

ABSTRACT

Title of dissertation: THE CHILD LABOR MOVEMENT'S NIGHT MESSENGER SERVICE CAMPAIGN: RIGHTS AND REFORM IN THE PROGRESSIVE ERA

Elizabeth E. Gardner, Doctor of Philosophy, 2017

Dissertation directed by: Professor Shawn J. Parry-Giles
Department of Communication

The Progressive Era is known for the democratization and expansion of government and the professionalization of occupations. The campaign to regulate child labor in the night messenger service (NMS) exemplifies the symbiosis and clash of these progressive forces. Specifically, this study analyzes how NMS reformers adopted rhetorics of social science, moral citizenship, and rights to define social problems and to expand the power of states over childhood.

To this end, this study examines the NMS campaign's discourse between 1909 and 1915 to demonstrate the ways in which reformers used technical arguments to renegotiate the process of reform and to realign the rights of children, parents, and states. These chapters follow the evolution of this campaign as it defined the NMS problem through its investigative reports, constructed the American public as under threat in its public appeals, and realigned the rights of adolescents within the states during its legislative process. As part of their technical arguments, campaigners identified experts as the instigators of reform, constructed the American public as an educated but inactive moral ideal, and established the leaders of the newly-formed child labor organizations as the undisputed managers of legislative initiatives. In so doing, the NMS campaigners

helped establish the legitimacy and centrality of child welfare organizations within reform. In the NMS campaign model, technical expertise was necessary to collect research and guide a legislative campaign. As the American people were not experts, campaigners simply called on the general public to be vigilant and responsive to the directives of reformers.

In the process, this study looks at the ways in which this reform campaign renegotiated the boundaries of adolescence in the Progressive Era. NMS campaigners sketched the independence of these adolescent laborers as a threat to the good of the community, and on the basis of that threat, reformers successfully lobbied to place the work of adolescents under the authority of the state. The NMS legislation positioned state governments rather than the family as the primary overseer of an adolescent's labor and moral education and redefined the confines of adolescent labor in terms of age, time, and space.

THE CHILD LABOR MOVEMENT'S NIGHT MESSENGER SERVICE CAMPAIGN:
RIGHTS AND REFORM IN THE PROGRESSIVE ERA

by

Elizabeth E. Gardner

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2017

Advisory Committee:

Professor Shawn J. Parry-Giles, Chair
Professor Julie Greene
Professor James F. Klumpp
Professor Trevor Parry-Giles
Professor Carly Woods

© Copyright by
Elizabeth E. Gardner
2017

To Dad & Mom

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing a dissertation can be a pretty solitary pursuit, but I have learned about the importance of community as I have made my way through this dissertation. I have received help, ideas, and encouragement from so many people, and I am *deeply* grateful. So my task in this short section is a tall order.

To begin, I owe Shawn Parry-Giles so much. Shawn taught me how to write clearly and to enjoy research, seeking out primary sources and digging into the archives. I am thankful for her straightforward manner of advising and her patience with me as I plodded through this project. Beyond Shawn's support, I benefited from the generosity of Kristy Maddux and Dr. Klumpp, who both let me barge into their offices to sound out ideas and ask them questions. Trevor Parry-Giles, Julie Green, and Carly Woods graciously served on my committee and pushed me to think better about my project.

I am also so thankful for the intellectual community of graduate students that I joined in the department. My graduate student colleagues were open-handed with me in their encouragement and resources, from listening to me as I processed arguments to sharing articles and abstracts. Early on this group included Alyssa, Terri, Tim, Heather, Tiffany, Artesha, Ben, Jim, and Karen. They welcomed me as I found my way in the department. As I got into writing, the crew changed. Writing dates at Panera or Coffy with Yvonne, Jade, Jessica, Thomas, Megan, Janna, Michael, and Sean made the sometimes-onerous task of writing something I'd look forward to. You all, along with Melissa, Stephanie, Lauren, Melissa, Meridith, Annie Laurie, and Will, are wonderful colleagues, and I'm excited to get to move through my career along with all of you.

Finally, I am thankful for my family. I owe so much to my DC family at Advent, who whether on Wednesday nights, Friday mornings, or Sunday evenings heard way more about night messengers than they ever bargained for and walked with me along the ups and downs of this process. The Blue Fishnets surrounded and encouraged me from near and far. My sisters, Sarah and Hannah, both loved me well through this time. And, to end, I want to thank my parents. You both taught me to enjoy learning and bore with me as I made my way along this long road.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	v
List of Abbreviations	vi
Introduction	1
1. Childhood and Adolescence in the Progressive Era	75
2. “Something Spicy”: Constructing Credibility for Social Studies of Childhood	170
3. The Rhetoric of Social Reform: Turning Progressive Faith into Public Argument	266
4. Rights and Reform in Legislative Debate	346
Afterword	417
Bibliography	426

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

MACLC	Massachusetts Child Labor Committee
MDCLC	Maryland Child Labor Committee
NCLC	National Child Labor Committee
NMS	Night messenger service
NYCLC	New York Child Labor Committee
PACLA	Pennsylvania Child Labor Association
YMCA	Young Men's Christian Association

INTRODUCTION

In October 1909, E. M. Barrows went undercover for the National Child Labor Committee to investigate the telegraph industry's night messenger service. Posing as a regular client, Barrows called a local Western Union Telegraph office in New York City on a Saturday night and asked for a strong boy to be sent to help him carry his suitcase. Lowering his voice, he told the clerk, "Give me a boy who's wise to what's going on around here after the lights are lit." In five minutes, Messenger No. 1882, Joseph Kramer, reported for service. The youth, as Barrows described, was "dark, stolid, unimaginative," "an incessant cigarette fiend," "steeped in sexual vice," but "honest, well meaning and ambitious." As they walked around, Kramer talked freely of his work as a messenger, and Barrows came to gain his "complete confidence."

When the child labor investigator asked the adolescent about the kind of job opportunities available to messengers, No. 1882 started to spout the company line about messengers rising up the ladder to become operators and clerks, but he stopped himself. "He was silent a moment," Barrows recorded, and then he "burst out: 'Messenger boys dont [sic] learn a dammed [sic] thing except to smoke cigarettes and lie, and frig around with women, and that's the truth.'" The youth continued his condemnation by lamenting that messenger boys as young as 10 or 12 had "to learn all the worst parts of the city the first thing." They came into contact with male and female sexual predators, No. 1882 insisted, before he continued on to describe these individuals as "men that'll do anything to a messenger boy if they get the chance." Having worked in the messenger service since he was fifteen years old, Joseph Kramer noted that other jobs no longer suited him. As the young messenger commented, he could not abide being "bossed." And he liked being

"out in the streets where there's plenty to see." Although the boy hoped to join the Navy, Barrows feared that the "lack of discipline" that No. 1882 learned from the streets would spoil these plans for advancement.¹

The National Child Labor Committee (NCLC) decided to make the reform of the night messenger service (NMS) a top agenda item in 1910 after additional investigations uncovered other scandalous stories.² This transcript of Barrows' interactions with "Number 1882" highlighted an array of reformers' concerns, from the moral and economic deterioration of adolescent messengers to immoral contacts, sensory overstimulation, and premature independence. These reformers concluded that the night messenger service led to the boys' "complete undoing, moral and physical."³

Outraged at the messenger service abuses, child labor committees, women's clubs, charity organizations, and civic associations came together to push forward reform. By the end of 1913, seventeen states had passed legislation to regulate the age and length of time that messengers could be employed at night.⁴ These successes were widely celebrated by NMS campaigners.⁵ By 1914, an investigator in Chicago could stress in his report that "during the night hours men, only, are sent out."⁶ Florence Kelley claimed that she had "never seen such an astounding change in the personnel of any occupation" as had occurred in the night messenger service when the industry shifted from "slow, shuffling, shabby, irresponsible, little twelve-year-old boys" to "alert and eager white-haired men."⁷ Amid a protracted fight to regulate child labor, reforming the night messenger service became the National Child Labor Committee's "quickest and easiest victory."⁸

Yet, few scholars have studied this campaign even though it represented an important success in the labor reform efforts of the Progressive Era, which stretched from about 1890 to 1920.⁹ Researchers have charted the history of the rise and fall of the telegraph industry generally. The role of the messenger within these tales, however, often fades into the background. Other studies of the anti-child labor movement have only partially examined this campaign,¹⁰ in part because of the campaign's fragmentary record.¹¹ Many reformers and legislators destroyed their NMS reports and letters because these documents were deemed too lurid to share publicly.¹²

In spite of this fragmentary account, the NMS campaign represents an important recovery project. This successful campaign within the child labor movement contributed to the child welfare reform efforts of the Progressive Era. It progressed from an individual reformer voicing his concern about the night messenger service to a noted expansion of state control over the nation's youth; it moved from a private social concern to a public political solution in a matter of two years. And in the end, states across the country instituted age minimums in the NMS ranging from sixteen to twenty-one. Intriguingly, some of these *same* states rejected efforts to institute general child labor restrictions for ten- and twelve-year olds.¹³

In examining the NMS campaign, this project studies the rhetorical strategies that helped transform child labor laws in the Progressive Era. Specifically, this project seeks to understand how the heated debates over scientific, social, and legal concerns produced a myriad of legislative changes in child labor at the federal and state levels. This study grapples with the ways in which these activists integrated rhetorics of social science and civic identity with a rights rhetoric to expand the powers of state governments over

adolescents. These arguments fed and reflected major shifts in the status of adolescents in U.S. society, the role of reformers in political change, and the authority of the government in family life. These arguments and strategies ultimately culminated in the debate over the first federal child labor law—the Keating-Owen Act of 1916.

Before turning to the details of this study, the NMS campaign is first situated within the broader history of child labor practices in the United States and the rhetorical context in which the campaign emerged. Before reformers tackled the messenger service they first had to convince the public that the issue of child labor represented an alarming problem deserving immediate attention.

CONSTRUCTING THE CHILD LABOR PROBLEM

The seeds of the Progressive Era child labor problem were sown in the fertile soil of the American labor force. The justifications *for* child labor in the American colonies became the objections *to* child labor by the turn of the twentieth century. The central concerns within this debate revolved around the labor needs of the community, occupational training, and the moral upbringing of the community's youth.

Child Labor and the American Colonies

In colonial America, communities needed the labor of children because of severe labor shortages. Seasoned workers were viewed as a rare commodity because only a percentage of the laborers who landed in the colonies managed to survive the first year of rough living conditions, grueling work, and life-threatening disease.¹⁴ This high mortality rate among early arrivals, coupled with high labor demands, meant that everyone had to work, including children. It was a matter of survival for the family and the community.¹⁵ Children worked with their families on the farm. They also hunted and gathered food.¹⁶

In this setting, child labor became a means of preparing a child for an occupation as an adult. Child labor was viewed as a way to make children independent members of the community. In 1629, for example, Reverend Francis Higginson praised the "New England Plantation" because "little children here by setting of corn may earne much more than their owne [sic] maintenance."¹⁷ This sentiment was rooted in European traditions. Employing children came to be viewed as a means of preventing pauperism during the medieval period.¹⁸ By the 1600s, the English legal system stipulated that pauper children be apprenticed or indentured to prevent them from falling into a life of idleness and vice. The American colonists carried this framework over to the New World and codified many of England's poor laws into their own legal systems.¹⁹

Communities enacted poor laws in hopes of warding off dependence by giving the government authority to place pauper children in apprenticeships.²⁰ When the community judged that pauper parents were not fulfilling their responsibility to their children, local officials were charged with arranging employment.²¹ In 1836, the New Plymouth Colony Laws stipulated, "It is enacted That those that have releefe from the townes & have children, and doe not ymploy them, That then it shall be lawfull for the Township to take order that those children shall be put to worke in fitting ymployment according to their strength and abilities, or placed out by the Townes [sic]."²² These provisions generally applied to those children who were eight years of age and older.²³ It came to be that taking on a poor child as an apprentice or providing work for a child was seen as a philanthropic move.

These provisions complemented the existing system of indentures and apprenticeships. Within such relationships, fathers entered into legal agreements to place

their children with a master craftsman to learn a trade. These work contracts occurred within the context of the community where personal relationships between families and craftsmen could moderate the experience.²⁴ Most often these arrangements entailed a program of training, education, and provision for the child apprentice, and the youth could expect to advance to the status of journeyman and potentially master craftsman.²⁵ Thus, this work as children prepared them to be independent community members once they became adults.

In the early years, children also came to the colonies as workers. In 1619, the Virginia Company requested that children be sent to the colony as apprentices. Other children were kidnapped and brought over to work. Even into the nineteenth century, indentured servitude in the New World became a way to deal with orphans and poor, dependent children from England.²⁶

During the colonial period, child labor was also seen as a way to instill moral values in children. The Puritan work ethic and Quaker notions of industry encouraged this push to place children in the fields or under a master to learn a trade. Children were employed to keep them from falling into the deadly sins of slovenliness, idleness, and laziness.²⁷ Legislation and court documents demonstrate early aversions to idleness. A Massachusetts court in 1641 pronounced, "[I]t is desired and will be expected that all masters of families should see that their children and servants should be industriously implied so as the mornings and evenings and other seasons may not bee lost as formerly they have bene [sic]."²⁸ At other times, officials became even more directive in their recommendations. In the mid-1600s, court officials stipulated that keeping cattle was not

sufficiently industrious even for a child. Instead, children were also expected to "bee set to some other implement withal as spinning upon the rock, knitting, weveing tape, etc."²⁹

Practical needs and religious beliefs consequently promoted child labor in the colonies. Up until the late 1800s, most people believed that child labor was economically and morally sound.³⁰ For the children, this work prevented the "sin of idleness" and prepared them for economic independence. For employers, children provided a cheap supply of labor. And for the community, child labor prevented pauperism and dependence on the government.³¹ Unfortunately, the system of indentures and apprenticeships was easily abused.³²

Child Labor and the Industrial Revolution

The nation's early approval of child labor held fast even as the context of labor changed due to advances in communication and manufacturing. Mechanization and mass production transformed industry, moving it from the cottage to the factory. Still, employers and proponents of child labor justified child labor with the same arguments. Consequently, children were some of the first to be affected by the changes of the Industrial Revolution. Manufacturers continued to employ children because of labor shortages, and mechanical advances expanded employers' ability to use child laborers in the face of high labor costs.³³

Indeed, child labor became one of the perceived virtues of the new industries. Hiring children meant that manufacturers were no longer draining the agricultural male labor pool. Additionally, employers viewed children as highly desirable employees, believing child laborers to be cheaper, easier to control, more efficient, reliable, and less likely to strike.³⁴ A 1789 petition for the first cotton factory in Beverly, Massachusetts,

touted its potential employment of children.³⁵ In 1790, nine children, between the ages of seven and twelve, operated Samuel Slater's first textile mill in Rhode Island.³⁶ Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, praised such factories for their employment of women and children, noting in 1791, "It is worthy of particular remark, that, in general, women and children are rendered more useful, and the latter more early useful, by manufacturing establishments, [sic] than they would otherwise be."³⁷ As the *Niles' Weekly Register* lauded in 1817, children allowed industry to prosper without removing adult agricultural laborers from the fields: "The great objection to manufactures was, that they abstracted labor from the more profitable and more healthy pursuits of agriculture. And this might have been a reasonable objection when able-bodied men were doing the work that is now better done by little girls from six to twelve years old."³⁸ In these early discussions, the community rejoiced that children could be useful and industrious.³⁹

The advent of the factory, accompanied as it was by urbanization and an influx of immigration, began to shift the traditional community structure and accordingly shift the contexts of child labor. As the means of production moved from the small shop or to the centralization of the factory, the role of the master craftsman faded. The rules governing the craft household also began to die out. Whereas the master craftsman previously maintained a household discipline, the factory owner no longer knew his workers and had to resort to new forms of discipline. The lives of the workers, previously governed by seasonal rhythms or the needs of the household in rural districts or small communities, came to be ordered by the factory whistle and monitored by a police force.⁴⁰ As noted above, textile mills and cotton factories were some of the first outlets for significant child labor in the new industrialized system.

They were not the only outlets though. Children, particularly boys, were employed in the coal mines that became more active with the industrialization of America. Railroads eased travel and supply routes and readily connected once "island communities" to the broader world.⁴¹ The coal needed to drive these great engines, to propel industry, and to warm the houses of the cities also required more extensive mining operations.⁴² Deep in the mines and on the surface in the breaker rooms, boys sifted through the coal, manned mine doors, drove mule teams, and helped to load coal carts.⁴³ Newly erected telegraph lines, often positioned alongside the railroad tracks, opened channels of communication within cities and between cities as they expanded across the nation. Messenger boys ran hither and thither picking up and delivering telegrams and providing the cheap labor that kept this "Victorian internet" running.⁴⁴

At first these messengers simply delivered telegrams, but their responsibilities grew as the telegraph industry advanced in the second half of the nineteenth century. From the beginning, companies like Western Union and American District Telegraph employed youths to carry telegrams from telegraph offices to individuals at homes and businesses. Decked out in military-style uniforms, boys were called upon to deliver important messages promptly. After the Civil War, telegraph companies began working with security and messenger companies to offer a fuller range of services. The invention of the "call box" in 1871 expanded the messenger boys' duties. These boxes were installed in personal residences and businesses. By turning a dial and pulling a lever, call box subscribers could request the district office to send a police officer or a messenger boy to their location. Upon responding to a call, messengers could then be asked to send a

telegram, answer the phone for an hour, deliver a package, or run to the store. In many respects, messengers became the nation's first temp workers.⁴⁵

Initially, messenger work was viewed as respectable; it was cast as a stepping stone to future success either in the telegraph industry or in business. The telegraph industry propagated the narrative that messengers rose from entry positions as messengers to become successful company clerks. In the early days of the telegraph, companies regularly promoted employees from within their own ranks. During slow periods, managers permitted, and in some offices even encouraged, the boys to fiddle with telegraphy, practicing on the machines and learning Morse code.⁴⁶ If messengers applied themselves in these times, they could expect to be elevated to the position of operator, clerk, or manager.⁴⁷

The industry also forwarded the perception that messengers' duties introduced them to important business leaders who might reward the most dedicated boys with sound jobs. The telegraph company embedded this narrative about a messenger's external advancement in their hiring practices and literature. For example, Andrew Carnegie worked as a messenger boy in his youth. Western Union capitalized on this connection by hanging a picture of him in every branch office to remind messengers of how diligent work could lead to external career opportunities and success.⁴⁸ The industrialist also celebrated this portrait. In his autobiography, Andrew Carnegie fondly reminisced about the joys of messenger work that brought him in contact with the distinguished men of Pittsburgh. He noted,

A messenger boy... met with very kind men, to whom he looked up with respect; they spoke a pleasant word and complimented him on his promptness... I do not

know a situation in which a boy is more apt to attract attention, which is all a really clever boy requires in order to rise. Wise men are always looking out for clever boys.⁴⁹

Similarly, in Horatio Alger Jr's novel, *Adventures of a Telegraph Boy, or "Number 91,"* the hero's courteous and dutiful ways attracted the attention of a businessman who eventually gave him a respectable job.⁵⁰

Despite such promises of a bright future, messengers' work entailed many questionable duties, especially at night. Child welfare reformers claimed that managers sent these adolescents on errands that were "too bad to be told their mothers."⁵¹ William Hard made this case in *Everybody's Magazine* in 1908, writing,

All night long these boys may be seen, slouching out of their offices, shambling along the street with the peculiar foot-dragging shuffle of their kind, passing the rows of open-faced saloons, turning down into the rows of droop-eyed, close-curtained houses, climbing the steps of a brothel, disappearing into the interior, coming out again after a while, and lounging languidly back to headquarters.⁵²

Other observers similarly denounced the deleterious side effects of night messenger work on an urban boy's health and morals. Edward Clopper concluded in a speech to the American Public Health Association in 1910 that the night messenger service connected boys "with the three great evils of gambling, drink, and prostitution" and thrust them "into the vilest associations."⁵³ Outraged at night messenger work, child labor reformers launched their moral campaign against child labor in the night messenger service with a series of official investigations. As part of these investigations, the NCLC commissioned Lewis Hine and Edward M. Barrows to collect data on the industry in 1909.

Messengers themselves boasted of their knowledge of the vice district in conversations with undercover agents. When asked what requests prostitutes made of messengers, one messenger replied, "Everything under the sun."⁵⁴ Boys claimed that they were sent for candy, "chop-suey," drinks, clothing, corsets, women's drawers, medicine, condoms, doctors, cigarettes, "knock-out drops," dope, and cocaine.⁵⁵ They ran messages to pimps, helped prostitutes to dress, learned to steal, cheat, and lie, and fell prey to ruffians and sexual predators, according to NCLC accounts.⁵⁶ Yet, telegraph companies continued to boast of the advancement opportunities open to their messengers. Like other sectors, the telegraph industry was slow to acknowledge shifts in the career trajectory of its employees.

