made between women in the current feminist movement, the dilemma of difference certainly has linked women in feminist contentions across the generations.

**The Problem of Praxis**

The difficulty of combining social ideology with social action has been a continuing dilemma for social thinkers and researchers
throughout the history of the discipline of sociology. Initially, the rationale for the development of sociology was the claim that sociologists would use the new social knowledge they acquired through scientific social research for social reform. As the discipline became more established, however, a desire for professional status appeared to be tarnished by a feminization of the field. Sociologists began to distance themselves from an emphasis on social reform and encouraged a quest for objective social knowledge as an end itself (Rosenberg, 1982; Bannister, 1987; Deegan, 1988, Ross, 1991).

Eventually, in the 1960's, after years in which a positivist focus dominated the discipline, social theorists (many of them feminists) began to question the objective, empirical core of sociology. As an example of the widespread feminist criticism of the positivistic sociology, Liz Stanley & Sue Wise (1983) critique traditional scientific claims to objectivity, and insist feminist research must be reflexive. Stanley (1990) argues that while feminist researchers should not restrict themselves to any one particular method, they must be certain to locate the feminist researcher "within the activities of her research as an essential feature of what is 'feminist' about it" (Stanley, 1990, p. 12). This will insure that "feminism is not merely a perspective, a way of seeing; nor even this plus an epistemology, a way of knowing; it is also an ontology, or a way of being in the world" (1990, p. 12). She considers praxis to be an:

indication of a continuing, shared feminist commitment to a political position in which knowledge is not simply defined as knowledge what but also as knowledge for. Succinctly the point is to change the world, not only to study it (1990, p.
In this, feminist researchers of today are not so innovative, after all, as they mirror very closely the goals and methods of Caroline Bartlett Crane, and other women active in Progressive Era reform.

In a manner similar to that of feminist historians in their original quest to uncover women lost in historical narratives, initially, feminist research in sociology sought to expose the male-centered nature of traditional sociological research. This early feminist research focused on research by and for women, asked new questions and looked at the discipline and the social world from the perspective of women. Now many feminist researchers contend that we must include men, as well as women, but still approach research from the perspective of women. As an example of some of the earliest feminist work in sociological research, Dorothy Smith (1987a) was one of the first to call for an alternate sociology, a "sociology from the standpoint of women" which would "create a way of seeing, from where we actually live, into the powers, processes, and relations that organize and determine the everyday context of the seeing" (1987a, p. 9). Smith contends that since men's standpoint in sociology is depicted as universal, women have been silenced.

However, she states that women who are situated outside of mainstream sociological discourse, (and the abstract, invisible relations of ruling) in sociology have a privileged view because men's experience of control allows them to believe that the abstract is
the actual, while women, who actually do the concrete, everyday work that contributes to the conditions of ruling, have (not unlike Marx's proletariat standpoint) a better consciousness of the relations of ruling. This enables women sociologists a sort of double vision in which to not only analyze, but also to resist this form of oppression. This method of grounding theory in the material conditions of lived experiences is central to much feminist thinking in social research.

Feminist standpoint theory (e.g., Hartsock, 1983; Smith, 1987a) utilizes Marxism to illustrate how the exclusion of women from the public arena contributes to the organization of knowledge. Standpoint theorists contend that their accounts of the social world are less partial and less distorted than male accounts. However, feminist relativism insists that there cannot be a feminist science because they question the possibility of a universal truth, and argue that feminists standpoint theorists merely attempt to set up a new female truth in contrast to traditional, malestream truths. In contrast, they contend there are only many subjective experiences, and all feminist researchers can do is reveal the various different knowledges they contain (Stanley & Wise, 1983).

Others critique feminist standpoint epistemology for the presumption that women share a common experience, or standpoint, that can be the base for feminist theory. As noted in the previous section on the dilemma of differences, this particular debate has haunted feminist thought for a century, and beyond. Patricia Hill Col-
lins (1991) argues for a black women's, rather than a black woman's standpoint. Although Collins does not privilege a black women's viewpoint, she argues that as an outsider-within this perspective can provide a special view of the relationship between dominant and subordinate groups (p. 11).

The growing recognition that women's experience is not universal and no more authentic than any other has led to a shift in standpoint theory from the materialist theory of Marx to a postmodernism which advocates partial and multiple perspectives (Grant, 1993, p. 113). Haraway (1991) provides a bridge between standpoint theory and postmodernism with her concept of situated knowledges. She argues that we can retain subjectivity and reality without resorting to a universal idea of identity or depending on the notion of a total, objective, universal knowledge: the god-trick. The idea of multiple knowledges allows us to retain a reconceptualized subject which is continuously unfixed and conditional, while we recognize that the world is real, but evasive.