In the new telegraph industry, as in more established crafts like glass manufacturing, new technologies displaced workers.⁵⁷ More efficient telegraph machines reduced the number of operators needed along the lines and therefore reduced the possible positions in which messengers could rise.⁵⁸ Advancement opportunities further diminished as the growth of the telegraph industry leveled out and new machines could be run by unskilled laborers. Some operators and clerks saw the boys as threats to their own jobs and refused to teach them telegraphy. If a messenger could master telegraphy why did the companies need to hire and pay adult men? Additionally, schools established by the telegraph industry to train operators glutted the market by the late 1800s. Companies encouraged enrollment in these training schools, making operators more readily available whenever a position opened up.⁵⁹ Within such a shifting context, few messengers could find room to advance within telegraph companies.

This altered situation did not change the telegraph industry's narrative about a messenger's opportunities for advancement. Nor did disruptions to career trajectories in other industries greatly influence the support for child labor. Moving into the twentieth century, the general public continued to applaud child labor. They looked upon child labor with either "approval or indifference."⁶⁰ Referring to attitudes toward child labor in coal mining regions, Owen Lovejoy, a NCLC leader, noted that "readers of this paper must not suppose that 'child labor' is a vital topic here. No subject is less frequently discussed. The churches are almost wholly silent. Nobody seems disposed to 'dodge the issue.' No issue is recognized." One coal mining breaker boss even boasted to Lovejoy, "The little devils like it."⁶¹

By the turn of the twentieth century, though, the concerns and arguments used to encourage child labor in the colonies and early republic morphed into arguments against child labor. Over the course of the nineteenth century, child labor moved from filling a labor shortage to creating a labor surplus, from being a means of occupational training to resulting in dead end work, and from instilling virtues to imperiling a child's morals. Such cultural changes gave rise to a debate over the role of children in the labor force within the era of Progressive politics.

COORDINATING A RESPONSE TO THE CHILD LABOR PROBLEM

Some of the first groups to speak out publicly against child labor were the labor unions. The National Trades' Union proposed a minimum age for workers in 1836. In 1876, the Knights of Labor began agitating for a ban on child labor under the age of 15 in factories and mines.⁶² By 1879, the Chicago Trades and Labor Assembly petitioned for legislation that called for compulsory education and the prohibition of child labor based

on the understanding that child labor "depressed wages, took jobs away from adults, deprived young people of educational opportunities, menaced their health, and fostered juvenile delinquency."⁶³ The Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions, which later reorganized as the American Federation of Labor, included a call for the abolition of child labor in their 1881 constitution.⁶⁴

Several political parties also came out against child labor in the second half of the 1800s. In 1872, the Prohibition Party became the first political party to integrate an anti-child labor plank into their official platform.⁶⁵ The Democratic Party followed in 1892, declaring in their platform: "We are in favor of the enactment by the States of laws . . . for prohibiting the employment in factories of children under 15 years of age."⁶⁶

States responded timidly to these early objections to child labor. In 1818, the governor of Rhode Island expressed concern over the education of child laborers in the factories. A Massachusetts investigation and report on child labor in manufacturing companies in 1825 similarly found existing educational provisions inadequate. No state action was taken in either situation. Only Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Connecticut had minimum age requirements by 1860. The legal age to work in these four states ranged from nine to thirteen, but this legislation applied only to limited industries, most commonly manufacturing. By that same time, only seven states had hour limits for working children. Maine set some of the strictest hour limits on child labor, limiting children under sixteen years of age to ten-hour work days. Massachusetts only restricted the working hours of children under twelve.⁶⁷

The first child labor laws in the South passed several decades later. Child labor laws trailed behind the growth of the southern textiles and industry in the 1880s.

Alabama passed the first child labor law in the South in 1887; yet, in the following legislative session, the law was partially, though effectively, repealed.⁶⁸ Southern states only began to regulate child labor in the textile industry in the early 1900s.⁶⁹ In both the North and the South, these early laws failed to provide clear and effective provisions for proof of age requirements and enforcement mechanisms.⁷⁰ Furthermore, these early laws applied exclusively to factory and manufacturing positions. They did not apply to the messenger service.

Believing the fledgling child labor laws to be insufficient, other organizations entered the movement against child labor. From its founding in 1891, the organization that eventually became the National Consumers' League sought to galvanize public opinion in support of improved working conditions for children and in the regulation of child labor.⁷¹ At their annual convention in 1898, the General Federation of Women's Clubs adopted a child labor resolution, which favored the abolition of child labor under the age of fourteen "in mill, factory, workshop, store, office, or laundry." The organization also supported a maximum 48-hour work week for children and affirmed an educational provision and manual training for children up to fourteen years old.⁷²

Several organizations formed solely in response to the problem of child labor. Irene Ashby Macfadyen served as an agent of the American Federation of Labor and investigated child labor in Alabama. Once there, her interactions with Edgar Gardner Murphy inspired Murphy to champion a piece of anti-child labor legislation in the state legislature. The measure's failure convinced Murphy of the need for an organization devoted to child labor reform; in 1901, he helped to form the Alabama Child Labor Committee, the first state child labor committee in the nation.⁷³ Similarly, the conditions

of child labor in New York City encouraged members of the Association of Neighborhood Workers, composed of local settlement workers, to form a special Child Labor Committee in 1902. This committee eventually became the New York Child Labor Committee. Responding to the exigencies of the city, the committee focused attention primarily on tenement work, street trades, and the ever-present factory work.

Activists increasingly recognized the need for a coordinating body in the face of stiff resistance to regional reform efforts. In a 1903 speech to the National Conference of Charities and Correction, Murphy called child labor a "national problem" and emphasized the need to bring society together on "behalf of every wounded, helpless, defenceless [sic] element of our industrial society."⁷⁴ A proceeding subcommittee called for an organization to act as a "clearing house of information," which could educate "the public mind" and "quicke[n] the public conscience" on the matter of "child labor."⁷⁵ In his announcement of this new organization in 1904, Felix Adler, the first chairman of the National Child Labor Committee, justified the need for a national child labor organization. He pinpointed the shift from an agricultural stage to an "industrial or commercial stage," which tempted states to use cheap child labor that resulted in "a holocaust of the children."⁷⁶ The new child labor force in the factories and mines, Adler charged, destroyed the children and therefore necessitated in-depth study.⁷⁷

Predicated on the idea that childhood was a precious time of innocence, child labor activists began to push for reform in the industrial sectors in particular. Generally, the NCLC first sought to reform child labor in the coal mines. Next, they tackled child labor in the glasshouses, cotton mills, street trades, tenements, and canneries respectively.⁷⁸ Reform of the night messenger service became a priority in 1910. Each

industry-specific campaign typically followed a set process—they started with a series of in-depth investigations, moved to the collection of public support, and ended with campaigns for state and national anti-child labor legislation.

RHETORICAL FORCES WEIGHING ON THE NMS REFORM

Rhetorical forces at the turn-of-the-century helped shape these reform efforts in the anti-child labor movement. In particular, the construction of social problems, the rhetoric of social science, and the discourse of deliberative democracy contributed to the nature of reform.

Sketching the Boundaries of Public Social Responsibility

In the late-1800s and early-1900s, reformers and the public were renegotiating the boundaries of what qualified as a public concern and how public morals should be protected and fostered. Whereas the individual within the local community had been the focus, reformers began to turn their attention to broader social concerns, particularly in response to fears of cities. Therefore, NMS campaigners were making a case to regulate child labor as the community sorted out how they were to moderate the morals of the individual in the community.

Progressive Era reformers used fear appeals about impersonal, urban environments that frequently drew on their conceptions of healthy and moral living rooted in their rural upbringings.⁷⁹ They contrasted cities to an idealized view of country life. Vocal leaders argued that rural, small-town America was a God-given, good and virtuous environment.⁸⁰ They feared what the co-founder of the American Boy Scouts, Ernest T. Seton, called "city rot."⁸¹ Yet, cities grew exponentially in the late 1800s upon the rising tide of immigration and industrialization.⁸² In 1880, half of the American

population lived on farms. By 1920, almost 75 percent of the population lived in cities.⁸³ These shifts in the American landscape altered the arguments and assumptions that could be made about how the community functioned.

Critics charged that the anonymity of these burgeoning cities was dangerous. Charles Loring Brace of the Children's Aid Society bemoaned that in moving out of their own country, emigrants often lost contact with the moralizing influences of their communities. As a result, a young man was "released from the social inspection and judgment to which he ha[d] been subjected at home."⁸⁴ City residents could hide from the disciplining attention of friends and leaders who traditionally used norms like church attendance to reaffirm social mores in the community.⁸⁵ Instead, reformers charged that cities brimmed with *dangerous* elements, including immigrants, Catholics, saloons, Mammon, and socialism.⁸⁶ Strong argued that the cities, filled with liquor, political corruption, prostitution, and slums, were "a serious menace to our civilization."⁸⁷

Increasingly, urban reformers circulated narratives about how city officials were unable to expand the municipal infrastructure to match the demands of this growing population. The challenges of housing conditions, labor relations, and disease control plagued local governments.⁸⁸ In 1896, Chicago's Department of Health described sections of tenement houses as "old, dilapidated or rotten, damp, unventilated, badly lighted, badly drained, unprovided with proper facilities for the disposal of excreta and without adequate or even necessary water supply."⁸⁹ Jacob Riis shocked the public with his narrative and documentation of New York City's overcrowding and sanitation problems in *How the Other Half Lives* (1890). After describing tenement conditions, he argued, "This gap between dingy brick-walls is the yard. That strip of smoke-colored sky up there

is the heaven of these people. Do you wonder the name does not attract them to the churches?"⁹⁰ This argument became prevalent and pressing as public figures pondered how the community's character was formed amid such squalor.

These questions and concerns signaled a larger shift in how public problems were perceived within religious and philanthropic contexts. Coming out of a history of revivalism, Protestants focused heavily on individual salvation in the second half of the nineteenth century. Their concern was the *individual's* soul and the *individual's* needs.⁹¹ In the late 1800s, the church applied this individualism to salvation *and* to material work. They used religion to endorse American business and big industry.⁹² Poverty was cast as a moral fault, and the poor were stigmatized.⁹³ Philanthropists and officials argued that the poor would only learn good judgment and self-control through experience. Within this view, working at a young age was exactly what the children of the poor needed in order to instill in them a strong work ethic. Governmental aid to the poor, the prevailing logic suggested, could stymie this learning possibility.⁹⁴

Many philanthropic organizations in the late-1800s maintained this focus on the individual. For instance, the Charity Organization Society movement involved groups of sponsors hiring agents to investigate applications for aid.⁹⁵ These organizations idealized personal involvement in the act of charity and neighborhood units, where they believed neighborly aid would be built upon mutual personal responsibility. They attended to the individual, taking up the specific case of the individual rather than attending to the larger structural causes of the problem.⁹⁶ As Donna Franklin argues, "The guiding philosophy was that pauperism could be eliminated through investigating and studying the character of those seeking help and by educating and developing the poor."⁹⁷ Charity Organization

Societies held that this type of organizing and volunteer “friendly visiting” would save society from the growing pauperism in modern cities.⁹⁸ These philanthropists claimed that social problems were rooted in individual deficiencies, and therefore, the solution to these problems was to focus on individuals, their moral education and renewal.

Some began to question this "individualistic ethos" as the limits of this approach became apparent in the modern industrial environment.⁹⁹ Public or “social” Protestantism emerged as a response to the disparity of wealth, industrial strife, and squalid urban conditions of the day.¹⁰⁰ As their central tenet, these social Christians embraced Jesus' call to love one's neighbor and the Old Testament prophets' calls for justice and righteousness over the traditional focus on individual piety.¹⁰¹ This social perspective also influenced philanthropy and how reformers talked about social concerns. Francis Peabody reportedly coined the phrase "the social question," which became an umbrella term used to speak about challenges within the family, communities, and industry. Instead of focusing on individual failings, these reformers came to concentrate on the “problems of modern social life.”¹⁰²

Public Protestants and reformers redirected their agenda and the solutions they pursued in light of this social perspective. Followers of the social gospel, one facet of this social approach, were to pursue social justice through philanthropic *and* political avenues.¹⁰³ Their first object was the regeneration of society, and they correspondingly argued that Christianity pertained to every issue.¹⁰⁴ According to Washington Gladden, a leader in the social gospel movement, the Gospel applied "to the shop and the mart and the mine and the kitchen and the office and the senate and the forum."¹⁰⁵ They saw their responsibility extending beyond individual regeneration and private initiatives. Therefore,

while individualists might fight to legislate against gambling or for Sunday "Blue Laws," public Protestants more frequently concerned themselves with legislating against slumlords and sweatshop employers.¹⁰⁶ They conceived of the old vices of intemperance, profanity, and prostitution as part of the social problem, resulting from poor working and living conditions, and many sought public rather than private interventions.¹⁰⁷ This shift can be observed in the outreach programs of the day. The Young Men's Christian Association, for instance, moved from seeking to prevent young men from sinning to a broader focus on building character and raising a youth's awareness of his membership in the community.¹⁰⁸ Leaders like Josiah Strong argued that the church should attend "to the salvation of society as well as to that of the individual,"¹⁰⁹ for they believed that addressing societal sins would improve the lot of the individual.¹¹⁰

Many of these social reformers began by trying to reform the family because they saw the family as the cornerstone of social life.¹¹¹ They argued that stable families exemplified a spirit of love and brotherhood.¹¹² The example of these families could flow into and improve society at large, as the world emulated their natural goodwill and harmony.¹¹³ Children within the family were a special focus of moral reform. In the innocence and happiness of childhood, the morality of children was to be developed in an altruistic family environment, and this foundation would help children to develop a strong, moral character. Such morality would equip them to overcome sexual temptation and materialism later in life.¹¹⁴ Propelled forward by this perspective, "child saving" became one of the most popularly-supported reform movements at the turn of the century.¹¹⁵

Social reformers and public Protestants expressed the most anxiety about managerial-class youths and lower-class, urban boys. They warned that the city and its vices threatened to sap the vitality of both of these groups. On the other hand, pampered and doted upon upper-class boys were believed to be over-civilized. Nativists feared that such weak and overeducated youths would succumb to "muscular immigrant hordes."¹¹⁶ Child savers frequently directed their attention to the lower-class and immigrant children of the city, for they believed the city environment threatened to over-stimulate the senses of street boys and drain their youth, making them unfit for future productive living.¹¹⁷ The play movement emerged to channel boyish energies into exercise and the outdoors. Protestant churches spearheaded these boy-saving efforts with organizations like outdoor camps and the Boys' Brigade that were devoted to developing character.¹¹⁸ These organized activities purportedly integrated the children properly into work rhythms and the social order. In childhood, many came to believe, a youth could be molded into Christian "manhood."¹¹⁹

These shifting arguments also fed into the anti-child labor movement. Within this new framework, the public was responsible for young messenger boys, because it was a squalid and desperate environment that supported this night trade and forced young impressionable minds into the fray. Many public Protestants devoted themselves to improving children's environments in order to improve society, and Christian ministers played central roles in the child labor movement's leadership. The NCLC's first two assistant secretaries, Owen Lovejoy and Alexander McKelway, were former pastors. Edgar Gardner Murphy was also an Episcopal priest when his interactions with Irene

Ashby Macfadyen continued to shift his attention from an individualistic to a more social approach to Christianity and reform.¹²⁰

Identifying the Problem through Social Scientific Investigations

In addition to shifting religious and cultural perspectives, social scientists aided the child labor movement as they worked to categorize child labor as a public problem. The NCLC adopted the prevailing methods of social science research in these campaigns, and investigations became a first step for the NCLC in regulating child labor.¹²¹ For example, reform began in earnest when the NCLC commissioned Lewis Hine and Edward M. Barrows to collect data on the night messenger service. This course of action built upon nineteenth-century empiricism and its assumptions about the ability of science and statistics to provide solutions to social problems.¹²²

Other statistical and social scientific initiatives pioneered the course for the NCLC's approach to investigations. Carroll D. Wright was an early representative of the empirical scientific tradition in the United States as he collected and tabulated data on social variables as the first Commissioner of Labor Statistics for the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The Commissioner's perspective on research reflected earlier theorists who assumed that each social situation had a straightforward cause and effect relationship that could be studied and subsequently addressed. Wright and many of his contemporaries thus originally argued that all that they needed to do was to complete one great investigation of labor conditions, which would automatically lead to the necessary reforms and legislation.¹²³ Charles Booth further trail-blazed data-gathering methods and statistics with his foundational 1891 London survey: *Life and Labour of the People of London*.¹²⁴ Booth's study integrated new forms of evidence on poverty,¹²⁵ and by its

example, it elevated statistics and scientific approaches to understanding the city.¹²⁶ This empirical tradition became the backdrop against which the NCLC's chairman announced the central role that investigations would play in the new organization. The underlying assumption for many reformers was that "knowledge of the facts will be the most useful of all means of accomplishing results."¹²⁷ These facts would then help to bring about "suitable legislation" to protect "the rights of childhood."¹²⁸

The NCLC was engaged in these scientific discussions early on. Both their first general secretary, Samuel McCune Lindsay, and their first vice-chairman, Homer Folks,¹²⁹ were at the center of emerging social science scholarship as trained sociologists.¹³⁰ At the turn-of-the-century these sociologists framed the new discipline as a thoroughly objective science, requiring empirical measurements.¹³¹ Researchers most often understood this objectivity to be "the attitude of the unbiased observer."¹³² They thought themselves to be as objective as botanists studying flowers even though their study of trusts was funded by John D. Rockefeller.¹³³

Given this definition of objectivity, sociologists made hands-on experience and direct contact a hallmark of early American sociology.¹³⁴ Researchers stressed the need for onsite experience in real life situations.¹³⁵ Sociologists traded the beakers and Bunsen burners of the traditional laboratory for a "city laboratory" where they could test urban social conditions.¹³⁶ A 1902 review of the sociology discipline in America touted the city of Chicago as "one of the most complete social laboratories in the world."¹³⁷

Hines and Barrows' night messenger service investigations also built on the methods and philosophies of American social settlement workers,¹³⁸ many of whom were active in the anti-child labor movement. Settlement residents believed that community

cooperation could answer the social question. They consequently moved to depressed areas and began to research living conditions in the urban wards.¹³⁹ Workers, like Robert A. Woods of Boston's Andover House, held that a "close, scientific study of the social conditions in the neighborhood" was "indispensable" to a reform movement's success.¹⁴⁰ They argued that science (e.g., empirical investigation) could elucidate the dimensions of poverty, help formulate policy recommendations, and influence public opinion in ways that could help prompt social change.¹⁴¹

These settlement workers helped to pioneer social scientific studies in urban environments at a time when urban statistics were scarce.¹⁴² In the process, they used innovative research methods, including interviews, questionnaires, participant observations, and secondary data analyses of local records.¹⁴³ The residents of Hull House in Chicago published *Hull House Papers and Maps* in 1895 as "simply" a compiled record of their "observations" of "neighborhood life."¹⁴⁴ Another settlement worker, Robert Hunter, used the same mix of personal experience and statistical grounding to structure his famous 1904 account of pauperism and life in the city entitled *Poverty*.¹⁴⁵ Hunter's account had wide appeal for it drew on statistics from pauper burials, charitable societies, and wage rates to portray poverty in more scientific terms.¹⁴⁶

Reform organizations like the National Child Labor Committee also gleaned from the settlements a better means of publicizing the data they collected in their studies.¹⁴⁷ Settlement residents "interpreted" their experiences among laborers and immigrants for the middle and upper classes by speaking publicly, writing articles, publishing studies, and promoting discussions.¹⁴⁸ In a like fashion, the secretaries of the NCLC traveled widely to address clubs, government groups, and churches.¹⁴⁹ Settlement workers also

improved upon traditional means of presentation by integrating photographs, colored maps, charts, statistical analyses, and narrative accounts in their displays.¹⁵⁰ The NCLC adopted these innovative presentation methods; in their NMS campaign materials they enhanced the pathos of their presentations by exhibiting photographs of the cocaine and billy clubs collected from messengers.

Pursuing Legislative Solutions to Guarantee Rights

Moving into the 1900s, the NCLC and its partners employed this rhetoric of social responsibility and the emerging rhetoric of social science in pursuit of legislative reform, and they spoke with confidence of their chances of success. Their enthusiasm stemmed from a firm belief in the inevitability of progress.¹⁵¹ For public Protestants, this optimism grew out of the reoriented eschatology of the Social Gospel and Progressive conceptions of progress. Social Gospellers claimed that the Kingdom of God was imminent.¹⁵² Because they believed in the innate goodness of humans and the approach of the kingdom of God, these reformers were convinced that by working together they could rectify the ills of society.¹⁵³ Progressives placed their faith in collective action, believing in the power of an energized citizenry. They trusted that if they worked together they could look optimistically toward the future.¹⁵⁴

In the churches and society, collective action became a trusted means by which to address social problems. Reformers stressed community, common responsibility, and the need for cooperation to confront the "social question."¹⁵⁵ An emphasis on social cohesion marked Progressive rhetoric.¹⁵⁶ Social concerns were brought to public light through investigations, and then the public's collective moral indignation was to catalyze Progressive legislation. Once a "sin" was called out, Robert Crunden argues, activists

believed that "decent citizens would repent and a good world could develop."¹⁵⁷ These citizens were to exhort, petition, and agitate for political and legislative reform. And they were to use the newly-instituted democratic tools of initiative, referendum, recall, and the direct election of senators to achieve these ends. Public democratic deliberation was to be at the center of this action.¹⁵⁸

This social focus played out in collaborative projects. Organizations joined with clubs, settlements, and churches to advance their reform agendas. Protestant churches joined with the anti-child labor movement by holding child labor day church services, delivering child labor sermons, and hosting child labor reform speakers.¹⁵⁹ The Consumers' League shared office space with the National Child Labor Committee in the Charities Building in New York City.¹⁶⁰ The NCLC also solicited the assistance of local child labor committees and women's clubs to agitate for reform.¹⁶¹

Child labor reformers used these calls for social cohesion and this emerging rhetoric of social science to make their case for legislative action. In the early 1900s, muckrakers brought a range of issues before the public. There was public agitation around labor, suffrage, and vice. In response to these challenges, the governmental sphere expanded. At the state level, legislation more firmly cemented protective labor regulations, compulsory attendance laws, and mothers' pensions. North Carolina, for example, introduced and updated their child labor regulations five times between 1903 and 1915. The state's first child labor law in 1903 prohibited children from working in the mills before the age of twelve and instituted a 66-hour work week for workers under eighteen years old. By 1915, the state's laws grew to include a maximum 60-hour work week, proof of age requirements, prohibitions on night work for children, and

compulsory school attendance regulations. In addition to child labor laws, several states also put in place protective legislation to limit the number of hours women could be employed in a week and to set workplace sanitary standards.¹⁶²

These efforts to enact protective legislation moved to the federal level in the early 1900s. Reformers marshaled systematic investigations, morality arguments, and a rhetoric of rights to lobby for a range of protective measures. Such measures were met with varying levels of success. In the case of the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906, their efforts were successful. On the other hand, the first piece of federal anti-child labor legislation, known as the Beveridge-Parson's Bill of 1906, was mocked and defeated.¹⁶³ The federal government also extended its oversight of the nation's children, morals, and labor through Comstock laws (obscene materials), the Lottery act, the Phosphorous Match tax, the Mann Act (white slavery), and the Children's Bureau. The campaign to regulate child labor in the night messenger service was one reform alongside a slew of other needs and demands.

This study engages in a rhetorical analysis of the debate surrounding the night messenger service, with particular attention given to the ways in which Progressive Era leaders sought to identify and understand the scope of the problem and to advocate for social and political change.

PROJECT DETAILS

This project considers two research questions related to the night messenger service reforms that were part of the Progressive Era debates over child labor in the United States. First, this project examines *how these child labor reformers challenged and changed reigning conceptions of adolescence and ultimately refined what it meant to*

be a child of character in America. Second, this study asks *how the NMS campaigners established their own expertise as they drew on social science methods, moral citizenship norms, and rights discourse to transform child labor into a significant public issue warranting government oversight.* To examine these rhetorical dynamics, this study focuses on the NMS investigative reports; newspaper, magazine, and journal articles; and materials from the state legislative campaigns between 1909 and 1915. These developments are historicized in the emerging rhetorics of the social sciences, beliefs in moral citizenship, and constructions of rights—rights for states and rights for the children under their supervision. At root, this project is about how social welfare reformers confronted a social issue and realigned relationships among children, the people, the state, and public reformers. The analysis ultimately demonstrates the ways in which child labor reformers used a rhetoric of social science to define a public problem, constructed the *phronimos* to mobilize public support for change, and realigned the rights of families (parents and children) to state and federal governments.

This analysis begins from the perspective that the *rhetoric* of public policy matters. As Martin J. Medhurst argues, rhetoric functions as a way of "knowing," "doing," and "being."¹⁶⁴ In relying on a public address framework, this study more specifically assumes that public discourse features an index of political ideas, that texts and their contexts are intricately intertwined, and that archival sources foster insight into public discourse.¹⁶⁵ In short, public address studies examine the ways in which ideas are constituted and transformed in discourse, how rhetoric shapes identity and reifies values, how arguments and counter-arguments forge political change, and how texts are situated within a web of social, linguistic, and textual contexts.¹⁶⁶ In this approach, this project

takes a Wragan approach to study the history of ideas that animated child labor arguments. The underlying assumption is that ideas evolve in texts and each text is situated within a web of multilayered contexts.¹⁶⁷

Theories associated with spheres of public argument, social science methods, moral citizenship, and rights rhetoric guide this analysis of the NMS reform efforts. To deepen an understanding of the formative political ideas leading up and through the Progressive Era, the night messenger service campaign is also situated within its overlapping intellectual, social, and legislative contexts.¹⁶⁸ Tacking back and forth between these texts and contexts allows for a richer examination of the rhetorical strategies that shaped the debate over child labor—a debate that relied heavily on the identities of gendered, raced, and classed childhood in the Progressive Era. More modern notions of childhood emerged in the nineteenth century, but they were intimately tied up with middle-class norms of gender and family.¹⁶⁹ This linkage between childhood and class carried into the Progressive Era. In these years, as Michael McGerr argues, middle-class reformers attempted to enforce their values about the home on both workers and the wealthiest ten percent of society.¹⁷⁰ They perceived that traditional notions of family were being eroded by shifting sexual norms and licentious urban environments. In response, manhood, which entailed physical strength and moral courage, deepened as the measure of the ideal citizen.¹⁷¹ Theodore Roosevelt embodied this ideal in his public image and writings about “manly virtues” and “the strenuous life.”¹⁷² NMS campaigners crafted their calls for regulation of the messenger service within and upon these ideals of a middle-class childhood and masculinity.¹⁷³ In such ways, class interests and gendered and raced power dynamics served as the foundation for the NMS campaign. It was only

due to the reformers' white, middle-class male privilege that they could wander the vice districts and maintain their respectability. And it was due to such privilege that they could spend only a few evenings researching working-class life and still claim to provide a comprehensive, credible account of this industry. These dynamics of class, gender, and race also pervaded the assumptions that reformers made as they asserted their own rights, states' rights, and a new vision of children's rights.¹⁷⁴

Public address studies also recognize that arguments in different spheres follow particular standards for credibility, reasoning, and judgment. As they took up notions of social science, citizenship, and rights, the NMS campaigners navigated the personal, technical, and public spheres.¹⁷⁵ The personal sphere is notable for being relationally-driven. In everyday conversations, individuals negotiate rules of argument in circles with families and friends based on previous interactions and experiences. Their conclusions are only consequential to the individuals involved in the relationship.¹⁷⁶ In contrast, public sphere arguments invite a broader base of participation, and common standards of argument are acknowledged, established, and updated collectively. These arguments engage people as members of the community at large,¹⁷⁷ and experience within a community serves as a marker of expertise.¹⁷⁸ These norms stand in sharp relief to the technical sphere, which restricts participation to experts who have a specialized knowledge of the field. These technical experts value procedure, often use inductive arguments, and ground their claims in experiments.¹⁷⁹ This project tracks the NMS campaign's formation and movement among these three blurred and dynamic spheres as the campaign sought to enact political change.¹⁸⁰

These deliberations were also shaped by the rhetoric of social science. In this context, social science theories consisted of sets of ideas about human behavior and social relations. In 1886, Munroe Smith defined social science as “all the relations that result from man's social life.”¹⁸¹ Social scientists at the turn of the century defined this field of knowledge in technical terms and conceived of it as a systematic study of collective phenomena. They also associated social science with the cultural authority of the physical sciences.¹⁸² This analysis works from the understanding that the rhetoric of social science entailed methods of investigation, theories of adolescent development, and assumptions about social connections and interdependence. Reformers’ definition of the night messenger service problem and their persuasive campaigning was shaped by these burgeoning social scientific forces in the Progressive Era.

Theories of citizenship, especially as they overlap with research on morality and masculinity, also guide this study’s understanding of child labor reform. Michael Schudson defines citizenship as “the political expectations and aspirations people inherit and internalize.”¹⁸³ This definition, though broad, recognizes the dynamic nature of citizenship, for citizenship evolves even as it draws “boundaries,” marking off who is a privileged member of the civic community and who is not.¹⁸⁴ In the United States, as Rogers Smith explains, these boundaries of citizenship have traditionally been defined by “democratic republican,” “liberal,” and “ascriptive” notions, which privilege virtue, rights, and inegalitarianism respectively.¹⁸⁵ These competing qualifications emerged early on as race, gender, and character were established as markers of citizenship. With the Naturalization Law of 1790, lawmakers limited U.S. citizenship to the “free white person” of “good character.”¹⁸⁶ Masculinity and morality remained central features of

American citizenship into the Progressive Era with women and non-whites being excluded and/or consigned to a status of second-class citizenship and immigrants being policed by officials at the borders for their moral and physical fitness.¹⁸⁷

In the Progressive Era, the ideal citizen became an educated white man. At the turn of the twentieth century, Schudson stresses reformers “celebrated the private, rational ‘informed citizen.’”¹⁸⁸ This development had implications for child welfare reform, for this rational, informed ideal focused attention on the upbringing of citizens. The anti-child labor movement, and the National Child Labor Committee in particular, hinged their calls for change on what they believed to be the necessary training for producing American citizens of strong character.¹⁸⁹ Child labor needed to be reformed, according to campaigners like Florence Kelley, because these children were “citizens in the bud.”¹⁹⁰ Drawing on theories of citizenship focuses this analysis on the attention that NMS reformers gave to the moral training of adolescent boys and depictions of the character of the American public.

Relatedly, rights discourse served as a major force of the NMS campaign and represents another primary focus of this study. This analysis follows Martha Minow’s two understandings of legal rights. On the one hand, rights help legislate rules to govern the relationships between individuals, groups, and the state. On the other hand, rights discourse refers to how an individual or group should be treated within society.¹⁹¹ Rights under both of these frameworks are dynamic and contested. NMS campaigners challenged the traditional, legal bounds that defined childhood in relationship to the family, asserted the rights of non-governmental organizations to represent individuals

before government representatives, and reinforced and expanded states' rights over childhood.

Drawing on these ideational threads, the NMS reformers moved their campaign through multiple spheres of argument to reposition adolescence within the community. Prior to this debate, the work of adolescents had been treated predominantly as a private, family matter, but reformers successfully made the case that adolescent labor was a public concern. Through their arguments, campaigners moved this conversation about child labor from the personal sphere of argument into the technical and public spheres by drawing on social science, moral citizenship, and rights theories. From the outset, reformers established the credibility of their account and validity of the problem by drawing on social science methods of investigation and research on urban environments and adolescence. When they articulated their arguments in the public sphere, they appealed to Progressive Era constructions of a moral American public to craft the NMS as an urgent threat to local communities and the nation at large. And by the end of the campaign, the NMS campaigners drew on evolving conceptions of rights to argue that state governments should protect the labor and moral upbringing of the nation's adolescents. Campaigners demanded (and in many cases secured) governmental protections that defined adolescence by its moral vulnerability and latent usefulness.

Chapter Overview

Chapter One accordingly examines the construction of childhood and situates the NMS campaign in evolving discourses about adolescence from the 1800s into the Progressive Era. During this time, adolescent psychologists and childrearing experts redefined how the community was to treat children, concluding that they needed to be in

the home, sheltered and protected.¹⁹² In the public arguments of child savers, three notions were placed in tension: heredity and environment, city and country, and home and street. Prominent leaders framed city life as a cause for anxiety by comparing it to healthy country living and casting urban environments as immoral and harmful to a child's development. Reformers' objections to child labor in the street trades exemplified these anxieties. In response, reformers privileged solutions that established new environments and social structures in hopes of ensuring the strength and character of America's future citizens.

Chapter Two builds on this history and focuses on how reformers' turn to the rhetoric of social science lent authority to their investigations of the NMS. In the early 1900s, many causes vied for the public's attention, but up to that point, child welfare reform had been a more informal, private concern. Adopting the strategies of the broader anti-child labor movement, the NMS reformers coopted emerging social scientific research methods and relied on technical arguments to characterize adolescence. Among competing voices, this grounding constructed the credibility of the NCLC investigators and provided legitimacy to the problems they identified. This chapter argues that this social scientific approach inspired their investigations and shaped their conclusions about the root problems and the sources of those problems. In their analysis, the night messenger became both a victim and a threat. They framed boys as prone to evil and companies as innocent. By drawing on the cultural authority of the social sciences, NMS investigators constituted this public problem and re-constituted these once-innocent boys into immoral drains on the community.

Chapter Three centers on the ways that NMS reformers constructed norms for decorous debate and public character that painted a singular image of the moral composition of the American people. NMS campaigners acted as muckrackers by featuring public moral arguments that defined the night messenger service as a public problem warranting a public response. The campaign struck a conservative chord by eschewing muckrakers' more radical rhetoric in favor of appeals to decorum and to assumptions about audience responses. In the process, NMS campaigners constituted the American public as the *phronimos*, a people of strong moral character essential to a prosperous society. These arguments elucidated progressive ideals of the American public. Night messengers served as the morally impoverished foil to these reformers' ideal public. NMS reformers insisted that messenger boys were socialized by the norms of the streets rather than the values of the home, school, and productive workplace, and this socialization was cast as detrimental to the community not in regard to the boys' preparation as citizens but in terms of their economic futures. With a rhetoric of doom, campaigners framed the messengers as a threat to the ideal public and a mandate for change. Insofar as the campaign framed these boys as a public problem, their presence called for a public response. The NMS campaign prescribed that the ideal, moral citizen had to be repulsed by the news of the depravity in the NMS. Yet beyond sounding the alarm of such moral depravity, reformers recommended no action steps for the public to take. Having built up the need for an ideal public, campaigners, rather than the people, constituted themselves as the primary actors in the public debate.

Chapter Four examines how campaigners asserted their reform-minded organizations as the primary agents in state conversations about the messenger service

and redefined the position of adolescents in relationship to the family and state. Reformers sought solutions to the NMS problem in the state legislatures, and their child welfare organizations led the reform efforts. Starting in 1910, NMS campaigners pursued governmental solutions that redefined children's rights, but these conversations built upon child labor reformers' established channels for interactions with the state and public. These networks were founded on organizational hierarchies, rooted in technical knowledge, built on commitments to a moral citizenry, and based on legislative expertise. This foundation became the grounds on which reformers asserted the right to address and make demands upon the state. In the process, they sketched out new boundaries for children's rights. No longer were a child's rights to be defined by the family, the father's common law rights, or the mother's love. Instead, the NMS campaigners claimed the state's power to protect children's rights. By enacting NMS legislation, states expanded their paternalistic oversight of boys' socialization. The government had already assumed responsibility for children's education and provision. In NMS laws, states expanded their sphere of authority to include children's labor – raising the legal age of childhood and linking this authority to a responsibility to regulate a boy's moral upbringing.¹⁹³ This expansion represented a seismic shift in the relationship between children (and citizens more generally) and their government. This campaign also primed the organizational strategies and rights arguments used by reformers in the first federal child labor legislation—arguments that persist to this day.

Finally, the Afterword examines the implications of this public debate that progressed from an investigation by a few reformers to state legislation that shifted the ideas of childhood and labor across the country. These reformers proceeded from a series

of objective studies of child labor in the night messenger service to a successful campaign against the immorality of this industry. This study treats the public debate over the night messenger service campaign as a microcosm of moral reform within the Progressive Era and as an important debate about the government's authority over the rights of children and the relationships between the government and its citizens. This conclusion ends by assessing how this realignment continues to inform our public discourse about children and their position within the community.

Before analyzing the rhetoric associated with the NMS, this project first examines the broader ideational contexts in which this campaign occurred. It looks at the contextual tensions that set apart adolescence and defined its ideal in terms of home, family, and school.

End Notes: Introduction

¹ Ed. M Barrows, "New York," October 16, 1909, box 36, folder 22, New York Child Labor Committee, New York State Public Library, Albany, New York. This archival collection will hereafter be cited as NYCLC MSS.

² Owen R. Lovejoy, "Annual Report of the General Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee. For the Fifth Fiscal Year, Ended September 30, 1909," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 35 (March 1910): 205.

³ "Topics of the Times. Messenger Boys in Peril," *New York Times*, May 2, 1910.

⁴ Elizabeth Sands Johnson, "Child Labor Legislation," in *History of Labor in the United States, 1896-1932*, ed. John R. Commons, vol. 3 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935), 423.

⁵ *Child Labor in Massachusetts: Annual Report of the Massachusetts Child Labor Committee* (Massachusetts State Child Labor Committee, 1912), 8.

⁶ Report on Minors Employed as Messengers by the Chicago Telegraph Companies, 1914, box 1, folder 16, Juvenile Protective Association Records, University of Illinois, Chicago, Chicago, IL.

⁷ Florence Kelley, "The Street Trader Under Illinois Law," in *The Child in the City: A Series of Papers Presented at the Conferences Held During the Chicago Child Welfare Exhibit*, ed. S.P. Breckinridge (Chicago: Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, Department of Social Investigation, 1912), 293.

⁸ Hugh D. Hindman, *Child Labor: An American History* (Armonk, N.Y: M.E. Sharpe, 2002), 226; Walter I. Trattner, *Crusade for the Children: A History of the National Child*

Labor Committee and Child Labor Reform in America (Chicago, IL: Quadrangle Books, 1970), 112.

⁹ Scholars continue to debate the precise dates and focus of the Progressive Era, but this time was animated by calls for inclusion and exclusion. Leaders praised American citizens and optimistically placed their faith in the public; reformers endeavored to make government more democratic through the initiative and referendum, the direct election of senators, the recall, and direct primaries. At the same time, though, this period is also notorious for its history of corruption, exclusion, and racism. See J. Michael Hogan, “Introduction,” in *Rhetoric and Reform in the Progressive Era* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2003), x; Robyn Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform, 1890-1935* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), xi; Richard Hofstadter, *The Progressive Movement, 1900-1915* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963), 1; Robert Morse Crunden, *Ministers of Reform: The Progressives’ Achievement in American Civilization, 1889-1920* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), 17; Michael E. McGerr, *A Fierce Discontent: The Rise and Fall of the Progressive Movement in America, 1870-1920* (New York: Free Press, 2003), 216; Rogers M. Smith, *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 418; Nell Irvin Painter, *Standing at Armageddon: The United States, 1877-1919*, 1st ed. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1987), xxxviii; Philip Taft and Philip Ross, “American Labor Violence: Its Causes, Character, and Outcome,” ed. Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr, vol. 1 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1969), 221–94; Ian Haney-López, *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race*, rev. ed. (New York: New York University Press, 2006); Martha Gardner, *The Qualities of a*

Citizen: Women, Immigration, and Citizenship, 1870-1965 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), 5.

¹⁰ Jeremy P. Felt, *Hostages of Fortune: Child Labor Reform in New York State* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1965); Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*; Hindman, *Child Labor*; Gregory J. Downey, *Telegraph Messenger Boys: Labor, Technology, and Geography, 1850-1950* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Gregory J. Downey, "Running Somewhere Between Men and Women: Gender in the Construction of the Telegraph Messenger Boy," in *Research in Science and Technology Studies: Gender and Work*, ed. Shirley Gorenstein (Stamford, CT: JAI Press, 2000). Downey examined how messengers actively participated as laborers in this evolving information technology network and touched upon the night messenger service reform campaign.

¹¹ Hindman wrote one of the most recent overviews of the anti-child labor movement, in which he noted that the destruction of night messenger service records made it more difficult to study this campaign. In contrast, many studies of the anti-child labor movement have extensively examined regional, industry-specific, and national organizing. Hindman, *Child Labor*, 219; Felt, *Hostages of Fortune*; Shelley Sallee, *The Whiteness of Child Labor Reform in the New South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004); Lynn Gordon, "Women and the Anti-Child Labor Movement in Illinois, 1890-1920," *The Social Service Review* 51, no. 2 (1977): 228–48; Robert McIntosh, *Boys in the Pits: Child Labour in Coal Mining* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000); Marc Linder, "From Street Urchins to Little Merchants: The Juridical Transvaluation of Child Newspaper Carriers," *Temple Law Review* 63 (1990): 829–64; James D. Schmidt, *Industrial Violence and the Legal Origins of Child Labor* (New York: Cambridge

University Press, 2010); James D. Schmidt, “‘Restless Movements Characteristic of Childhood’: The Legal Construction of Child Labor in Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts,” *Law and History Review* 23, no. 2 (2005): 315–50; James L. Flannery, *The Glass House Boys of Pittsburgh: Law, Technology, and Child Labor* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009); Nicholas J. Hoffman, “Miniature Demons: The Young Helpers of Milwaukee’s Glass Industry, 1880-1922,” *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 91, no. 1 (Autumn 2007): 2–13; Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*.