Sandra Harding (1987) concludes that the tensions in feminist theories are productive, and acknowledges the fragmented nature of women's experiences, but she is not willing to concede the postmodern perspective that "there can never be a feminist science, sociology... but only many stories that different women tell about the different knowledge they have" (p. 188). She argues that it is premature for women to give up what they have never, had, the opportunity to "know and understand the world from the standpoint of their
experiences for the first time" (p. 189).

However, Harding, despite her emphasis of feminist standpoints, insists that "feminism 'for women only' is a luxury that female fem­inists cannot afford and never desired. After all, [she notes] we want to change the world--not only women" (1993, p. 145). A century ago, Crane also argued that women and men must work together in their common goal toward social reform. She stated, "I don't believe in women alone nor in men alone, but in men and women working together" (ca. 1896). Current attempts by feminists in sociology and history, to build a bridge between women-centered vs. male-centered theories, research and actions bring Crane's aspiration full-circle.

The (Non)Impact of Feminist Thought on Sociology

Smith (1987b) maintains that the women's movement has given women a sense that their interests should be represented in sociol­ogy, rather than the traditional male-centered focus of the disci­pline. She states that it is not enough to supplement what has tra­ditionally been left out of sociology. A sociologist enters a conceptually ordered society, and women who are outside and subservient to this structure develop a "bifurcation of consciousness" between the abstract nature of sociology and the real world we seek to study, (1987b, p. 89). Women's perspective "discredits sociology's claim to constitute an objective knowledge independent of the sociologist's situation" (1987b, p. 91).

Smith argues that sociology cannot avoid being situated, and
so should begin from the direct experience of the everyday world. She believes that women’s direct experience places her a step back where she can recognize the world we live in and its failure to account for or even describe its actual features (1987b, p. 95).

In contrast to early efforts in the discipline to eliminate any trace of feminization from sociology, Smith calls for a new sociology which privileges rather than punishes a woman’s perspective.

Despite high hopes and expansive rhetoric, the impact of feminist theories on sociology is open to debate. In an often cited article, "The Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology" (1985), Judith Stacy & Barrie Thorne contend that in spite of a vast accumulation of new empirical and theoretical work about women which filled in the gaps concerning women in sociological knowledge, feminist theory has made little impact on the central theoretical paradigms in sociology. Feminist theories have been co-opted and ghettoized in sociology and the paradigm shift that feminist scholars anticipated has never materialized. They argued that feminist theory would help overcome both the positivist bias and the atheoretical emphasis in the discipline. Stacy & Thorne (1985) lamented the lack of effect of feminist thought in sociology because they believe that the interdisciplinary focus of much feminist work, could provide a model for sociological frameworks within sociology and across disciplines, and predicted that a feminist revolution in sociology could have widespread impact on social knowledge.

More recently, Stacy (1995) acknowledges some feminist inroads
into sociology. Still, she has joined the growing trend in feminism in which the cultural is supplanting the social (and thus sociology) as the locus of feminist thought. She is both cheered and concerned with the recent feminization of sociology, in which feminist work is at the very least allowed to coexist in the still predominately positivistic discipline. However, she worries that growing acceptance of feminist work in academe, may increase disciplinary boundaries and undermine interdisciplinary efforts in feminist work. In an attempt to reconnect the link between academe and activism, Stacy warns of the "challenge of keeping success from spoiling academic feminism" (1995, p. 325.) Feminists are also concerned that the "masculinist hierarchy between theory and practice is being reproduced in academic feminism" (Maynard & Purvis, 1994, p. 8).

Others also note the ambivalent relationship between feminist thought and sociology. Wilson (1993) believes that feminism and sociology have, to some extent reinforced each other. He argues, however, that sociological theory has been little diverted by feminist thought because sociology is based on objectivism, while feminism embraces subjectivism. He suggests an alliance between the two (1993, pp. 343; 353-355).

These current considerations and challenges concerning feminist thought and academic connections may be well served by a close analysis of the disputed relationship between women, power and the academy a century ago (Rosenberg, 1982; Deegan, 1988; Fitzpatrick, 1990). Still, picture is unclear, women made gains due to their
enforced separation from the academic professions and institutions. However, they also largely lost the opportunity to contribute to social thought, shape social research, continue their traditional connection between social thought and action, and ultimately, to leave a legacy for activist and professional women in the present.

It appears that, while there are dangers of co-optation and/or ghettoization, women gained more from their professional, academic connections than they lost. On balance, it seems an alliance between academe and activism is in the best interest of women interested in social reform, but the relationship is no less problematic today than it was a century ago.

Women in Sociology on the Eve of the 21st Century

Anna Yeatman (1990, p. 294) claims "sociology has abandoned feminism" and argues that resistance in the field is in reaction to the radical changes that a truly feminist approach to theory in the discipline would entail. In contrast, however, Michele Barrett suggests that feminism may have abandoned sociology. She contends that feminism has turned to culture in the last decade, and so is more at home in the arts and humanities than in the social sciences. She places this move toward culture, over structure, within a larger shift in feminism. Barrett states that the "word/things balance has been shifted away from the social sciences' preoccupations with things and toward a more cultural sensibility of the salience of words" (1992, pp. 204-205). Barrett concludes that
Post-modernism entails a rejection of the grand projects of the rationalist Enlightenment, including Marxist as well as liberal systems of thought. In terms of sociological analysis, post-modernity is a phenomenon of post-industrial capitalism. But since most sociology owes much to rationalism, sociologists must choose between a sociology of post-modernity and a post-modern sociology. (p. 206)

Conclusion

Thus, this dissertation project utilizes a feminist gaze to trace the production, (re)production and legitimation of knowledge in sociology from the origin of the discipline in the Progressive Era to the present post-modern moment. The academic/theoretical debates described in this project are more than academic for many feminists, however, as most feminist theorists link their intellectualized identities to a practical feminist politics. Following Marx, for feminists the purpose of epistemology is not just to satisfy intellectual curiosity, but also to contribute to an emancipatory goal: the expansion of democracy in the production of knowledge (Alcoff & Potter, 1993, p. 13). Ironically, this lofty goal was just as eagerly sought by women social reformers 100 years ago, as it is today.

Contemporary calls concerning the reconnection between thought and action, between academe and activism, and between male and female cultures, attempt to restore some the major fissures deliberately created in sociology a century ago (Hartman & Messer-Davidow, 1991; Maynard & Purvis, 1994; Sklar, 1995b; Stanton & Stewart, 1995). There have been great strides in the recovery of women in the history of social thought. There has also been an increased comprehension of
women's exclusion from the professions, their invisibility in the construction of disciplinary knowledges and structures, and of their actual contributions to all of these endeavors.

The debate, however, continues. Heated controversy concerning a more inclusive perspective on the origins of sociology indicate that the professional stakes are very high for many individuals concerning just who may legitimately be defined as a sociologist, what counts as social knowledge, how best to gain that knowledge, as well as, what constitutes the ultimate goal of social research. Mary Jo Deegan (1996b) documents this deep resistance within the discipline to any acknowledgement of a fundamental, and ongoing bias against women in the department of sociology at the University of Chicago. As this institution has played a hegemonic role in the development, definition and deportment of the discipline of sociology, in general, it is crucial to an understanding of the larger issue of the structural and ideological production of academic sociology. Deegan (1995) warns, however, that sociology is embedded in society: this is a highly problematic fact for a discipline that studies society. It creates an irreducible tension in the profession between being a part of society and claiming to be outside its rules. One of the most burdensome and embarrassing challenges to sociological assertions of disinterest is the incorporation of inequality within its practice, ideas, networks, and fundamental social processes. This injustice undermines sociologist's avowal of objectivity, expertise in interpreting social problems, and difference from the groups they study. Furthermore, like members of other groups, sociologists do not want to examine their biases, patterns of discrimination, and failure to meet their ideals. Unlike those in other groups, however, sociologists generate the tools to critique inequality and empower the victims to understand victimization as a social process (1995, p. 322).
Deegan contends that due to this paradox, "[i]t is almost impossible to use sociology to discuss sociology as biased, because the concepts hide the professional practice of sexism" (1995, p. 322).

A careful analysis of the archival material of Caroline Bartlett Crane, and other individuals on the margins of sociology at a time in which these boundaries were being negotiated, help define and explicate those at the center. A more inclusive examination of the discipline expedites a clarification of the exclusions. Silences shout! Roads not taken map the terrain of the era, and suggest alternative routes to the present, even for the present. Ironically, snapshots of sociology at the turn of the last century, may help clarify conflicting images of the discipline in the fast-paced, high-tech multi-media world of virtual reality at the end of the 20th century.