¹² Kelley, “The Street Trader Under Illinois Law,” 293; “‘Old Boy’ Messengers: Western Union Telegraph Company Gives Up The ‘Kids.’,” *The Sun*, November 9, 1912; *Child Labor in Massachusetts*, 1912, 8.

¹³ The night messenger service reforms are most impressive when contrasted with other industries. For example, agriculture proved resistant to many attempts at reform. Standards for child labor in agriculture are still lower than those applied to other industries. See “Fields of Peril: Child Labor in US Agriculture” (Human Rights Watch, 2010), http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/crd0510webwcover_1.pdf; Hindman, *Child Labor*, 226; Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 112; Kelley, “The Street Trader Under Illinois Law,” 293; *Child Labor in Massachusetts*, 1912, 8; Elizabeth Davidson, *Child Labor Legislation in the Southern Textile States* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939), 275–76.

¹⁴ Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1975), 159.

¹⁵ Ibid., 158–59; Edith Abbott, “A Study of the Early History of Child Labor in America,” *American Journal of Sociology* 14, no. 1 (1908): 16; Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 24.

¹⁶ Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 21.

¹⁷ As quoted in Abbott, “A Study of the Early History of Child Labor in America,” 15.

¹⁸ Grace Abbott, ed., *The Child and the State; Select Documents, with Introductory Notes*, vol. 1 (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1938), 80.

¹⁹ Abbott, “A Study of the Early History of Child Labor in America,” 17.

²⁰ Ibid., 15.

²¹ Schmidt, “Restless Movements Characteristic of Childhood.”

²² *The Compact with the Charter and Laws of the Colony of New Plymouth: Together with the Charter of the Council at Plymouth and an Appendix, Containing the Articles of Confederation of the United Colonies of New England, and Other Valuable Documents* (Boston, MA: Dutton and Wentworth, 1836), 70.

²³ Abbott, “A Study of the Early History of Child Labor in America,” 18.

²⁴ Alan Dawley, *Class and Community: The Industrial Revolution in Lynn* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976); Tom Ireland, *Child Labor as a Relic of the Dark Ages* (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1937), 26; Newton D. Baker, “Forward to The Story of an Epoch-Making Movement,” in *The Story of an Epoch-Making Movement* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1986), xii.

²⁵ Schmidt, “Restless Movements Characteristic of Childhood,” 320–21.

²⁶ Abbott, *The Child and the State*, 1:195; Stephen C. Compton, “Edgar Gardner Murphy and the Child Labor Movement,” *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 52, no. 2 (June 1983): 183; Hindman, *Child Labor*, 17.

²⁷ Abbott, “A Study of the Early History of Child Labor in America,” 20.

²⁸ As quoted in *Ibid.*, 15–16, 19; Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 21.

²⁹ As quoted in Abbott, “A Study of the Early History of Child Labor in America,” 16.

³⁰ Hindman, *Child Labor*, 13; “Summary of the Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage Earners in the United States,” Women in Industry Series (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1916), 229.

³¹ Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 22–24.

³² Hindman, *Child Labor*, 16.

³³ Abbott, “A Study of the Early History of Child Labor in America,” 23.

³⁴ Herbert J. Lahne, *The Cotton Mill Worker* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc, 1944), 103; Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 27.

³⁵ Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 26.

³⁶ Ireland, *Child Labor as a Relic of the Dark Ages*, 26; Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 26; Viviana A. Rotman Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child: The Changing Social Value of Children* (New York: Basic Books, 1985), 59.

³⁷ Alexander Hamilton, *Report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States on the Subject of Manufactures*, online ed. (Childs and Swaine, 1791), http://books.google.com/books?id=FphDAAAacAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs__ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false.

³⁸ “Statesmen and Politicians: Political Economy—No. 1,” *Niles’ Weekly Register*, June 7, 1817.

³⁹ Before 1800, the phrase *child labor* did not frequently enter conversations; it became a more prominent part of the public vernacular after the Civil War. In the late 1800s, according to Walter Trattner, “Most Americans still believed that hard work was good for youngsters—it prevented juvenile delinquency and female promiscuity, and it was the first rung on the ladder to success.” Schmidt, *Industrial Violence and the Legal Origins of Child Labor*, xvii; Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 36.

⁴⁰ See E. P. Thompson, “Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism,” *Past & Present*, no. 38 (December 1967): 56–97; Dawley, *Class and Community*.

⁴¹ Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order, 1877-1920* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1980), xiii.

⁴² Between 1860 and 1900, anthracite coal production increased 525 percent. Bituminous production jumped 2,358 percent in the same time period. See Martha S. Watson and Thomas R. Burkholder, “Introduction: The Gilded Age and the New America,” in *The Rhetoric of Nineteenth-Century Reform*, ed. Martha S. Watson and Thomas R. Burkholder (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2008), xi; Painter, *Standing at Armageddon*, xviii.

⁴³ The “breaker boys” of the anthracite coal regions came to act as a “cultural icon,” symbolizing the worst aspects of child labor. See Hindman, *Child Labor*, 90; Francis H. Nichols, “Children of the Coal Shadows,” *McClure’s Magazine*, February 1903, 435–44; John Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1909), 166; Edwin Markham, “The Hoe-Man in the Making,” *The Cosmopolitan; a Monthly*

Illustrated Magazine, October 1906, 568; “Misery of ‘Breaker’ Boys in Pennsylvania Mines,” *Washington Post*, December 11, 1905, 2; Owen R. Lovejoy, “School-House or Coal-Breaker,” *Outlook*, August 26, 1905, 1011.

⁴⁴ At first *carriers* hand-delivered dispatches to the offices. Later these runners came to be known as *messengers*. Magnetic Telegraph, the first privatized telegraph company, specified that boys were to deliver the telegrams, and from the early days onward, the telegraph companies consistently employed boys to deliver telegrams. Tom Standage, *The Victorian Internet: The Remarkable Story of the Telegraph and the Nineteenth Century’s On-Line Pioneers* (New York: Walker and Company, 1998); Downey, *Telegraph Messenger Boys*, 16.

⁴⁵ Samuel Morse and Alfred Vail originally patented a simple electrical telegraph in the late 1830s and envisioned it primarily as a means of inter-city communication. From the first large-scale telegraph prototype between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. in 1843, the telegraph services were extended in the 1850s, coming to 800 towns by 1857. Western Union rose as a competitor to Morse's original lines and consolidated the industry after the Civil War. Downey, *Telegraph Messenger Boys*, 15–20, 40, 45.

⁴⁶ This informal training approached an apprentice relationship in the 1850s and 1860s. See *Ibid.*, 32–33.

⁴⁷ Standage, *The Victorian Internet*, 64.

⁴⁸ Andrew Carnegie, *Autobiography of Andrew Carnegie* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920), 43; Downey, *Telegraph Messenger Boys*, 166.

⁴⁹ Carnegie's biographer also recorded how as a young messenger Carnegie took advantage of opportunities at work. Carnegie, *Autobiography of Andrew Carnegie*, 43;

Bernard Alderson, *Andrew Carnegie: The Man and His Work* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1905), 20,
<http://books.google.com/books?id=bXNEAAAIAAJ&pg=PA156&dq=Andrew+Carnegie+%22messenger%22+work&hl=en&sa=X&ei=xAOsUOCvKqm60QG74oCQBA&ved=0CDkQ6AEwAw#v=onepage&q&f=false>.

⁵⁰ Horatio Alger Jr., *Adventures of a Telegraph Boy or "Number 91"* (Philadelphia, PA: David McKay, 1900).

⁵¹ Mrs. Stanley S. Reed and Mrs. E. L. Worthington, "The Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs at Mammoth Cave. Report of Meeting Read to Maysville Club by Mrs. Stanley F. Reed and Mrs. Leslie Worthington, Delegates," *Daily Public Ledger*, June 27, 1912, 3.

⁵² Greg Downey argues that this article focused "[b]road public attention" on the night messenger service. William Hard, "De Kid Wot Works at Night," *Everybody's Magazine*, January 1908, 36; Downey, "Running Somewhere Between Men and Women," 10.

⁵³ Edward N. Clopper, "Child Labor and Public Health," *Journal of the American Public Health Association* 1, no. 5 (May 1911): 327.

⁵⁴ Edward F. Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, PA. November ____, 1910, box 4, National Child Labor Committee Collection, Library of Congress. This archival collection is hereafter cited as NCLC MSS.

⁵⁵ Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, PA. November ____, 1910, box 4, NCLC MSS; and Investigation of the Messenger Service in Connecticut, 1914, box 4, NCLC MSS.

⁵⁶ See Barrows, "New York," October 16, 1909, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS; Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, PA. November ____, 1910, box 4, NCLC MSS; Investigation of the Messenger Service in Connecticut, 1914, box 4, NCLC MSS; Harry M. Bremer, Messenger Service in West Virginia. 1915, box 4, NCLC MSS; Herschel H. Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, KY. 1913, box 4, NCLC MSS; and Harry M. Bremer, Night Messengers of Virginia. 1913, box 4, NCLC MSS.

⁵⁷ The effects of mechanization on labor became glaringly apparent in glass manufacturing. Technological inventions increased the number of unskilled laborers (children) and decreased the number of journeymen needed in the glass industry. In the early 1900s, boys could get a job, but there were few opportunities for them to advance as they had in the past. They remained in the low-paid positions at which they started. In time, semiautomatic machines reduced the number of workers needed overall. See Hindman, *Child Labor*, 123–43; Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Americans: The Democratic Experience*, 1st ed. (New York: Random House, 1973), 342.

⁵⁸ Early on, telegrams could only be transmitted over long distances incrementally. An operator would transmit a message to the next station where it would be received by another operator and retransmitted. This process would be repeated until the message reached its intended telegraph office, and the telegram would then be delivered by a messenger boy to its final destination. Technological improvements, like automatic repeaters that amplified and forwarded messages from office to office, decreased the number of operators needed. Downey, *Telegraph Messenger Boys*, 24; Standage, *The Victorian Internet*, 194.

⁵⁹ Downey, *Telegraph Messenger Boys*, 34.

⁶⁰ Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 11.

⁶¹ Owen R. Lovejoy, “In the Shadow of the Coal Breaker” (New York: National Child Labor Committee, 1907), 14, 3,
http://darrow.law.umn.edu/documents/Lovejoy_Shadow%20of%20Coal%20Breaker.pdf.

⁶² Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 30; “Summary of the Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage Earners in the United States,” 231.

⁶³ Gordon, “Women and the Anti-Child Labor Movement in Illinois,” 229.

⁶⁴ Hindman, *Child Labor*, 49.

⁶⁵ Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 33.

⁶⁶ Edward B. Dickinson, ed., *Official Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Ill., June 21st, 22nd and 23rd 1892* (Chicago, IL: Cameron, Amberg & Co., 1892), 101.

⁶⁷ “Summary of the Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage Earners in the United States,” 246–47.

⁶⁸ Davidson, *Child Labor Legislation*, 19–20.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 275.

⁷⁰ Abbott, *The Child and the State*, 1:260.

⁷¹ In 1898, the National Consumers' League formed out of the Consumers' League of New York and other affiliated consumers' league branches. Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 35; Landon R. Y. Storrs, *Civilizing Capitalism: The National Consumers' League, Women's Activism, and Labor Standards in the New Deal Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 14–18; Katherine Kish Sklar, “The Consumers' White Label Campaign of the National Consumers' League, 1898-1918,” in

Getting and Spending: European and American Consumer Societies in the Twentieth Century, ed. Susan Strasser, Charles McGovern, and Mattias Judd (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 17–35.

⁷² Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 35; Mary Jean Houde, *Reaching Out: A Story of the General Federation of Women's Clubs* (Chicago, IL: Mobium Press, 1989), 89.

⁷³ Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 54; Davidson, *Child Labor Legislation*, 32; Hindman, *Child Labor*, 50.

⁷⁴ A *New York Times* article describing the foundation of the National Child Labor Committee noted, "The idea of organizing such a committee was suggested some three years ago by Edgar Gardner Murphy, and it was directly in consequence of his suggestion that in October, 1903, the Child Labor committee of New York City appointed from its own members Dr. Felix Adler, William H. Baldwin, Jr., and Mrs. Florence Kelley to act as a provisional committee which was to do the preliminary work needed for the organization of a National Committee." Later Adler, the first secretary of the committee, declared that Murphy was "the father and founder of the committee." Edgar Gardner Murphy, "Child Labor as a National Problem," in *Proceedings of the Conference of Charities and Correction at the Thirteenth Annual Session Held in the City of Atlanta, May 6-12, 1903*, ed. Isabel C. Barrows (Press of Fred J. Heer, 1903), 134; "Dr. Lindsay to Head Child Labor Project," *New York Times*, July 21, 1904, 7; Hugh C. Bailey, *Liberalism in the New South: Southern Social Reformers and the Progressive Movement* (Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press, 1969), 168.

⁷⁵ Minute Book National Child Labor Committee First to the Tenth Meeting, April 1904-April 1906, box 6, NCLC MSS.

⁷⁶ This contrast between agricultural versus industrial or urban child labor was widely held. In 1906, Senator Albert Beveridge (D-OH) introduced the first piece of federal child labor legislation. In speaking to the Annual Conference of the NCLC he noted, "For a child to work upon the farm is a good thing if he is not forced to labor beyond his strength...But the child labor which I denounce is the child destroying labor of the factory, the sweat shop and the mines." See Albert J. Beveridge, "Child Labor and the Nation," in *Child Labor and the Republic: Proceedings of the Third Annual Meeting of the National Child Labor Committee, Cincinnati, December 13-15, 1906* (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1907), 116.

⁷⁷ Minute Book National Child Labor Committee First to the Tenth Meeting, April 1904-April 1906, box 6, NCLC MSS.

⁷⁸ Hindman, *Child Labor*, 52.

⁷⁹ Janet Forsythe Fishburn, *The Fatherhood of God and the Victorian Family: The Social Gospel in America* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 11; Crunden, *Ministers of Reform*, 81.

⁸⁰ Martin E. Marty, *Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America* (New York: Dial Press, 1970), 157; Fishburn, *The Fatherhood of God and the Victorian Family*, 85; Clifford Putney, *Muscular Christianity: Manhood and Sports in Protestant America, 1880-1920* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 41.

⁸¹ Putney, *Muscular Christianity*, 115.

⁸² Wiebe, *The Search for Order*.

⁸³ Painter, *Standing at Armageddon*, xxxiv.

-
- ⁸⁴ Charles Loring Brace, *The Dangerous Classes of New York and Twenty Years' Work Among Them* (New York: Wynkoop & Hallenbeck, Publishers, 1872), 35.
- ⁸⁵ Marty, *Righteous Empire*, 161.
- ⁸⁶ Josiah Strong, *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis* (New York: Baker & Taylor, 1885), 129–33.
- ⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 129.
- ⁸⁸ Studies revealed an unequal distribution of deaths across the wards from common diseases. One-sixth of the deaths from typhoid in a given year came from the Nineteenth Ward, even though it housed only one thirty-sixth of Chicago's residents. "Typhoid Fever Is Menacing City," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, August 6, 1903; Harold L. Platt, "Jane Addams and the Ward Boss Revisited: Class, Politics, and Public Health in Chicago, 1890-1930," *Environmental History* 5, no. 2 (2000): 203.
- ⁸⁹ F. W. Reilly, *Biennial Report of the Department of Health of the City of Chicago Being for the Years 1895 and 1896* (Chicago, IL: Cameron, Amberg & Co., 1897), 63–64.
- ⁹⁰ Jacob A. Riis, *How the Other Half Lives: Studies among the Tenements of New York* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1890), 44.
- ⁹¹ "The Social Gospel," *The Biblical World* 40, no. 3 (1912): 147.
- ⁹² Marty, *Righteous Empire*, 149; Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949), 130.
- ⁹³ Marty, *Righteous Empire*, 110.
- ⁹⁴ Fishburn, *The Fatherhood of God and the Victorian Family*, 57.

⁹⁵ This movement took off in the 1880s. James Leiby, *A History of Social Welfare and Social Work in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), 115; Roy Lubove, *The Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career, 1880-1930* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 1.

⁹⁶ Leiby, *A History of Social Welfare*, 114; Michael Reisch, “The Sociopolitical Context and Social Work Method, 1890-1950,” *The Social Service Review* 72, no. 2 (1998): 161.

⁹⁷ Donna L. Franklin, “Mary Richmond and Jane Addams: From Moral Certainty to Rational Inquiry in Social Work Practice,” *The Social Service Review* 60, no. 4 (1986): 508.

⁹⁸ Similarly convinced of the moral roots of poverty, the friendly visitors of the New York Association for Improving the Conditions of the Poor (an older organization) were instructed to supervise the poor and morally exhort them in order to ward off their tendency to intemperance and indolence. Lubove, *The Professional Altruist*, 1–5; Leiby, *A History of Social Welfare*, 114.

⁹⁹ Robert T. Handy, *The Social Gospel in America, 1870-1920* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), 4; May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America*, 111.

¹⁰⁰ Josiah Strong, *The Next Great Awakening* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1913), iii; Marty, *Righteous Empire*, 179; Handy, *The Social Gospel in America*, 3–4; Maurice C. Latta, “The Background for the Social Gospel in American Protestantism,” *Church History*, 1936, 258; May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America*, 112.

¹⁰¹ Over doctrinal squabbles, the calls to love one's neighbor as oneself dominated the social gospel. The historical figure of Jesus was to serve as a guide for individual and social life. The Bible, especially the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer, the Parable of the Prodigal Son, and the Golden Rule, provided a foundation for moral ideals. Jacob Henry Dorn, *Washington Gladden: Prophet of the Social Gospel* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1967), 183; Handy, *The Social Gospel in America*, 11; Daniel Ross Chandler, "Charles M. Sheldon and the 'Social Gospel' Novel Movement," *Religious Communication Today*, September 1986, 21–23; Fishburn, *The Fatherhood of God and the Victorian Family*, 130.

¹⁰² Francis Greenwood Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question: An Examination of the Teaching of Jesus in Its Relation to Some of the Problems of Modern Social Life* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1900); Donald K. Gorrell, *The Age of Social Responsibility: The Social Gospel in the Progressive Era 1900-1920* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988), 22–23.

¹⁰³ Handy, *The Social Gospel in America*, 11.

¹⁰⁴ Dorn, *Washington Gladden*, 202.

¹⁰⁵ Washington Gladden, *The Church and the Kingdom* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1894), 34–35; Dorn, *Washington Gladden*, 202. Jacob Henry Dorn noted, "The Social Gospel presupposed the applicability of the Golden Rule to all spheres of human activity, whether domestic, ecclesiastical, political, economic, or international."

¹⁰⁶ Marty, *Righteous Empire*, 185.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 184–85.

¹⁰⁸ Putney, *Muscular Christianity*, 67.

¹⁰⁹ Josiah Strong, *Religious Movements for Social Betterment* (New York: Baker & Taylor, 1900), 13.

¹¹⁰ J. Graham Morgan, "The Development of Sociology and the Social Gospel in America," *Sociological Analysis* 30, no. 1 (1969): 43; Paul H. Boase, "Christian Socialism and the Social Gospel," in *The Rhetoric of Protest and Reform, 1878-1898*, ed. Paul H. Boase (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1980), 246; Chandler, "Charles M. Sheldon and the 'Social Gospel' Novel Movement," 20.

¹¹¹ Theories of social Darwinism pervaded the Social Gospel and sociological research as well as laissez-faire doctrines. The family was at the center of Darwin's theory. An individuals' physical, mental, and moral development stemmed out of the genetic and behavioral influences of their parents. Civilization hinged on the patterns of mate selection and parenting. Family life thus provided an avenue for an emphasis on community morality and became a central element of the rising Social Gospel in the late nineteenth century. Boase, "Christian Socialism and the Social Gospel," 243; Fishburn, *The Fatherhood of God and the Victorian Family*, 69.

¹¹² Drawing on the language of the time, Fishburn identifies three pillars of Social Gospel thought, including "the Fatherhood of God," "the Brotherhood of Man," and "the Kingdom of God." God was seen as immanent, transcendent, and a model of the Christian relationship. Social Gospel thinkers believed that the figure of God the Father modeled a perfect relationship, showing a perfect balance of the masculine traits of creation and sustenance as well as female virtues of love and forgiveness. In seeking to explain the "Fatherhood of God" and the "Brotherhood of Man," Social Gospel leaders drew their ideas of self-sacrifice and cooperation from Victorian ideals of the family in

society. Fishburn, *The Fatherhood of God and the Victorian Family*, 15, 141, 28; Boase, "Christian Socialism and the Social Gospel," 255.

¹¹³ Fishburn, *The Fatherhood of God and the Victorian Family*, 156.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 145.

¹¹⁵ Dominick Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals: Organized Playgrounds and Urban Reform, 1880-1920* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981), 1.