Summary

This chapter concludes an examination of the relationship between women, the history of sociology and social movements in the Progressive Era. I discuss the challenge of social biography. I address the sociohistorical implications of the recovery of lost women, and revisit recent feminist critiques of Progressive women reformers regarding their motivations and the intended/unintended consequences of their action. I place current feminist debates into historical perspective and suggest what legacy we may claim today from an examination of women in Progressive era reform.
1On a different note, Marianne Hirsh & Evelyn Fox Keller (1990, p.) maintain that a decade ago they felt part of a vanguard movement which could change the world, but there was no category called feminist theory just feminists doing theory—now, after a decade of struggle and conflict the feminist illusion of sisterhood has given way to fractured discourses. From the beginning feminist theorists found that not only were there major conflicts, but these differences had the potential of disrupting any collective effort of gender analysis. Hirsh & Keller argue that the oppositions may derive from the very dichotomous structures feminist theory sought to dismantle and question what feminism means and whether feminism has an epistemological core (1990, pp. 2-3).

2Donna Haraway (1990) also argues against those still seeking some grand theory of women's oppression. She insists that there is no drive in cyborgs to produce total theory, but there is an intimate experience of boundaries, their construction and deconstruction. Haraway contends that cyborg imagery can suggest a way out of the maze of dualisms, which are systemic to the logics and practices of domination, and lead to the "utopian dream of the hope for a monstrous world without gender" (1990, pp. 223;219).

3Harding prefers to think in terms of methodological features, rather than a feminist method, and notes three distinctive features of feminist research; 1.) in contrast to traditional androcentric,
objective social science, feminist research begins from the perspective of women's experiences, which 2.) leads to research designed for women, and 3.) insists that the researcher be on the same level as the subject (1987, p. 1).

4In contrast to Blanche Wiesen Cook's (1991) assertions, however, she stresses the importance of institutional records, over personal papers, as central to the examination of women and power in the reform era.

5For more extensive biographical description of Caroline Bartlett Crane, see Bennett, 1915; Brown, 1972; Rickard, 1994.

6Some of the varied social movements of the time include:
1. The Women's Club Movement
2. The Temperance Movement
3. The Movement for Women in Higher Education
4. The Home Economics Movement
5. The Settlement House Movement
6. The Public Health Movement
7. The Labor Reform Movement
8. The Scientific Motherhood Movement
9. The Movement to shelter and educate Working Women
10. The Suffrage Movement
11. The International Peace Movement
12. The Social Purity Movement
13. The City Beautiful Movement
14. The Birth Control Movement
15. The Movement for Dress Reform
16. The Municipal Reform Movement
17. The Housing Reform Movement
18. The Penal Reform Movement
19. The Grange Movement
20. The Play Movement

7See Faulkner, 1931; Link, 1954; Mowry, 1958; Wiebe, 1967; Mann, 1975; Link & McCormick, 1983 for analysis of the Progressive period.

8Although the initial leaders established and shaped the discipline, the earliest years in the development of the field of socio-
logy have generally been overshadowed by the prestige and repute of the Chicago school typically dated from about 1920 (see Deegan, 1988; Bulmer, 1984).

9See May, 1949; Hopkins, 1982 [1940]; and Gorrell, 1988 for an overview of the social gospel movement.

10Although traditional accounts of the social gospel movement tend to ignore the activities of women, one notable exception is Curtis (1991).

11Edwin Sutherland, the father of white-collar crime, first became involved with sociology at the University of Chicago through extension classes and did his thesis under Henderson (Bannister, 1987, p. 57).

12Crane's class notes for courses at the University of Chicago are contained in the Crane Collection, Western Michigan University Archives and Regional History Collection.

13In this view, Crane echoes the vision of Black women reformers in the Progressive era, but because of the segregated nature of progressive reform, the reform efforts of White and Black women seldom informed each other. This lacuna was not only detrimental to each group of women's individual endeavors, but to progressive reform as a whole (Giddings, 1985).

14The third class, Charles the Great, taught by Professor Terry, was an entirely historical analysis of the role of the church in the rise of the state beginning in the Middle Ages.

15She was also, of course, in contact with Jane Addams, Flor-
ence Kelley, Anna Howard Shaw, Susan B. Anthony and other prominent women in a women's network of social reform activities.

16 Crane attended and participated in the Chicago World's Fair in 1893.

17 In one exception to the rule, Crane's work in municipal sanitation is featured by Suellen M. Hoy, in Melosi, 1980. See, also, Hoy (1995).