¹¹⁶ Classics like Rudyard Kipling's *Captain Courageous* chart these fears. The novel tells the coming of age tale of the son of a millionaire who is accidently thrown into the working world and is forced to learn the value of hard labor and morals. Putney, *Muscular Christianity*, 100, 31; Rudyard Kipling, "*Captains Courageous*": *A Story of the Grand Banks* (Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1897).

¹¹⁷ Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 1.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 2, 23; Putney, *Muscular Christianity*, 4, 16, 116.

¹¹⁹ Fishburn, *The Fatherhood of God and the Victorian Family*, 144; Chandler, "Charles M. Sheldon and the 'Social Gospel' Novel Movement," 23–24; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*.

¹²⁰ Murphy also helped to start "Neighborhood House," which was modeled on northern settlement houses. Hugh C. Bailey, *Edgar Gardner Murphy: Gentle Progressive* (Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press, 1968), 21, 23, 26.

¹²¹ From the settlement house workers' efforts to bridge the gap between the rich and poor by moving into depressed neighborhoods and building relationships with those around them to William T. Stead's call for the residents of Chicago to get to know their city by going "down, down to the depths," the turn-of-the-century reformers efforts to

probe and investigate conditions was a first step. This method is also clear in Graham Taylor's efforts to act as a witness for the city and Thomas Dawley's projection of his book as simply his "unhampered" observations. See Allen Freeman Davis, *Spearheads for Reform: The Social Settlements and the Progressive Movement, 1890-1914* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), 6; "What T. J. Morgan Has to Say. The Notable Feature of the Afternoon Meeting at Central Music Hall," *Chicago Tribune*, November 13, 1893, 2; Graham Taylor, "A Quiz on Trades Unions," *Chicago Daily News*, March 14, 1903, 8; Thomas Robinson Dawley, *The Child That Toileth Not: The Story of a Government Investigation That Was Suppressed [Sic]*, 2nd ed. (New York: Gracia Publishing, 1912), vii.

¹²² Patricia Madoo Lengermann and Jill Niebrugge-Brantley, "Back to the Future: Settlement Sociology, 1885-1930," *The American Sociologist* 33, no. 3 (September 2002): 10, doi:10.1007/s12108-002-1009-z.

¹²³ Wright was a leader in the American Social Science Association and chief of the Massachusetts Bureau of Labor Statistics. In 1873, he became the first Commissioner of Labor Statistics for the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. See *Ibid.*, 12; Wiebe, *The Search for Order*, 147.

¹²⁴ Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, "Back to the Future," 12.

¹²⁵ Boorstin, *The Americans*, 215; Franklin, "Mary Richmond and Jane Addams," 509.

¹²⁶ His work became "well-known in United States social science circles." Settlement house workers, including Jane Addams, Edith Abbott, and Graham Taylor referenced Booth and his collaborators Sidney and Beatrice Webb in their own work. Taylor later called Booth's survey of London "the most scientific analysis ever made of any

population." Boorstin, *The Americans*, 215–16; Graham Taylor, "Social Aspects of Life and Labor," *Chicago Daily News*, November 22, 1902, 8; Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, "Back to the Future," 12; Graham Taylor, "What Chicago Needed for Christmas," *Chicago Daily News*, December 26, 1903.

¹²⁷ Minute Book National Child Labor Committee First to the Tenth Meeting, April 1904-April 1906, box 6, NCLC MSS.

¹²⁸ Samuel McCune Lindsay, Report for the Chair, Minute Book National Child Labor Committee First to the Tenth Meeting, April 1904-April 1906, box 6, NCLC MSS.

¹²⁹ Sociology's first professional journal, the *American Journal of Sociology (AJS)*, became an important outlet for social science research, but as the discipline was young, the boundaries of sociology were flexible. Lead sociologists along with settlement house residents and Social Gospel reformers published in *AJS*. Josiah Strong, a Social Gospel leader, called for local alliances to stop child labor in the journal's second issue. From this beginning, authors regularly devoted attention to the problem of child labor. The varied background of these authors showcases how the academy was not the only source of sociological inquiry during this period. Johnson, "Child Labor Legislation," 408; David M. Austin, "The Flexner Myth and the History of Social Work," *The Social Service Review* 57, no. 3 (1983): 358; Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 97; Bailey, *Edgar Gardner Murphy*, 90; Josiah Strong, "Local Alliances," *American Journal of Sociology* 1, no. 2 (1895): 175; Florence Kelley, "The Illinois Child-Labor Law," *American Journal of Sociology* 3, no. 4 (1898): 490–501; Jane Addams, "Trades Unions and Public Duty," *American Journal of Sociology* 4, no. 4 (1899): 448–62; Leonora Beck Ellis, "A Study of Southern Cotton-Mill Communities, Child Labor, The Operatives in General," *American*

Journal of Sociology 8, no. 5 (1903): 623–30; Josephine C. Goldmark, “The Necessary Sequel of Child-Labor Laws,” *American Journal of Sociology* 11, no. 3 (1905): 136–38; Abbott, “A Study of the Early History of Child Labor in America,” 15–37; Allan Hoben, “Child Labor in City Streets, by Edward N. Clopper,” *American Journal of Sociology* 18, no. 4 (1913): 579.

¹³⁰ The discipline of sociology was rooted in European thought. The discipline's sociological ancestors were the British "social survey and social welfare traditions," but also the French Gabriel Tarde and Emile Durkheim, the German Max Weber and Ferdinand Tonnies, and American pragmatists. Sociology was still evolving in the 1890s. The American leaders of the discipline resided by and large in Chicago as the University of Chicago established the first sociology department in the world in 1892. For several years, the University of Chicago was the only school with a concentrated graduate curriculum in sociology. Small, the first chairman of the sociology department at the university, did much to forward the department and was at the forefront of the profession from the 1890s until World War I. See Robert C. Bannister, *Sociology and Scientism: The American Quest for Objectivity, 1880-1940* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 3, 32–33, 37; Lester R. Kurtz, *Evaluating Chicago Sociology: A Guide to the Literature, with an Annotated Bibliography* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 101; Nicholas C. Mullins and Carolyn J. Mullins, *Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), 41.

¹³¹ Kurtz, *Evaluating Chicago Sociology*, 3.

¹³² Bannister, *Sociology and Scientism*, 4.

¹³³ Ibid., 32.

¹³⁴ Sociology gained many new tools for hands-on research from settlement house residents. Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, “Back to the Future,” 10.

¹³⁵ Kurtz, *Evaluating Chicago Sociology*, 12.

¹³⁶ Graham Taylor, who was a professor of Christian Sociology and lectured at the University of Chicago alongside his settlement work, continued to stress learning through personal involvement. As he wrote, his teaching method called for "less classroom work and more individual training; less purely scholastic methods and more of the inductive procedure; less dependence upon literary sources and more reliance upon direct contact with life and personal experience in the work on the field with men, women, and children." Graham Taylor, *Pioneering on Social Frontiers* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1930), 383.

¹³⁷ Frank L. Tolman, “The Study of Sociology in Institutions of Learning in the United States,” *American Journal of Sociology* 8, no. 1 (1902): 116.

¹³⁸ In 1884, Reverend Samuel Barnett and Henrietta Barnett established the first settlement house, Toynbee Hall, in the slums of East London. American reformers encountered this model for reform in London and brought it back to the United States. Stanton Coit established Neighborhood Guild, the first American settlement, on New York City's Lower East Side. Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Star opened Hull House, one of the most famous American settlement houses, in 1889. By 1900 there were over 100 American settlements, and the number of settlements continued to grow into the 1910s. See Mina Carson, “American Settlement Houses: The First Half of the Century,” in *Settlements, Social Change, and Community Action*, ed. Ruth Gilchrist and Tony Jeffs

(London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2001), 34; Michael Rose, "The Secular Faith of the Social Settlements: 'If Christ Came to Chicago,'" in *Settlements, Social Change, and Community Action* (London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2001), 21.

¹³⁹ American settlement residents, who were frequently university students and recent college graduates, lived in the settlement house and then researched, interacted with, and became a part of their local neighborhood. By living in an urban neighborhood, middle-class reformers found an outlet through which to respond to societal problems. They believed that they could act as a resource for immigrant and working families. They supplied educational information to the neighborhood, provided an open space for discussion, and researched the needs of the community. The founders of these settlements hoped that by building relationships between classes and by working in the communities, they would be able to transcend class conflicts. Ruth Gilchrist and Tony Jeffs, "Introduction," in *Settlements, Social Change, and Community Action*, ed. Ruth Gilchrist and Tony Jeffs (London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2001), 10; Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, "Back to the Future," 16; Carson, "American Settlement Houses," 34; Julie DeGraw, "Untangling the 'Snare of Preparation': The Chicago Social Settlement Movement and Its Relationship with the University of Michigan in the 1880s," *Educational History Journal* 33, no. 2 (2006): 130.

¹⁴⁰ Robert A. Woods, "University Settlements," *The Andover Review* 18 (October 1892): 323.

¹⁴¹ Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, "Back to the Future," 11.

¹⁴² The first social workers often entered the slums as a moral act, serving as the neighborly visitors of the nineteenth-century charity organizations. Increasingly,

however, settlement and social workers moved toward more scientific analysis and expert management. Ibid.; Wiebe, *The Search for Order*, 149–50; Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion*.

¹⁴³ Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley provide a fuller list of the research methods pioneered by the settlement workers. They include "the survey, the interview, the questionnaire, personal budget keeping, participant-observation, key informants, and secondary data analysis (which included the census, legislation, memoirs and diaries, wage and cost of living records, court reports, social worker reports, tax rolls, nursery rhymes, industrial accident reports)." Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, "Back to the Future," 12.

¹⁴⁴ This work continues to be a prominent example of the groundbreaking research that came out of the settlements. Jane Addams, "Introduction," in *Hull House Papers and Maps: A Presentation of Nationalities and Wages in a Congested District of Chicago, Together with Comments and Essays on Problems Growing Out of the Social Conditions* (New York: T.Y. Crowell & Co., 1895), vii–viii; Davis, *Spearheads for Reform*, 86, 171–72.

¹⁴⁵ Like the Hull House authors, working at New York's University Settlement provided Hunter close contact with poverty. His writing thus became "a personal narrative" telling of what he had "seen while living among the poorest of the working poor," many of whom were Hunter's "old neighbors." See Robert Hunter, *Poverty* (New York: MacMillan & Co., 1912), vi.

¹⁴⁶ The Pittsburgh Survey of 1909 provided an even fuller account of urban information than its American predecessors. Boorstin, *The Americans*, 216; Davis, *Spearheads for Reform*, 86, 171–72.

¹⁴⁷ Several studies and bodies emerged to fill this void in the 1910s. Edward N. Clopper looked at juvenile delinquency records, truancy records, accounts from principals, and local investigations to pen *Children in the City Streets*. Philip Davis served as the Director of Civic Service House in Boston, Massachusetts. He used statistics and his years of settlement experience and "daily supervision" of thousands of juvenile street children in the city in his book *Street-Land: Its Little People and Big Problem*. See Edward Nicholas Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1912); Philip Davis, *Street-Land: It's Little People and Big Problems* (Boston: Small, Maynard & Company, 1915), xv; "Problems of City Life," *The Independent*, October 25, 1915, 146.

¹⁴⁸ Judith Ann Trolander, *Professionalism and Social Change: From the Settlement House Movement to Neighborhood Centers, 1886 to the Present* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987), 15.

¹⁴⁹ At the first NCLC Board of Trustees meeting, Samuel McCune Lindsay reported on the secretary staffs' activities in the preceding month, noting, "[A]ddresses on child labor had been delivered by the Secretary at Teachers' College, New York City, at the Annual State Convention of the Evangelical Alliance of Pennsylvania, and at the Annual Meeting of the Philadelphia Branch of the Consumers' League, as well as at the New York State Conference of Charities; and by Assistant Secretary Lovejoy in the Calvary Methodist Episcopal Church, New York City, and at the Annual Meeting of the Brooklyn

Consumers' League." Other months were similarly filled with speaking engagements. See Minute Book National Child Labor Committee First to the Tenth Meeting, April 1904-April 1906, box 6, NCLC MSS.

¹⁵⁰ Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, "Back to the Future," 12.

¹⁵¹ This positive outlook stemmed from the Enlightenment's exaltation of nature and humans and a reoriented eschatology. The leaders of the Social Gospel believed that they did not need to wait for the second coming of Jesus Christ to address the social problem. Their postmillennialist notion of the Kingdom of God convinced them that the whole world was redeemed and being redeemed. It was destined. Some, like Walter Rauschenbusch, applied this postmillennialist eschatology to nationalism. "Rauschenbusch used the terms *Kingdom of God* and *manifest destiny* interchangeably. The 'Kingdom of God' was religious language connoting the destiny of the American democracy to demonstrate the brotherhood God intended for the world. In Social Gospel thought, the family represented the kingdom in microcosm and was considered a means of establishing the manifest destiny of America." May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America*, 231–32; Gladden, *The Church and the Kingdom*, 32; Cecil E. Greek, *The Religious Roots of American Sociology* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1992), 38; Fishburn, *The Fatherhood of God and the Victorian Family*, 15.

¹⁵² Walter Rauschenbusch articulated this idea when he wrote, "The kingdom of God ... is a conception for this life here of ours, because Jesus says: 'Thy kingdom come, thy will be done' here..." Walter Rauschenbusch, "The Kingdom of God," in *The Social Gospel in America 1870-1920*, ed. Robert T. Handy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), 267; Justin Wroe Nixon, "The Status and Prospects of the Social Gospel,"

Journal of Religion 22, no. 4 (1942): 348; Boase, "Christian Socialism and the Social Gospel," 255; Handy, *The Social Gospel in America*, 11.

¹⁵³ Boase, "Christian Socialism and the Social Gospel," 255; Handy, *The Social Gospel in America*, 11.

¹⁵⁴ Hogan, "Introduction," x; Hofstadter, *The Progressive Movement*, 5.

¹⁵⁵ In an article in the *American Journal of Sociology*, Graham Taylor articulated this neighborly goal as he called for the church to fulfill its social function and to equip its members to be citizens inspired by the "ideals of [the] Christian social relationship." Similarly, Richard T. Ely delivered a sermon entitled, "Social Aspects of Christianity." He formed this lay sermon around Jesus' pronouncement of the greatest commandment: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Matthew 22: 34-40). Making this command his foundation, Ely disregarded regular church attendance or correct doctrines on baptism or the Lord's Supper as the distinctive marks of Christianity. Instead, he argued, "The performance or non-performance of social duties in the gospel narrative separates the doomed from the blessed: 'I was in prison, and ye visited me,' etc." This command defined Christian duty. Graham Taylor, "The Social Function of the Church," *American Journal of Sociology* 5, no. 3 (1899): 310; Robert T. Handy, ed., "Richard T. Ely," in *The Social Gospel in America* (New York: Oxford Press, 1966), 186.

¹⁵⁶ Daniel T. Rodgers, "In Search of Progressivism," *Reviews in American History* 10, no. 4 (December 1982): 113–32.

¹⁵⁷ Crunden, *Ministers of Reform*, 165; Hofstadter, *The Progressive Movement*, 5.

¹⁵⁸ Hofstadter, *The Progressive Movement*, 5; J. Michael Hogan, ed., "Conclusion: Memories and Legacies of the Progressive Era," in *Rhetoric and Reform in the Progressive Era* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2003), 472; Leroy G. Dorsey, "Preaching Morality in Modern America: Theodore Roosevelt's Rhetorical Progressivism," in *Rhetoric and Reform in the Progressive Era*, ed. J. Michael Hogan (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2003), 51.

¹⁵⁹ "Child Labor Programs and Projects," 1916, box 1, NCLC MSS; "Boynton, M. P. Sermon on Child Labor—Chicago, IL," 1910, box 1, NCLC MSS; and Minute Book National Child Labor Committee First to the Tenth Meeting, April 1904-April 1906, box 6, NCLC MSS.

¹⁶⁰ Minute Book National Child Labor Committee First to the Tenth Meeting, April 1904-April 1906, box 6, NCLC MSS.

¹⁶¹ The cooperation between local and national actors is highlighted in the proceedings of the NCLC's annual conferences. At the 1905 conference, Mrs. A. O. Granger reported on the child labor work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. She noted how in 1904 the General Federation recommended that local "clubs should be concentrated upon the passage of laws" related to night work, literacy requirements, and "the adoption of the Standard Child Labor Law." Granger also boasted of the committed club work in North Carolina and Illinois on the issue of child labor. Furthermore, in 1909, when the NCLC decided to prioritize the reform of the night messenger service, the NCLC boasted of forty "state and local committees in co-operation or affiliation with the National Child Labor Committee." Many of these bodies reported their progress on legislative initiatives at the NCLC's annual conference. Mrs. A. O. Granger, "The Work of the General

Federation of Women's Clubs against Child Labor," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 25 (May 1905): 102–7; *The Child Workers of the Nation: Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois, January 21-23, 1909* (New York, 1909), 172–211, 250–52,

https://books.google.com/books?id=qA0XAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gb_s_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false.

¹⁶² New York's Mercantile Inspection Act in 1896 limited the work week of women, regulated child labor, and set workplace sanitary standards. Oregon enacted similar legislation in 1903, which regulated the labor of women. In the landmark 1908 Supreme Court case, *Muller v. Oregon*, Oregon's ten-hour work limit for women was upheld on the basis of the mountain of statistical evidence compiled by Florence Kelley, Josephine Goldmark, and Louis Brandeis. Maud Nathan, *The Story of an Epoch-Making Movement, Women & Children First* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1986), 59; Joseph L. Candela Jr., "The Struggle to Limit the Hours and Raise the Wages of Working Women in Illinois, 1893-1917," *Social Service Review* 53, no. 1 (March 1979): 15–34; Smith, *Civic Ideals*, 459.

¹⁶³ Unfortunately for Beveridge, the Judiciary Committee ultimately struck down this bill as unconstitutional, yet during the three days in which he spoke on the floor of the Senate, attempting to force a floor vote on the bill, the galleries filled with supportive, rambunctious crowds. Grace Abbott, ed., "The Beveridge-Parsons Bill of 1906," in *The Child and the State*, vol. 1 (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1938), 472; John Braeman, "Albert J. Beveridge and the First National Child Labor Bill," *Indiana Magazine of History* 60, no. 1 (March 1964): 25.

¹⁶⁴ Martin J. Medhurst, "Afterword: The Ways of Rhetoric," in *Beyond the Rhetorical Presidency* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1996), 220.

¹⁶⁵ Herbert A. Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," in *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans*, ed. A. M. Drummond (New York: The Century Co., 1925); Stephen E. Lucas, "The Schism in Rhetorical Scholarship," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 67, no. 1 (February 1981): 5; Stephen E. Lucas, "The Renaissance of American Public Address: Text and Context in Rhetorical Criticism," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 74 (May 1988): 243; Shawn J. Parry-Giles and J. Michael Hogan, "Introduction: The Study of Rhetoric and Public Address," in *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, ed. Shawn J. Parry-Giles and J. Michael Hogan (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 3; Martin J. Medhurst, "The History of Public Address as an Academic Study," in *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, ed. Shawn J. Parry-Giles and J. Michael Hogan (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 19–66.

¹⁶⁶ For Lucas, a text's social context entails the "relationship between a text and its social audience." The linguistic context pertains to the vocabulary, conventions, and idioms of a chosen text that are relevant because language is living and changes over time, space, and place. Finally, Lucas uses textual context to refer to how the text creates its own internal context as it unfolds and is processed by the audience. Kirt Wilson also takes up this sentiment and further addresses what has frequently been cast as a dichotomy between text and context by recognizing the relationship between rich contexts and unique rhetorical performances. He writes that each piece of discourse is "a rich and dynamic rhetorical expression, yet it [is] imbricated within a matrix of additional

contexts." Or, as he continues, "Public address provides an almost limitless opportunity to study the multilayered contexts...grounded in concrete moments of expression that have value as unique performances of human experience." See *Ibid.*; Lucas, "The Renaissance of American Public Address," 249; Bruce E. Gronbeck, "Rhetorical History and Rhetorical Criticism: A Distinction," *Speech Teacher* 24, no. 4 (November 1975): 309–20; Lucas, "The Schism in Rhetorical Scholarship," 1–20; Kirt H. Wilson, "The Racial Contexts of Public Address: Interpreting Violence During the Reconstruction Era," in *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, ed. Shawn J. Parry-Giles and J. Michael Hogan (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 212.

¹⁶⁷ As Wrage noted, "The study of ideas provides an index to the history of man's values and goals, his hopes and fears, his aspirations and negations, to what he considers expedient or inapplicable." Ernest J. Wrage, "Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 33 (1947): 451; Gronbeck, "Rhetorical History and Rhetorical Criticism"; Lucas, "The Schism in Rhetorical Scholarship."

¹⁶⁸ Political ideas make up *ideology*, a word that takes on many nuances. Michael Calvin McGee defines ideology as "a political language, preserved in rhetorical documents, with the capacity to dictate decision and control public belief and behavior." By identifying and analyzing the ideological forces of this period, I work to recognize the competing interests and worldviews that directed the evolution and expression of the night messenger service reform debates. This approach follows what Phillip Wander called the ideological turn, which "acknowledges the influence of established interests and the reality of alternative worldviews, and commends rhetorical analyses not only of the actions implied but also of the interests represented." Philip Wander, "The

Ideological Turn in Modern Criticism,” *Central States Speech Journal* 34 (1983): 1–18; Michael Calvin McGee, “The ‘Ideograph’: A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66, no. 1 (1980): 5.

¹⁶⁹ Class, as the historian E. P. Thompson argues, is an active process that occurs when common experiences lead people to articulate an identity for themselves which is distinct from the identity of others who have different interests. E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1963), 9.

¹⁷⁰ McGerr, *A Fierce Discontent*.

¹⁷¹ Matthew Bentley, “Playing White Men: American Football and Manhood at the Carlisle Indian School, 1893–1904,” *The Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth* 3, no. 2 (2010): 188, doi:10.1353/hcy.0.0092.

¹⁷² Theodore Roosevelt, “The Manly Virtues and Practical Politics,” in *American Ideals and Other Essays, Social and Political* (Philadelphia: Gebbie and Company, 1903), 38–50.

¹⁷³ As Ava Baron argues, “Gender is a dynamic social process constituting social relations to power.” Ava Baron, “Questions of Gender: Deskillling and Demasculinization in the U.S. Printing Industry, 1830-1915,” *Gender and History* 1, no. 2 (Summer 1989): 180.

¹⁷⁴ Ava Baron, “Gender and Labor History: Learning from the Past, Looking to the Future,” in *Work Engendered: Toward a New History of American Labor* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991), 1; Bonnie J. Dow, “Feminism and Public Address Research: Television News and the Construction of Women’s Liberation,” in *The*

Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address, ed. Shawn J. Parry-Giles and J. Michael Hogan (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 346.

The NMS campaign touched further on questions of race and gender, less in what was articulated than in what remained unaddressed. The NMS reformers occasionally noted the ethnic background of the messengers in their investigative reports, but these markers of racial difference did not make it into the public campaign materials. The campaigners' silence on this issue marked the messenger service off as white. In much the same way, some states passed legislation that laid out explicit regulations for girls working in the messenger service, but this work was also largely marked off as masculine. The campaigners' silence constructed the messenger service as white and male.

¹⁷⁵ David Zarefsky, "Goodnight's 'Speculative Inquiry' in Its Intellectual Context," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48 (Spring 2012): 211–15.

¹⁷⁶ Rachel Avon Whidden, "Maternal Expertise, Vaccination Recommendations, and the Complexity of Argument Spheres," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48, no. 4 (2012): 243–57; G. Thomas Goodnight, "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument," in *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, ed. Thomas O. Sloane (Oxford University Press, 2001), 629–31; G. Thomas Goodnight, "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument: A Speculative Inquiry into the Art of Public Deliberation," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48 (Spring 2012): 198–210; G. Thomas Goodnight, "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres: A Note on 21st Century Critical Communication," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48 (Spring 2012): 258–67; Zarefsky, "Goodnight's 'Speculative Inquiry' in Its Intellectual Context."

¹⁷⁷ Valeria Fabj and Matthew J. Sobnosky, “AIDS Activism and the Rejuvenation of the Public Sphere,” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 31 (Spring 1995): 163–84; Robert C. Rowland, “The Relationship between the Public and the Technical Spheres of Argument: A Case Study of the Challenger Seven Disaster,” *Central States Speech Journal* 37, no. 3 (1986): 136–46; Zarefsky, “Goodnight’s ‘Speculative Inquiry’ in Its Intellectual Context”; Goodnight, “The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument.”

¹⁷⁸ Robert Asen et al., “‘The Research Says’: Definitions and Uses of a Key Policy Term in Federal Law and Local School Board Deliberations,” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 47 (Spring 2011): 195–213; Goodnight, “The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres: A Note on 21st Century Critical Communication”; Gerard A. Hauser, “Features of the Public Sphere,” *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 4, no. 4 (1987): 437–41; David Zarefsky, “Argument Fields,” in *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, ed. Thomas O. Sloane (Oxford University Press, 2001), 37–40; Heather J. Carmack, “Social and Tertiary Health Identities as Argument in the DSM-V Asperger’s/Autism Debate,” *Western Journal of Communication* 78, no. 4 (July 2014): 462–79, doi:10.1080/10570314.2013.845792.

¹⁷⁹ Zarefsky, “Goodnight’s ‘Speculative Inquiry’ in Its Intellectual Context”; Nicholas S. Paliewicz, “Global Warming and the Interaction between the Public and Technical Spheres of Argument: When Standards for Expertise Really Matter,” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48, no. 4 (2012): 231–42; Goodnight, “The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument”; Goodnight, “The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres: A Note on 21st Century Critical Communication”; Goodnight, “The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument: A Speculative Inquiry into the Art of Public Deliberation”; Rowland, “The Relationship between the Public and the Technical

Spheres of Argument”; Benjamin K. Sovacool, “Spheres of Argument Concerning Oil Exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge: A Crisis of Environmental Rhetoric?,” *Environmental Communication* 2, no. 3 (2008): 340–61, doi:10.1080/17524030802396745; Asen et al., “The Research Says”; Joseph A. Sommerville, “Experts in Moral Argument,” in *Spheres of Argument: Proceedings of the Sixth SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation* (Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1989), 81–85; Carmack, “Social and Tertiary Health Identities as Argument.”

¹⁸⁰ Rowland, “The Relationship between the Public and the Technical Spheres of Argument”; Robert C. Rowland, “Spheres of Argument: 30 Years of Influence,” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48, no. 4 (Spring 2012): 195–97; Lisa Keränen, “Mapping Misconduct: Demarcating Legitimate Science from ‘Fraud’ in the B-06 Lumpectomy Controversy,” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 42, no. 2 (2005): 94–113; Avon Whidden, “Maternal Expertise, Vaccination Recommendations, and the Complexity of Argument Spheres”; Josh Boyd, “Public and Technical Interdependence: Regulatory Controversy, Out-Law Discourse, and the Messy Case of Olestra,” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 39 (Fall 2002): 91–109.

¹⁸¹ Munroe Smith, “Introduction: The Domain of Political Science,” *Political Science Quarterly* 1, no. 1 (March 1886): 1, doi:10.2307/2139299.

¹⁸² Risa Applegarth, *Rhetoric in American Anthropology: Gender, Genre, and Science* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2014), 13.

¹⁸³ Michael Schudson, *The Good Citizen: A History of American Civic Life* (New York: The Free Press, 1998), 6.

-
- ¹⁸⁴ Evelyn Nakano Glenn, *Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 1.
- ¹⁸⁵ Smith, *Civic Ideals*, 2–6.
- ¹⁸⁶ Act of March 26, 1790 (Naturalization Law of 1790), 1 Stat. 103-4.
- ¹⁸⁷ Gardner, *The Qualities of a Citizen*; Belinda A. Stillion Southard, *Militant Citizenship: Rhetorical Strategies of the National Woman's Party, 1913-1920* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2011); Haney-López, *White by Law*, 31–32; Deborah Gray White, *Too Heavy a Load: Black Women in Defense of Themselves, 1894-1994*, 1st ed. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1999), 25.
- ¹⁸⁸ Schudson, *The Good Citizen: A History of American Civic Life*, 6.
- ¹⁸⁹ Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*.
- ¹⁹⁰ Florence Kelley, "The Federal Government and the Working Children," in *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the National Child Labor Committee, 1905, 1906*, ed. Robert H. Bremner (New York: Arno Press, 1974), 289–92.
- ¹⁹¹ Martha Minow, "Interpreting Rights: An Essay for Robert Cover," *Yale Law Journal* 96 (July 1987): 1866–67.
- ¹⁹² Robert Wiebe called such child-saving campaigns the "central theme" of "humanitarian progressivism." Wiebe, *The Search for Order*, 169.
- ¹⁹³ Some girls served in the messenger service. NMS reformers focused almost exclusively on boys in their campaign investigations and publications. Therefore, although some legislation also regulated the labor of messenger girls, this project focuses on how campaigners described and sought to restrict adolescent boys from working in the NMS.

CHAPTER ONE

CHILDHOOD AND ADOLESCENCE IN THE PROGRESSIVE ERA

One day young Ned told his father: "I want to be a messenger boy." Ned, the 1914 protagonist of Lydia Hale Crane's *The Messenger Boy* playlet, had seen the messenger boys running about the city in their smart-looking uniforms. One messenger, Ned enthusiastically told his father, "looked almost like a soldier." Ned learned from this boy that messengers got to run "all around everywhere" and were "knowin" ones. Ned was fascinated; he imagined how messengers must have "a real good time." Father was wiser though. He carefully explained to Ned that being a messenger was not "a good business." To protect his young son from the ways of the world, the father explained, "Really, Ned, I should hate to see you a messenger boy, no matter how fine a blue suit you wore." Continuing he warned,

I should hate to have you lose your play-time and education, to have you obliged to get any sort of a meal at any old time, to have you sent into saloons and the worst places in the town, to have you weary and footsore, out in the worst of weather, or hanging around with crowds of rough, swearing, cigarette smoking young toughs playing craps. Why, Ned, I would rather you had small-pox or bubonic plague.

That settled the matter for Ned, and he began to plan instead "to be the President of something big."¹ Ned's father corrected his boy's path, but concerns about the play, education, fitness, and environment of child laborers and particularly night messengers continued to be the political focus of Progressive reformers.

This chapter examines how arguments about childhood and adolescence were reflected in the reform debate over the night messenger service. Traditionally, families had sole authority over the upbringing of their children and worked out decisions about labor and education in the personal sphere of argument. Yet by the Progressive Era, a child's labor and education were being framed as a community matter and hence a topic for the public sphere of argument. The street trades, especially at night, became antithetical to the new role that reformers prescribed for children during the nineteenth- and early-twentieth-centuries. This type of work was in direct opposition to what progressive reformers recommended as the proper physical, economic, and moral conditions for citizenship. In an odd twist, children became a matter for public debate as reformers stressed that they should be kept within the private family home (or, when necessary the school, club, or playground). Children were to be sheltered, not forced to roam the streets in direct contact with vice.

This chapter begins by reviewing what scholars say about the process and context of studying childhood and adolescence. Then I look at how experts on childhood defined and refined what they believed to be proper and aberrant stages of development over the course of the nineteenth- and early-twentieth centuries. Next, I highlight three interrelated tensions that were central to the evolution of this conversation between the early 1800s and 1900s. In the public discourse those from the era contrasted the role of environment versus heredity, city life versus country life, and home versus street. Child experts and welfare reformers integrated these definitions and tensions into their efforts to prevent and rehabilitate delinquents. They prescribed where youths were to be and what they were to be doing, and they looked to the home, school, and organized play to form youths

into productive citizens. As I conclude, I will highlight how reformers integrated these growing concerns into their descriptions of child labor in the street trades and its physically, materially, and morally degrading effects.

APPROACHING AND SETTING THE BOUNDS OF SCHOLARSHIP ON YOUTH

Before examining how public arguments about children shifted at the turn of the twentieth century, we must first acknowledge the construction of childhood.

Fundamentally, childhood is a universal *and* culturally-rooted construct. On the one hand, childhood and adolescence are biological phases in human development and are thus universal. In every time and culture, a child's relative age helps to define his social roles and responsibilities. Given these universal elements, it is tempting to neglect the situatedness of human development and to assume that the phases in this progression look the same across time and space. Yet, the biological phases of childhood and adolescence take on different names and meanings depending on cultural variants.²

Ultimately, every culture and generation collectively defines the characteristics associated with each phase of life, and an individual's experience of a certain age hinges on sex, geography, religion, class, education, work, race, ethnicity, and historical era. Age cohorts form within societies by adapting to shared circumstances (e.g., millennials). There is no set progression for childhood development though; there is no established timeline at which an adolescent quits school, leaves home, and starts to work. In sum, childhood is not a static concept.³

Competing expectations about the proper role of a child in society between colonial days and the American Revolution illustrate both the universal and constructed nature of childhood and how these differences hinged on a child's geographical, cultural,

and temporal position. Children's lives in the Chesapeake colonies in the 1600s were marked by family instability, indentured servitude, and a high mortality rate. By the 1700s, though, white children in this region were more coddled while slave children were worked and disciplined. This experience was different than the relaxed approach to childrearing adopted by many American Indian tribes.⁴ In contrast, New England Puritans in the 1600s and 1700s viewed infants and children as incomplete and corrupted with original sin. Thus, Puritan society emphasized schooling and hurried children along to adulthood by engaging them in work at an early age.⁵ In this same period, Quaker influences in the area from New York to Delaware anticipated nineteenth-century, middle-class views of emotional bonding, indulgent childrearing, and early childhood autonomy. From New England down to more southern colonies, the American Revolution reduced some of the regional variations of childhood as it led to greater geographic mobility, new employment opportunities, evangelical religious revivals, and shared experiences of military conflict.⁶ This limited chronology highlights how geography, religion, culture, and experience contributed to early shifts from viewing children as little adults to viewing children as fragile and precious.

THE EMERGENCE OF AN IDEALIZED CHILDHOOD

Scholars continue to debate the origins of idealized conceptions of childhood, but the differences between traditional and idealized views of children are clear. Historically, a child entered adult society as soon as he was weaned; there was no stage of life between infancy and adulthood.⁷ Infants, as the historian Philippe Ariès argues, were "too fragile" to participate in the life of adults and so "simply 'did not count.'"⁸ Yet, between the

sixteenth and twentieth century, childhood grew to be identified as a socially-distinct phase of life in the United States.⁹

Multiple intellectual, societal, and religious evolutions fed into this cultural shift, and many researchers have traced this development. Steven Mintz believes that Enlightenment ideas of the child as a blank slate, liberal Protestant beliefs in the innocence of children's souls, Evangelicals' emphasis on the stages of childhood development, and Romantic visions of children as "symbols of purity, spontaneity, and emotional expressiveness" shaped modern views of childhood.¹⁰ Tracing a similar timeline, Christopher Lasch roots the child's shift from "little adult" to vulnerable and innocent youngster in the late-1700s and early-1800s. He associates this progression with attempts to exert social control, especially around the turn of the twentieth century, and argues that Progressive reformers focused on removing children from the labor market in order to surround them with the care of the state and the school instead of potentially foreign and harmful familial influences.¹¹ The historian Viviana Zelizer examines the broad cultural transformations including mourning rituals and child welfare issues that factored into the "sacralization" of childhood whereby children were "invested with sentimental or religious meaning" in society.¹² The shift was gradual and uneven, but the child became "irreplaceable" and "his death irreparable."¹³

Variouly called romantic, modern, or sheltered, this revamped conception of childhood identified the child as innocent and in need of protection. By the late-1800s, many abandoned theological notions of an infant's depravity.¹⁴ As Philip Davis, a settlement house worker, wrote in 1915, "The new view of the tender child is that it is incapable of crime and, whether in or out of mischief, is always in need of protection,

encouragement and care."¹⁵ Children were supposedly fragile, malleable, corruptible, and vulnerable, so middle-class reformers believed children should be insulated from adult concerns.¹⁶ Parents were instructed to preserve their children's innocence by sheltering them from "death, profanity, and sexuality."¹⁷ Child-rearing experts wanted children to be separated into age-specific categories and offered age-appropriate games, readings, and responsibilities.¹⁸ Child labor was antithetical to this perspective. If forced to work, children "inevitably" came into contact with the adult world. Child labor "forced consciousness of life properly belonging to adult years" upon impressionable children, the socialist John Spargo warned in 1909. This exposure, he continued, brought "the ruthless destruction of the bloom of youthful innocence."¹⁹

Middle-class, and especially urban, families increasingly recognized this sheltered childhood in the nineteenth century, but at the turn of the twentieth century, many families held onto the traditional notion of a productive childhood. A paradox emerged along class lines. The market economy excluded middle-class children *from* work but increased the potential of working-class children *to* work.²⁰ Indeed, the number of children working increased between 1870 and 1900.²¹ Labor unions and prosperous farmers warmed up to notions of a protected childhood after the Civil War, but in urban, working-class and farm families, it was an accepted social practice to have children work even into the 1900s. A child was expected to be economically productive at a young age. Ultimately, the acceptance of this "precious" childhood hinged largely on a child's race, class, gender, and region.²²

By 1900, middle-class reformers adamantly indicted parents for exploiting their children's labor. Yet, child labor reform was just a first step for reformers. They sought a

comprehensive shift in how children were treated in the family and society. Their modern conception of childhood focused on more education, less gainful employment, and a prolonged presence in the parental home.²³ Edward Clopper, an employee of the National Child Labor Committee, fleshed out the contours of the new ideal in 1912:

If our civilization is to continue and to improve with time, every child must have a proper opportunity to grow under conditions as nearly normal as possible; we must secure to the children their birthright--the right to play and to dream, the right to healthful sleep, the right to education and training, the right to grow into manhood and into womanhood with cleanness and strength both of body and of mind, the right of a chance to become useful citizens of the future.²⁴

The far-reaching goals of Progressive child activists, like Clopper, led the historian Mintz to argue that the Progressive Era represented an attempt "to universalize the middle-class ideals of childhood as a period devoted to play and education."²⁵

Progressives habitually traced these concerns about children to arguments about citizenship. Activists urged that the nation could not afford to neglect its children because the vote of an "ignorant twenty-three year old" counted just as much as "the vote of the governor."²⁶ Leading this charge, Theodore Roosevelt warned in 1906 that "the children of today are those who tomorrow will shape the destiny of our land, and we can not [sic] afford to neglect them."²⁷ Similarly, Florence Kelly in 1906 called children "citizens in the bud."²⁸ Children were like delicate flowers, and the community was their "trustee."²⁹

These idealized views about childhood gradually came to encompass more years of life, and anti-child labor reformers negotiated and helped to establish these chronological boundaries. For instance, a ten-year-old supposedly needed to be protected;

yet, in time, a fourteen-year old needed similar protection. Writing in 1911, the general secretary of the National Child Labor Committee, Owen Lovejoy, recognized the variations within the "wide span of life" defined by the word "child." Some children "should not be employed at all," he claimed. Others "may wisely contribute to their own support and to social wealth." Lovejoy asserted that "the recognized standard of all civilized nations" established fourteen as the minimum age at which a child should work in "competitive industry."³⁰ There were special circumstances in which experts called for protections for even older children. In the case of the night messenger service, the National Child Labor Committee lobbied in 1911 for protections beyond what "civilized nations" regulated. For night messengers, the NCLC sought employment restrictions for youths up to the age of twenty-one. This emphasis by child labor activists pointed to broader cultural shifts regarding adolescence.

THE EMERGENCE OF ADOLESCENCE

In contemporary society, adolescence is tied to puberty and implies a physiologically distinct phase of life, but in the nineteenth century this connection was not established.³¹ During this time, *youth* referred to "the intermediate stage of development," but even *youth* was not a distinct phase of life imbued with certain opportunities and dangers. In the 1830s, youth stretched from about the mid-teens to the mid-twenties.³² In these years it was difficult to set age parameters on youth because experiences were not graded by age. Instead, youth was defined by social status instead of physical development. If a sixteen-year-old was in school, he was a child. If he was in college, he was a youth. A child could migrate from one category to another as he moved

from school to work and back to school depending on the season of year and his financial circumstances.³³

There were some mid-century references to the term *adolescence*, but the word was unfamiliar to the general populace into the mid-1800s. When used, *adolescence* most commonly appeared in scientific literature and was associated with fears of modern life in the cities and over civilization. Around 1900, the term moved into popular use and became a household word among middle-class families.³⁴

Americans thus discovered adolescence in the Progressive Era.³⁵ They began to attribute particular importance to the late-teen years as a new phase of life. Philip Davis stressed in 1915 that the first twenty-one years of life must be used as "active, preparation for useful manhood and womanhood," for twenty-one was the "really strategic turning point in the career of all men and women."³⁶ The reformer Allan Hoben identified the years from about 12 or 13 until 25 as a period of transformation in which a boy passed from childhood into manhood.³⁷ Across the board, people began to argue that laying a broad and deep foundation for youths in these years would lead to "ultimate success" later in life.³⁸

Like childhood, researchers and activists applied this new concept of adolescence unevenly. The concept signified different ages for boys and girls. In the early 1900s, *adolescence* usually referred specifically to boys from prepubescence until just before marriage.³⁹ Even among boys, Progressive reformers varied significantly in how they defined the years and duration of adolescence. William Forbush, the author of *The Boy Problem*, set out a broad age range for adolescence in 1901, claiming that Jesus entered

"before the world at the beginning of his adolescence and left it at its close."⁴⁰ This argument effectively stretched adolescence from twelve to thirty-three.