18 See Kerber, 1988, for a comprehensive review of the concept of separate spheres in feminist scholarship.

19 See Blair, 1980, for an analysis of Domestic Feminism and the women's club movement in the Progressive era.

20 The water supply, sewage disposal, police and fire protection, food supply, charities, school and recreation were examined.

21 The fact that, in retrospect, the temperance movement was considered to be more conservative and the suffrage movement more radical indicates the difficulty in judging the ideology of women reformers in the period by standard left-right distinctions today.

22 Gilman, wrote in her diary on May 4, 1897, "Caroline Bartlett Crane here--also other ladies. Mrs. Crane is lovely--a fine woman--minister of The People's Church at Kalamazoo. Go to Conference in the evening & hear her" (Knight (Ed.), 1994, p. 673). On June 1, 1897, Gilman continues in her diary, "12:15 to Kalamazoo... I speak [at The People's Church] on 'Duties, Domestic & Other.' Pretty good. Enthusiastic reception. Spend night with Caroline Bartlett Crane. Like Dr. Crane [Caroline's husband]" (Knight (Ed.),
Blair (1980) contends that while traditional textbooks create the impression that Sinclair was solely responsible for passage of the Pure Food and Drug Law, in reality these issues were promoted by thousands of active club-women anxious to change the world (p. 102). Crane's work is but one example that confirms this assertion.

Wright (1980) called the period between 1890-1910 the golden-age of public health and noted that in this era cleanliness had become a media event (pp. 117, 121).

Much of her survey work was done during the same years in which the well known Pittsburgh Survey (1909-1914) was being conducted (see Faris, 1976, pp. 7-8; Bulmer, 1984, pp. 66-67; Cohen, 1991, pp. 245-268).

Steven Diner notes that Addams and Sophonisba Breckinridge also utilized club-women, and made them a major force in social reform in Chicago (1980, p. 63).

However, the personal lifestyles and intimate relationships of women reformers, which are thought to either foster or constrain their reform efforts, have long been an area of interest for scholars. See e.g. Banner, 1980; Cook, 1991; Davis, 1973; Deegan, 1996a; Farrell, 1967; Sklar, 1985, 1995a; Smith-Rosenberg, 1975.

For a sage illustration of this paradoxical dilemma in biography and autobiography see Carol Schield's (1995), The Stone Diaries.
Suffrage for women, despite the expectations of many, did not solve all other social injustice in the world, and many of the issues faced by progressive era reformers still trouble those interested in social reform today (Sherr, 1995). Caroline did not share the optimistic view that the vote for women would solve all the social problems in society. Still, she would probably be amazed that we continue to struggle with many of the same consumer, environmental and social concerns she battled during her lifetime.
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Feminist theorists contend that theory is the basis of sociology and argue that a feminist sociology is for (and by) women, not just about women (Abbott & Wallace, 1990, pp. 10-11). They critique malestream sociology for being both sex-blind and sexist. They claim that sociology has ignored, distorted or marginalized women, and further, this is a result of systematic biases and inadequacies in male centered theories, not just the omission of women from samples. Male theories do not ask questions or do research in areas of concern to women, and when women are included in samples, they are viewed from a position that perceives males as the norm. Sociological theories have often taken for granted, rather than challenged biased views of women (Abbott & Wallace, 1990, p. 202). Therefore, theory and research in sociology cannot just add women and stir, but must ground knowledge in women's experience (Smith, 1979; 1987a).

There is a vigorous debate in sociology and feminist thinking about methods: qualitative vs. quantitative and objective vs. reflexive. Feminist research methods began as a critique of existing methodology, and were usually (a) defined by a focus of some in research done by feminists for women; (b) concerned with a perceived distinction between male quantitative methods and qualitative female methods; and (c) overtly political with the goal to change lives. Feminist research seeks to move away from a positivistic sociology, and toward research that involves the liberation of women. Feminist research seeks research strategies that incorporate women rather than
treat the subjects of research as objects used by the researcher. Although there is beginning to be a backlash from feminist researchers involved in quantitative research, many feminists argue that feminist research must use qualitative methods so the voice of the subjects can be heard. They believe that it is crucial to view the world from the perspective of the subject, and reject the view that the researcher must be objective (Stanley & Wise, 1983; Cook & Fonow, 1986). They insist that it is essential to be reflexive, and maintain that involvement between the subject and the subject and the researcher is both necessary and unavoidable. Of course, feminists are not alone in seeking a more subjective sociology. There have long been other voices in sociology calling for a more reflexive approach to research, in contrast to the predominant focus on positivism in the field.