These differences came out as activists and boy experts defended reforms like the regulation of child labor. For instance, Clopper lambasted the District of Columbia's 1908 Child Labor Law for setting the minimum age limit for night work at sixteen. He decried, "*sixteen years*, the beginning of the period of adolescence, when boys have the greatest need of protection from the vices running riot in cities!"⁴¹ The NCLC's Owen Lovejoy made a similar defense. When an editorial in the *Telephone and Telegraph Age* questioned whether there was any difference between the morals of a sixteen-year-old and a twenty-one-year-old, Lovejoy succinctly retorted, "Answer: Yes."⁴² Progressive activists, educators, and boy experts identified the mid- to late-teens as essential years for development, and a growing body of research on childhood development reinforced these claims.

THE SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF CHILDHOOD AND ADOLESCENCE

In the predawn of the Progressive Era, many doctors, educators, and psychologists started to analyze the years of childhood more closely in order to set out its norms. Beginning in 1880 and stretching for almost four decades, a child study movement emerged and gave the scientific study of childhood a systematic trajectory. Studies of children were generally casual before this time. For instance, Charles Darwin based his "A Biographical Sketch of an Infant" (1877) simply on observations of his son's development.⁴³ Methodical studies of children rose with figures like John Dewey and Edward L. Thorndike and within organizations like the Society for the Study of Child Nature, the American Association of University Women, and the National Congress of

Mothers. These professionals wanted to know what caused children's behavior, and they turned to the formal study of children to find answers. The primary legacy of these figures in the child study movement was in suggesting that a child's physical, mental, and emotional development proceeded in stages and was marked by distinct characteristics.⁴⁴

A range of theorists contributed to the study of childhood and the development of the concept of adolescence, but by 1900, the psychologist G. Stanley Hall was the central theorist in this conversation.⁴⁵ To collect data, he commissioned teachers and college-educated mothers to gather information on their children's physical, mental, and sexual development through questionnaires and personal observations. His research was not thoroughly original, but it circulated widely at the turn of the twentieth century and influenced social work, progressive education, and after-school programs for boys, known as boys' work. Out of this research, Hall popularized the concept of adolescence as a part of his evolutionary model of childhood development, known as recapitulation theory.⁴⁶

The Norms of Childhood and Adolescence

Recapitulation theorists like Hall proposed that children "recapitulate human history" as they grow.⁴⁷ These researchers argued that children passed through each historical human epoch over the course of their development from infancy to adulthood, supposedly progressing through the life of "invertebrates" and "gill-breathing vertebrates" during the pre-natal stage and transforming to "lung-breathing vertebrates" at birth.⁴⁸ Then, as the author of *The Boy Problem* asserted in 1901, the child continued the course of evolution "of his own race-life from savagery unto civilization" throughout life.⁴⁹

In this progression, recapitulation theorists generally identified three phases of development – infancy, boyhood or childhood, and adolescence. The first stage stretched from birth to about six years of age. The second "Big Injun" or "Early Pigmy" stage spanned from roughly six to twelve years of age.⁵⁰ And the final stage of adolescence started around age eleven and continued into the mid-twenties. These last two stages helped to define perceptions of childhood and adolescence and informed progressives' work with children.

Recapitulation theorists projected that the stage of childhood was normally a formative time of individualism, instincts, and social impulses. During childhood, children supposedly recapitulated nomadic or tribal levels of social organization. Boys fought and romped on the streets in instinctual imitation of the "barbaric struggle" of humankind. They were savage, individualistic, filled with energy, and thirsting for adventure and discovery.⁵¹ As Davis stressed, boys wanted "to move about, to do things, to feel the push and pull of Nature's forces."⁵² If these instincts were suppressed in children, recapitulation theorists cautioned, they would certainly crop up menacingly later in life. The boy's natural predatory instinct could evolve into theft. His "indiscriminate food-appetites" could turn to gluttony and drunkenness. With these pitfalls, psychologists like Hall built up the importance of the years of childhood as essential in the development of an individual's character. In childhood, as Forbush pressed, a boy's conscience and "higher instincts" became defined.⁵³

Researchers believed that youths entered a period of life imbued with social significance after they passed through the character-defining, individualistic years of childhood. They framed late childhood as a pre-adolescence or "gang age." A boy's gang

was his tribe, and the impulse to form gangs in these years was supposedly "set deep in the soul of boyhood," according to the vocation educator J. Adams Puffer.⁵⁴ These gangs, he continued, provided "the earliest manifestation in man of that strange group-forming instinct" that undergirded all of human society.⁵⁵

Experts stressed that a boy's gang directed his actions, morals, and conduct, so they took great care to study the company boys kept and how they filled their time. Recapitulation theorists believed that boys mimicked past primitive ages by playing Indian, running, fishing, throwing stones, and whittling on wood. Baseball, in their view, was the "epitome" of these instinctual games. Such games met boys' dominant instinct for cooperative play and were crucial, for the boy's instinctual play developed into the adult's "persistent habits of mind." Researchers studying the norms of childhood connected the socialization of gang membership with preparation for citizenship; the author of *The Boy and His Gang* in 1912 claimed that a gang was nature's "special training school for the social virtues." A gang at play supposedly threw off prejudice and provided a civic education for boys of all races and nationalities.⁵⁶

Recapitulation theorists and those who worked with children identified the third stage—adolescence—as the "most critical period of life."⁵⁷ They claimed that this stage began around the age of eleven, stretched into the mid-twenties, and mimicked the evolutionary life of the "noble savage" or "heathen."⁵⁸ When Hall started studying adolescence in 1902, he considered it to be a new stage in human development, but psychologists steadily identified a core set of common traits.⁵⁹

To begin, boy experts constructed adolescents as malleable. The adolescent "creature," as Forbush warned in 1901, was in an in-between state "endowed with the

passions and independence of manhood" but still a "child in foresight and judgment."⁶⁰

These were tractable years, because a boy's social nature was born in adolescence. His will was still young. His habits became fixed. Psychologists concluded from these developments that adolescence was the "close of the plastic age" and therefore the time when boys could best be influenced. Adults needed to focus on training a child's will and shaping his ideals in adolescence. Improperly handling a child's will, Forbush cautioned, might "leave him a weakling child through life" or "maim him forever."⁶¹

Hence, there was a growing argument that adolescence was a time of crisis, both promising and dangerous. Experts cast adolescence in extreme terms. It was the "best decade of life." In no other "psychic" soil did good and bad seeds "strike such deep root, grow so rankly, or bear fruit so quickly and so surely." It could turn out "wine or vinegar."⁶² Commentators frequently drew upon storm metaphors to describe adolescence.⁶³ Hall wrote in 1908 that, "The dawn of puberty...is soon followed by a stormy period of great agitation, when the very worst and best impulses in the human soul struggle against each other for its possession."⁶⁴

Additionally, adolescence was framed as a maelstrom of physical, mental, and moral change. The adolescent's heart grew and his temperature rose.⁶⁵ What's more, Hoben sympathetically noted, "the boy is besieged by an army of new and vivid sense impressions that overstimulate, confuse, and baffle him. He is under stress... He cannot correlate and organize his experiences. They are too vivid, varied, and rapid for that."⁶⁶ Such uneven growth and stimulation led adolescent boys to become restless and to dream of adventure.⁶⁷ Puffer claimed in 1912, "Nearly all boys with good, red blood in their veins" experienced a "migratory impulse."⁶⁸ When improperly cultivated these new

instincts resulted in "wanderlust."⁶⁹ Intellectual and emotional restlessness purportedly accompanied this rapid physical maturation; adolescence came to be seen as a period of intense passions, risk-taking, and fluctuating emotions.⁷⁰ Adolescence, for Forbush, was "a time of stubborn doubts, painful and dangerous," so boys needed to be given time for repose and idealization in order to be mentally equipped for a productive adulthood. This confluence of physiological and psychological factors in adolescence resulted in moral instability and uncertain identities. In 1901, Forbush explained, "No songs are too gay, no sorrows ever so tearful. It is the time for slang, because no words in any dictionary can possibly express all that crowds to utterance." This tumult caused adolescence also to be a time for religious conversion.⁷¹ Child experts constructed adolescence as a vital stage in a child's physical, mental, and emotional development, and its proclaimed norms became the lens through which child researchers judged the state of American childhood.

THE BOY PROBLEM

Boy experts framed their concerns about an emerging "boy problem" within the gendered norms of childhood and adolescence in the late-nineteenth century.⁷² Girls generally spent their leisure hours inside or in the view of adults, but boys were outside, roaming the streets. As the child study movement warned, danger lurked everywhere for such lads. Popular writers, the historian Joseph Kett notes, believed that "too much sleep, too much food, and above all, too much sex" corrupted boys.⁷³ The experts identified this corruption in gendered terms and developed and embedded masculine gender norms in their articulation of the problem.⁷⁴ Broadly, child experts worried about "degeneracy," but they were particularly concerned about effeminacy and precocity.⁷⁵

Psychologists, religious leaders and parishioners, boy workers, and politicians feared that turn-of-the-century lads lacked proper masculine social traits. These fears stretched back into the 1890s when opinion leaders pointed to strong feminine influences in the home, church, and school as the cause of effeminacy in boys.⁷⁶ Many worried that the church was no longer able to keep boys interested "through the adolescent period" as women significantly outnumbered men in church attendance.⁷⁷ In 1903, Theodore Roosevelt stressed the need for "the rougher, manlier virtues" and claimed that men should be "able to hold their own in rough conflict."⁷⁸ In 1910, the leader of the Boy Scouts, Ernest T. Seton, echoed and summarized these concerns. He charged that the "system" turned "our robust, manly, self-reliant boyhood into a lot of flat-chested cigarette smokers, with shaky nerves and doubtful vitality."⁷⁹

In addition to effeminacy, child experts warned that boys, especially urban boys, were developing prematurely and becoming precocious in the process. In the present day, precocity in children is put in a positive light. Certain children are gifted intellectually. They are admired by society and put in advanced classes by educators.⁸⁰ Society began to view precocity or "adult behavior in youth" as a disease that needed to be treated in the 1830s, and this hostility carried into the Progressive Era. G. Stanley Hall's research within the child study movement encouraged this fear as he stressed instincts and the importance of restraining sexual drives. The over-rapid development of precocity came to have symptoms that could be watched for and included nervousness, independence, and expressions of sexuality in adolescents.⁸¹

Psychologists and boy experts were convinced that if children and adolescents were exposed to sexuality – conversations about sex or sexual information – they would

be led to sexual experimentation and perversion. Forbush warned in 1901 that perversion was generally "the result of information gained surreptitiously and curiosity unduly aroused and of evil companionship or unusual temptation." Thus, the boy problem arose as boys fell into the "sex-temptations" of "impure thoughts and conversation, self-abuse and fornication" and inevitably resulted in corruption and ruin.⁸² Premature exposure to such vices would surely result in a child's perversion and corruption. Medical practitioners and child experts grounded their concerns about the boy problem in theories of the convertibility of energy and warned the public of the consequences of energy depletion. Energy depletion theories began appearing in medical tracts in the 1830s and correlated sexual, physical, moral, and spiritual energy. As Kett articulates, they held that "anything that dissipated the reserve of sexual energy... depleted all other kinds of energy."⁸³ Therefore, theorists argued that sexual experimentation made young people lazy, greedy, and lustful, and associated nervousness and premature assertions of independence with compulsive masturbation among adolescents. Hall and other child psychologists warned that sex could easily assert "its mastery" over adolescents and could lead to "secret vice, debauch, disease, and enfeebled heredity." Precocious boys and "compulsive masturbators" were both cast as physically dwarfed with sunken chests and shifty eyes.⁸⁴ The adolescent was at risk, and precocious behavior became a tell-tale sign of danger.

Some reformers tied this boy problem specifically to the growth of cities.⁸⁵ Country boys lived free in "contact with nature and wild life and opportunity for origination in work and play in woodland, pasture, and carpenter shop." In contrast, a city was an "artificial environment."⁸⁶ This attention among reformers to childhood

environments touched upon a key tension within the conversation about childhood between the early 1800s and 1900s over the influence of a child's physical setting in development.

PRIMARY TENSIONS MARKING THE EVOLUTION OF YOUTH FROM 1800 TO 1900

Three tensions were central to emerging notions of childhood and adolescence during the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, including tensions between environment and heredity, city life and country life, and home and street. The first tension unfolded at the macro level. There was an active debate over the influence of environmental versus heredity factors in a child's development. This tension, in turn, informed the discourse on urban living. Politicians, religious figures, and child experts alike placed in tension the value of life in the city with the value of life in the country. Finally, this contrast also emerged as a tension at the local level as child experts juxtaposed the street environment with the more wholesome, supervised settings of the home, school, club, and playground.

Heredity versus Environment

As they reevaluated the child's role in society, the public debated whether environment or heredity was a greater influence on a child's development, and many studies from the mid-1800s forward focused on hereditarianism.⁸⁷ The Howe Sanborn Report in 1865 asserted that drunken parents produced weak stock and transmitted evil tendencies to their children.⁸⁸ The social Darwinist Herbert Spencer and the Italian criminologist Cesare Lombroso similarly spoke of an intractable "criminal class."⁸⁹ Other late-nineteenth-century research claimed to confirm such notions. Delinquent children,

such reasoning suggested, were simply reverting back to earlier "race instincts." These ideas carried into the early 1900s as research sought to detect heredity traits. Gregor Mendel, the father of genetics, experimented with peas and showed that certain traits were passed down from generation to generation. Among the public, eugenics grew as a movement with studies of families like the Jukes, who notoriously included seven generations of criminals. When applied to children, these ideas meant that there were limits to a child's natural powers.⁹⁰

Some held a double standard and precariously straddled the divide between heredity and environment. They claimed that "hereditary tendencies" shaped the character of the slum child but claimed that good homes supplied the environment in which a child could be socialized into proper conduct. Others similarly struck a balance between pessimistic social Darwinism and optimistic views involving the redemption of the individual.⁹¹

Many child welfare activists came to emphasize the role of environment over heredity and to monitor children's settings specifically in the mid-1800s and into the early 1900s. Recapitulationists believed that a child's environment partially dictated whether their natural instincts would turn to good or ill.⁹² In 1909, the socialist John Spargo insisted, "Nature starts all her children, rich and poor, physically equal... each generation gets practically a fresh start, unhampered by the diseased and degenerate past."⁹³ These figures believed that environments shaped a child's physical and moral development.⁹⁴ Phillip Davis reminded his readers that the environment was a teacher and cautioned that streets, an eminently dangerous environment, educated "with fatal precision."⁹⁵ Child-savers, recapitulation theorists, and other middle-class reformers echoed Davis'

arguments about children in urban environments and reiterated the nineteenth-century idealization of rural settings.⁹⁶

Country Life vs. City Life

The public also established a dichotomy between the city and the country and idealized the latter. Contrasts between the two environments were prominent. Nineteenth-century publicists spread and propagated a country-boy myth.⁹⁷ Late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century novelists trumpeted the virtues of country living.⁹⁸ The mythical country lad fished at the local waterhole and romped through fields and pastures.⁹⁹ The mounting praise for country living correlated with condemnations of urban life.

The proclaimed benefits of country living were bounteous, profiting a person's character and physical well-being. According to many authors, country people used plain speech; they were simple, honest, and steady – of strong moral values.¹⁰⁰ Physically, they were full of vim and vigor. The lively country youth was enterprising and unspoiled by tainting influences. His country upbringing would be the key to success later in life.¹⁰¹ In 1872, Charles Loring Brace of the Children's Aid Society asserted, "the cultivators of the soil are in America our most solid and intelligent class."¹⁰² This idea carried into the twentieth century, and in 1910, a founder of the American Boy Scouts described the mythical country boy as "the best material of which a nation could be made."¹⁰³ The country was supposedly a boy's natural setting; it was his "home-land." Even short stints in the country were perceived to be advantageous. The air restored the city boy's health, and the "silent evangelism" of nature restored his morals.¹⁰⁴ In the language of recapitulation theorists, country boys could productively indulge their savage instincts roving about hunting and fishing. But, unhealthful conditions could produce "moral

monsters."¹⁰⁵ Settlement house workers, child labor reformers, and boy experts alike considered cities to be one of the most threatening environments.

Cities grew exponentially over the course of the nineteenth century, though, and politicians and authors increasingly depicted them as the worst elements of modernity. In 1800, one in twenty-five Americans lived in a city. By 1900, one in three Americans lived in a city.¹⁰⁶ Chicago provided an illustrative case. The city's population jumped from 100,000 to 1,100,000 between 1860 and 1890.¹⁰⁷ Urban residents, immigrants and natives alike, were thrust into the lascivious environment of city life.¹⁰⁸ Davis claimed that these environments "suppressed" beauty, and others declared that urban living was deleterious to a child's physical and emotional health.¹⁰⁹

City slums were a central concern. The term *slum* came to imply a festering pit of poverty, crime, disease, and prostitution.¹¹⁰ In 1856, the Children's Aid Society wrote of slum children, "brought up in bad air, in filthy rooms, used to drunkenness [sic], to lewdness, to idleness and debauchery" and warned of the end result of such unschooled and unchurched youth.¹¹¹ This understanding persisted, and in 1905, G. Stanley Hall called slums "putrefying sores." He believed the "denizens" of America's slums were "lower in the moral and intellectual scale than any known race of savages."¹¹² The "physical and moral atmosphere" of these areas, according to the author of *Street-Land*, was "not congenial to the eye and soul of man."¹¹³ These realms were especially deemed inappropriate for children, and many charged that slums and cities caused juvenile delinquency.¹¹⁴ The New York settlement worker Robert Hunter claimed in 1912 that the "great, homeless, yardless tenement" was "the nursery of crime."¹¹⁵

Urban reformers identified overcrowding in tenements as a common feature of this environment and a compounder of sanitation problems. Alleys were "noxious" with garbage and refuse. Tenement neighborhoods bred and spread disease.¹¹⁶ In 1896, Chicago's Department of Health described many tenement houses as "old, dilapidated or rotten, damp, unventilated, badly lighted, badly drained, unprovided with proper facilities for the disposal of excreta and without adequate or even necessary water supply."¹¹⁷ Almost two decades later, health problems were still rampant. In 1913, fifty percent of Chicago's children died before they reached five years of age.¹¹⁸

Urban environments, according to a common argument, directly threatened proper childhood development. Boys, who grew up "living between walls and pavements and among a thousand distractions and allurements," as Forbush charged, were "much less potent in grasp, attention and efficiency."¹¹⁹ Such settings were inappropriate for children and adolescents. Hall believed that the "urbanized hothouse life" led to precocity, tending "to ripen everything before its time."¹²⁰

Home vs. Street

Finally, reformers constructed a tension between the home and the street in the debate over childhood and adolescence. Over the course of the nineteenth and into the twentieth century, psychologists, educators, and settlement workers came to argue that the home environment was the natural and proper setting for childhood development. Their praise of the traditional home contrasted sharply with their condemnation of life in city streets.