However, feminist research faces challenges both within the feminist community and in the larger scientific field. One of the most important critiques is that it is seen as subjective, and therefore of no scientific value. Harding (1987) asks whether politicized inquiry in the subjective feminist mode can produce a more complete and less distorted research result than positivistic research. This question reflects widespread debate over the merits of objective vs. subjective research. The arguments over the validity of a reflexive feminist approach to research continue. However, there is an increasing call for a greater acceptance of quantitative, as well qualitative methods in feminist research (e.g., McDonald, 1995;
Sprague & Zimmerman, 1993).
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The W.M.U. "Archive" has arranged the Crane papers in the following manner:

1. Papers written between 1843-1935
2. 1000 items and 1500 letters
3. Correspondence concerning various interests: sermon and church materials; sanitary survey; meat inspection bill; civic improvement league; suffrage materials; and prison reform
4. Material on "Everyman's House"
5. Manuscript, The Life of Caroline Kleinstueck
6. Speeches and manuscripts
7. Travel journals
8. Sociology notebooks--University of Chicago
9. Scrapbooks and clippings (People's Church)
11. Private correspondence between Caroline and Augustus Crane from 1899 to 1935

Researchers are permitted full access to these materials. Moreover, the Archive staff are expert in the documentation and use of these and related materials.

The Crane papers are, in actuality, a small, non-representative sample of materials from that era. They have survived for a variety of idiosyncratic reasons, but primarily because Crane, along with
other progressive women reformers, was conscious of the fact that women of her generation were important social actors. The fact that she was a well known public figure, both at the local, and to a lesser extent, the national level, also encouraged the collection and preservation of her personal and public papers.

I propose to read the entire set of files. The collection is composed of 56 boxes, and each box has been sorted into files which have been divided by subject, labeled and listed in an extensive, concise inventory. There are also glass slides and unprocessed photographs.

My method will be a qualitative content analysis. Content analysis, an unobtrusive or nonreactive research method, is generally thought to consist of an examination and coding of documents in order to count the frequency of certain words or other manifest content in the materials (Babbie, 1986). Historical, comparative content analysis, on the other hand, is a qualitative approach to data collection. Documents are studied, not primarily to be coded, enumerated and recorded, but in order to understand individuals and society through the documents. Thomas and Znaniecki's (1927) *The Polish Peasant*, is a classic account using a qualitative content analysis of letters. While this method of interpretation may be critiqued as subjective, many feminist researchers contend that this mode of interpretation makes the research more meaningful.

Further, Berg (1989) argues that research is not done merely to acquire information, but to answer larger social questions re-
garding individuals in their social setting. A qualitative approach attempts to determine how individuals interact with society, and how they interpret their social world. He notes that qualitative procedures are useful because they provide a means of accessing unquantifiable facts about the actual people researchers observe and talk to, or people represented by their personal traces (such as letters, photographs, newspaper accounts, diaries, and so on). As a result, qualitative techniques allow the researchers to share in the understandings and perceptions of others and to explore how people structure and give meaning to their daily lives. Researchers using qualitative techniques examine how people learn about and make sense of themselves and others. (p. 6)

According to Schwartz and Jacobs (1979), a nomothetic approach to case studies asserts that it is impossible to generalize from single cases, while an idiographic approach contends that it is scientifically valid and methodologically correct to study the behavior of a human being and to perceive her not only as a representative of a group, but also as an independent totality from whom generalizations may be drawn. (p. 69)

Since the purpose is understanding, not quantifying or classifying patterns, the case study approach is best from this view because it is possible to study a single individual at a personal level.

There has long been resistance on the part of sociologists to the study of individual (rather than collective) lives. Yet this view is now changing. Feminists and others, disenchanted with universal meta-theory, are leading the effort to reintegrate the individual into social theory. It is now recognized that individual lives "illustrate the general with the particular and make more vivid the workings of social structures" (Evans, 1993, pp. 6-7).

Berg (1989, pp. 96-98) states "that a wide range of knowledge
can be acquired by the use of archival records." Diaries, journals
and letters are an important, and under-utilized source in social
research, by which to observe the intimate details of an individual's
social life. He warns, however, that "triangulation is necessary,
because although archival data may be very useful for certain re-
search questions, it must be used with caution" (pp. 96-98).
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