To begin, child experts and educators constructed the traditional home as a middle-class institution that protected against public corruption.¹²¹ Horace Bushnell, a

mid-century minister and theologian of Christian nurture, stressed in 1847 that "the family spirit" and the "organic life of the house" worked unconsciously to form a child's morals.¹²² The family home, as the historian Christopher Lasch articulated, was to be a "haven in a heartless world."¹²³ This middle-class institution provided a sanctuary where social virtues were nurtured and children were protected from the onslaught of capitalist modernization.¹²⁴ Support for this perspective grew from the time of Bushnell's writing to the turn-of-the-century, and in 1901, Forbush called the home a "divinely appointed institution."¹²⁵

Experts, especially child-savers who worked with neglected and dependent children, decreed that the family home was a natural setting. Influenced by evolutionary biology and Darwinism, they argued that nature set the standard and modeled the inherent value of children remaining "with their parents throughout an extended period of dependence," according to the historian Michael Katz.¹²⁶ In 1909 to the Conference on the Care of Dependent Children, Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch urged,

Nature herself has taught us that the family is the institution which, in the course of evolution, tends to conserve the things best for human life... I think the family life is the natural life. It is the life which nature has decreed, through its evolutions; it is that form of life in which the human species can best develop. Hirsch's crowd met this recommendation with applause.¹²⁷

Out of this opinion, those who worked with children relied on the home to set a boy on the correct path for life and to save him from his own missteps. Drawing on Bushnell's popular philosophies, child activists identified the home as the setting for proper socialization.¹²⁸ Both national figures and boy experts stressed the importance of

the home in a child's development. In 1901, Forbush insisted, "The greatest means of helping the boy is the Home."¹²⁹ Theodore Roosevelt expounded on the same principle a decade later, urging, "we cannot get on well unless we have the right kind of home, the right kind of family life in this republic."¹³⁰

Middle-class reformers grew alarmed, then, when they perceived the breakdown of the home in the late-1800s and early-1900s. In 1915, Davis mourned, "The good old-fashioned home has absolutely broken down."¹³¹ A range of statistics and signs fed fears about the state of the family. Divorce rates rose exponentially, increasing fifteen-fold between 1870 and 1920. Birth rates decreased among native, middle-class families. Women were renegotiating their position in society. Marriage was postponed for men and women. Prostitution rates increased. And a "new morality" challenged the sexual norms of the late-1800s.¹³² According to Lasch, this new morality "proclaimed the joys of the body, defended divorce and birth control, raised doubts about monogamy, and condemned interference with sexual life by the state or community."¹³³ Alcohol, sex, and divorce made up a trifecta of concern for reformers.¹³⁴

These features, whether causes or symptoms, were all constructed as part of the "home problem," which was allegedly rooted in uncongenial environments *and* parental neglect.¹³⁵ Middle-class nurture writers saw a lack of parental love in laboring class families. They thought that fathers were neglecting their family roles and mothers were simply inexperienced.¹³⁶ In the child labor movement, this argument came out in accusations about idle, lazy, or "dinner toting" fathers who lived off their children's labor.¹³⁷ Columbus Ohio's Juvenile Court reported in 1909 that a twelve year old was brought in and charged with being "stupid, incorrigible, quarrelsome and unmanageable

in school." Court officers got "to the bottom of" the case and discovered that the boy's "parents were living apart, an all too frequent state of affairs; that the mother was an habitual drunkard, and that the boy's stupidity was due to liquor." The kid even had a flask of whiskey in his pocket in the courtroom. Such accounts led the court to conclude that over a fourth of the city's cases of delinquency were "the direct result of parental neglect."¹³⁸ One Indiana night messenger boy said that "if his father knew what kind of work he was doing, a strap would be laid across his back and he would be compelled to abandon it." The youth's father "did not know" though; he was unacquainted with his son's activities.¹³⁹ Commentators used such incidents as indicators of broader concerns. Many reformers charged that the family was "breaking up" because parents did not spend sufficient time at home.¹⁴⁰ Others charged that parents even neglected their children, like this young messenger, in the "very years of crisis." According to boy workers, many parents (i.e., poor, ignorant immigrants) failed to provide adolescents with direction or time for recreation and reflection at this critical time. These "bad home conditions" allegedly drove daughters and sons to vice and crime. In the end, middle-class reformers made the case that the loss of homes as the center of family life caused a new morality crisis. In the city especially, homes became places to work and sleep only.¹⁴¹

Urban housing contributed to this perceived problem. Overcrowded tenements made congestion a glaring feature of slums. People commonly lived and worked in unventilated rooms or dank cellars.¹⁴² These dwellings were not like New England homesteads nor were they like the homes immigrants left back in the Old Country. Brace charged in 1872 that even the "better kind" of tenement "sows pestilence and breeds every species of criminal habit."¹⁴³ Many studies pointed out that crowded residences

failed to provide sufficient privacy for families.¹⁴⁴ Large families squeezed into small one or two room apartments. When necessary, people took in boarders. The Chicago Vice Commission disapprovingly reported in 1911 that boarders slept "in the same room with members of the family." This company, they continued, "accustoms children to the presence of strangers and it is no wonder that they lose their moral sense and easily accept the improper attentions of others."¹⁴⁵ Additionally, families frequently moved from one tenement to the next, so even the edifying influence of the neighborhood was lost.¹⁴⁶

With such crowded housing, family life spilled out onto the streets, which Clopper called "fungous growths."¹⁴⁷ As the streets increasingly became children's playgrounds, reformers like Davis emphasized that they were "poor ground for play."¹⁴⁸ There were frequent street and train accidents, and in 1914 children under fifteen made up sixty percent of the traffic victims in New York City. Trolley accidents were so common that people started calling it a disease – "trolleyitis."¹⁴⁹ Playing in the street, or the "street habit" as Hunter termed it, started innocently but quickly became harmful.¹⁵⁰ The streets, reformers lamented, were "undoing the work of home and school."¹⁵¹

Relatedly, middle-class, progressive reformers in the early-1900s claimed that the streets overstimulated children, overwhelming their senses and tainting their morals. Cities supposedly assaulted a child with visual and auditory distractions. Children were susceptible to "impressions," as Davis warned, and the city streets forced "a host of impressions,--disorganized, irrelevant and trivial."¹⁵² More threateningly, immoral influences formed an unsavory chunk of this sensory onslaught. Children picked up morals from people they observed on the streets and from their playmates. Street children

quickly mimicked whichever travelling troop was in town from the stunts of Peter Pan to the "brutality" of the boxer Jack Johnson. Many believed bad habits and trends were contagious. Davis and others warned that children could not escape the "demoralizing effect" of drunks and loafers in saloons, backstreets, and poolrooms.¹⁵³ Many feared that these liquor interests were dominating city life.¹⁵⁴ These same crowds introduced children to gambling, and certain street games were "but gambling games in embryo," Davis claimed.¹⁵⁵ Child-labor reformers and experts feared that city life on the streets also stimulated premature sexual activity and hence sapped a youth's energy for life.¹⁵⁶ At night, the danger of the streets increased. In a 1910 newspaper editorial, Owen Lovejoy warned, "Immoral forces in large cities are notoriously more unbridled late at night."¹⁵⁷

The street boy personified the negative traits associated with the boy problem and the urban streets. While ordinary boys cultivated honor and valor, "the precocious boy of the street" developed "the cold vices of cynicism, misanthropy, and avarice," Hoben warned in 1911. Such "reptilian" traits, he asserted, were normally "almost exclusively among adults."¹⁵⁸ Cities amplified temptations, even as adolescents needed to conserve their energy by refraining from sexual activity.¹⁵⁹ How could a home compete with the "thousand sights" and wonders of the city streets?¹⁶⁰ For many progressive reformers, a child's physical setting was central to his proper development.

In this way, circulating tensions between environment and heredity, country and city, and home and street helped to define society's evolving perspective toward children. In turn, these tensions and the norms prescribed for childhood, including the framing of the boy problem, animated the public discourse on child labor. These ideas infused the child labor debate over the street trades and lent vehemence to the anti-child labor cause.

The threads of these tensions and norms are visibly woven into the objections raised to child street traders and night messengers in particular.

STREET WORK AND THE BOY PROBLEM

By 1910, many states had adopted minimum age limits for factory work, but the public continued to consent to child street workers. Early anti-child labor efforts had been primarily directed at mines, mills, and mercantiles, but most states had no protections for child street traders in the early 1900s. Reform writers of the day still had to counter claims that street work taught industry and enterprise to children.¹⁶¹ Some people continued to see street traders as "little merchants."¹⁶² Child labor activists stressed that such views were misguided. Street work brought children into contact with many unhealthful influences, according to activists, and at night children came into contact with the most "vicious features" of the city.¹⁶³ In 1903, Ernest Poole charged, "The homeless, the most illiterate, the most dishonest, the most impure--these are the finished products of child street labor."¹⁶⁴

Yet, street work was within the reach of urban children. The decline in apprenticeships by 1850 made street work the most accessible paid employment for children.¹⁶⁵ There are no reliable figures about the number of children working in the streets, but Clopper asserted that the problem of child labor in the streets was widespread in 1912. Retrospectively, David Nasaw saw street work as practically ubiquitous among urban children.¹⁶⁶ In the homes of the poor, families expected young children to scavenge. They collected junk to sell to junkmen, gleaned coal from train yards, and picked up wood from around the city. Huckstering of one sort or another was also

popular and included peddling random goods on the streets, selling newspapers, and blacking boots.¹⁶⁷

Among such occupations reformers considered several forms of street work, including telegraph messenger work, to be "specially open to objection."¹⁶⁸ Messengers worked in both formal and informal situations. Parents and neighbors frequently sent children out for little tasks. Corner grocers and butchers called children off the street to run their errands.¹⁶⁹ Full-time messengers worked for companies like Western Union and American District Telegraph. Official statisticians counted these more formalized positions when tallying child labor numbers, and in 1900, the U.S. Census recorded 37,811 boys aged ten to fifteen working as "Messengers and errand and office boys."¹⁷⁰ Since telegraph companies employed messengers, this work was not technically a street trade. Yet, anti-child labor reformers frequently clumped telegraph messenger boys with other streets trades because of the amount of time that these boys spent unsupervised on the streets.¹⁷¹ Activists had much to say about the "evil effects of street work."¹⁷²

Street Work and Physical Deterioration

Anti-child labor activists spoke of the physical consequences of street work. Many street traders worked long, irregular hours. Before and after school (and during, if they were sly) boys and girls walked the streets hucking their wares. Children selling flowers and candy clustered around crowds leaving late-night shows. Newsies sold their papers early and late. Uniformed messengers shuttled notes and packages to and fro in the vice district around the clock. The National Child Labor Committee collected testimony from managers of the American District Telegraph Company and the Postal Telegraph Company admitting that a messenger's minimum work day was ten hours

long.¹⁷³ For some reformers, it was this irregularity and the abnormal and late hours that made child labor in the street trades untenable.¹⁷⁴

Their irregular work hours were matched by irregular diets.¹⁷⁵ In 1903, Poole warned, "For many [street traders] this nervous irregular life is sustained and poisoned by hastily bolted meals, with often double a man's portion of coffee, cigars, and cigarettes." Street traders drank coffee to "an amazing excess." And smoking among these kids was "almost universal." Many street traders, including messengers, generally ate their lunch-stand meal or free-saloon meal hurriedly.¹⁷⁶

Reformers stressed that the public should be alarmed over child laborers' irregular sleeping schedules and sleeping arrangements.¹⁷⁷ These child laborers managed to sleep when and where they could. Noisome tenement dwellings provided an unfit haven for daytime sleeping. One thirteen-year-old boy who worked at night told investigators that he smoked "perique," a special tobacco blend, just so that he could sleep during the day.¹⁷⁸ Those who worked with the children listed street children's lack of sleep as a cause of their "loss of vitality."¹⁷⁹

The streets also became the street traders' homes.¹⁸⁰ Boys used this arrangement at times to avoid parental demands and discipline.¹⁸¹ There were also "bunk" boys who were chased out of their homes or ran away and had to bunk about wherever. Some boys, even those from "good families" Davis reported, ran away from home enamored with the "fascination of night life."¹⁸² Then there were hordes of child laborers or "street arabs" who told the investigator Jacob Riis that they "didn't live nowhere."¹⁸³ Workers ended up sleeping in streets, stables, condemned buildings, and tenement hallways. Reformers vividly described this transient juvenile street life. Between midnight and 2:00 a.m. one

November night, Riis reportedly observed sixty children sleeping on the streets. He noted, "They lie in tangled heaps of two's and three's, over gratings, down steps, and under benches. Their faces are white, cold, unconscious--like the faces of dead children." The fragmented nature of street traders working, eating, and sleeping led Ernest Poole to conclude in 1903, "The main characteristic of street work is its unwholesome irregularity."¹⁸⁴

This unwholesome irregularity told on children's health at a time when experts correlated physical health and morality.¹⁸⁵ Settlement workers and investigators perceived many disconcerting abnormalities among street traders. From the boys' skin to their gait, reformers recorded many symptoms of nervous disorders and overstimulation among these workers. Street work and its overstimulation affected boys' constitutions, purportedly leaving them small and weak.¹⁸⁶ Night work, especially, was said to induce these symptoms. "Pale faces and languid bearing characterize night children of Street-Land," recorded Davis.¹⁸⁷ Street traders' ill health was manifested in their sluggish walk. Among messengers, many slouched. Others walked with a drag.¹⁸⁸ Working on the streets led some to unconscious nervous movements. Of one young newsboy, Poole wrote, "What little flesh he owned was constantly twitching, and his hands moved nervously as he talked."¹⁸⁹

Street Work and Material Deterioration

Believing that children needed to be sheltered and protected, anti-child labor activists also worried about what children would do with the money they earned. A child's earnings varied markedly in the street trades. The irregular work of most street traders led to irregular pay. Children on average received about one third of an adult's

wages for their work, according to a study in the 1910s.¹⁹⁰ Telegraph messengers by comparison earned good wages. An article in the *New York Tribune* in 1879 claimed that telegraph companies paid messengers an average of \$3 a week. Some Chicago messengers reported bringing in a minimum of \$60 a month. Many teens resisted leaving the night messenger service because no other jobs would pay them as well and give them such freedom.¹⁹¹ Regardless, anti-child labor activists claimed that the pay was not worth the hazards. This compensation was deemed to be a pitiable compensation for the "physical weariness and moral risk attending street trades in a large city."¹⁹²

Anti-child labor activists also debated why children entered the street trades. Proponents of child labor frequently argued that widowed mothers were dependent upon the wages of their sons and daughters to survive. Most reformers dismissed such claims. They asserted that the number of widowed mothers was exaggerated. In the majority of cases, reformers and researchers claimed, families did not need the money. A child's wages helped but were nonessential to the family.¹⁹³ This source of income, though often small, was essential to working-class families' survival in the 1800s and early 1900s. The numbers vary, but children between the ages of ten and nineteen brought in an estimated 20-46 percent of the family income.¹⁹⁴ Such contributions often meant the difference between stability and destitution.

When children became wage-earners their status within the family shifted. Many children were expected to hand over their entire pay envelop to their parents, but once a child became a wage-earner, they were at times permitted a modicum of control over their non-work hours. Child labor reformers warned that wage-earning would instill premature independence in child laborers and tempt them to buck parental control.¹⁹⁵

Poole cautioned that "supportin" the family would grow "irksome" to child laborers, and boys would gradually become estranged from their families.¹⁹⁶ Adolescents believed that they "earned their independence" with their first wages and thus thought they had the right "to smoke and chew and spit" like the other men.¹⁹⁷ This estrangement might start with gambling and a few lies, but it would end with the boy living on the streets.¹⁹⁸ In this way, what children did with their earnings became a focus of much concern.

Repeatedly child experts cautioned that ready access to money would corrupt boys. Children earning wages would surely result in "reckless spending." In the cities these youths could fritter away their money in any number of pursuits. Street traders, like newsboys, were frequently in debt. According to child-savers, they spent their money frivolously on neckties and kid gloves. Or they would shell out their earnings on candy, cheap lunches, and movies at the theater. Shows at the theater often just whetted a boy's interest in temptation.¹⁹⁹

What's worse, loafing around selling papers or being holed up in a back office waiting to be sent out on an errand led many boys to gambling. They gambled on marbles and the races. A boy could lose his whole week's earnings in a game of craps before he ever made it out of the messenger office. Along these lines, street traders encountered different temptations depending on their trade and their district.²⁰⁰

Child welfare reformers objected less to Wall Street customers than they did to the customers of the night though. Catering to the night crowds was a lucrative business but wrought with dangers. These crowds paid carelessly and well for the services of the street traders and messengers. The night shift was also "popular" because the streets were full of thrills and excitement for young boys.²⁰¹ Davis warned, "Night life is eventful. It

brings to youth strange experiences which are out of keeping with its daily life in home and school. It whets new appetites which cannot be satisfied legitimately."²⁰² Among street traders, messengers were the "typical 'night children' of the streets," according to the Chicago Vice Commission.²⁰³

Progressive educators believed that such habits frustrated their best education attempts, for they were convinced that street work took even the most intelligent lads and set them on a course toward ruin.²⁰⁴ Child laborers became difficult to handle in the classroom.²⁰⁵ When street traders did go to school, Poole argued, they were frequently "ungovernable or backward." Child laborers also came to school tired after having stayed up late to work the night crowds, to attend the moving pictures, or to take in the excitement of the night streets. On the other hand, night schools had to contend with the attractions of the night streets and so often had irregular attendance. Poole wondered how "the monotonous school-room," a "foreign" mother, or the "tenement" could compete with the bustle and thrill of selling papers on the Brooklyn Bridge on election night.²⁰⁶

Among street traders, truancy was a looming problem. Boys became deft at escaping truant officers, sometimes with the aid of their parents.²⁰⁷ This truancy was cast as another form of loafing and was said to lead to vagrancy and vagabondage. In 1915, Davis cautioned, "Premature toil encourages truancy in a double sense – breaking away from home as well as school."²⁰⁸

The degrading effect of the street was also seen in part in the high rate of turnover among workers. There was a very high job turnover rate among child laborers generally. Their work was often semi-skilled or unskilled. There were few opportunities for advancement. They met little encouragement from businesses for loyalty. So they were

often willing to switch jobs without warning.²⁰⁹ The turnover rate was even higher in the street trades, especially the messenger service. The scholar Gregory Downey estimates that in the messenger service there was a yearly turnover rate of between 100 to 300 percent.²¹⁰ Poole recorded that one New York telegraph company employed 1,000 night messenger boys at a time but employed 6,000 boys over the course of the year due to the high turnover. Child labor reformers attributed this shiftiness to the ills of child labor. Poole and others warned that street work led to a "[c]onstant thirst for change."²¹¹ High job turnover rates boded poorly for street traders' futures.

Reformers also believed that street work stirred in boys distaste for gainful employment.²¹² Premature toil led to "premature idleness" – to the "unemployed" and the "unemployables."²¹³ This concern mirrored a growing preoccupation about employment opportunities among boy workers in the late 1800s. Experts and educators feared that boys were entering dead-end jobs in their early teens that would rob them of the schooling necessary for future advancement.²¹⁴ The post-adolescent street trader, Davis warned, who woke up to the realization that he was "no longer a 'kid'" and deserved "a man's wage," would find himself unfit for other employment. He was untrained. He was accustomed to the freedom and excitement of the streets. And all the "early habits of street life" transformed a regular workplace into "a prison" in his eyes.²¹⁵ Reformers feared he would be at the mercies of an insecure labor market.²¹⁶ This type of work, they argued, sapped a boy's energies, blunted his senses, and shattered his ideals.²¹⁷

Street Work and Moral Deterioration

Fostered by these street influences, precocity was particularly prevalent in street traders.²¹⁸ City streets offered "unbridled freedom," which attracted youths but also

soured them to the restrictions of home.²¹⁹ The home was made to seem dull in comparison to the vices of the streets. In this way, life on the streets implanted "that amazing precocity" that "leads to so much harm."²²⁰ As Chicago's Vice Commission reported, it familiarized little night street traders with knowledge "far beyond their years" and turned them into "creatures of independent habits before they reach puberty."²²¹ Child labor laws aimed to keep children from asserting independence prematurely – to curb their precocity.²²²

As Clopper outlined, street traders were also particularly prone to moral deterioration. The "grosser forms of immorality," Spargo decried, occurred even more frequently in the street trades than in factories.²²³ Street trading posed perhaps "the greatest moral hazards" to "city children," as Davis reminded the public, because it brought them into "regular daily contact with street vices."²²⁴ The Chicago Vice Commission mourned that it was a sad spectacle to see "little vendors become creatures of independent habits before they reach the age of puberty" by learning "vulgarity and immorality" from the denizens of saloons and houses of ill-repute.²²⁵ Adults at the Newsboys' Home got a glimpse of the shocking lives of street traders as they turned out the pockets of incoming lodgers and discovered a curious range of objects, including clubs, revolvers, skeleton keys, burglars tools, and "vicious pictures."²²⁶ Child labor activists found the messenger service to be even worse than other street trades.

These concerns were rooted in notions of adolescence, but they also mirrored the broader currents of rhetoric surrounding sex from that era. Reformers claimed that boys, who were going through a period of sexual awakening, were inadequately aware of the danger posed by solicitous men and women.²²⁷ They drew on reports about the

prevalence of sexual diseases among street traders to support their concern. Venereal diseases were purportedly very common among messengers and newsboys.²²⁸ The New York Child Labor Committee asserted that 75 percent of night newsies had venereal diseases by the age of fifteen.²²⁹ Spargo cautioned that newsboys were rent by the “ravages of venereal diseases” when they came to the John Worthy School in Chicago because of their “irregular habits, scant feeding, sexual excesses, secret vices, [and] sleeping in hallways.”²³⁰

Child labor activists also connected street work with a life of crime. Studies were unclear about the connection between the street trades and crime.²³¹ Anti-child labor activists were sure though, and like George Mangold in 1910 claimed, “No other form of work has such demoralizing consequences.”²³² Street trading surely led to pickpocketing, petty theft, truancy, dishonesty, begging, gambling, and drinking.²³³ Many temptations confronted messenger boys specifically. They might raise charges or lie about their work; it was easy to cheat foreigners, drunks, and opium users.²³⁴

Progressive reformers drew on information from courts and reformatories to justify their concern. According to one account, 63 percent of boys sent to a house of refuge, 60 percent of truants at a parental school, and 46.6 percent of boys at a truant school were street traders.²³⁵ In Washington, D.C., child street traders made up 25 percent of working children, but they made up 66 percent of children under 15 who were sent to reform schools or put under probation officers.²³⁶ By such accounts, street traders certainly made up a disproportionate fraction of juvenile delinquents. In short, this street work led to a boy's complete physical, material, and moral undoing. Children's work,

though, was increasingly targeted by reformers who found children working and playing in the streets to be antithetical to modern conceptions of childhood and adolescence.

THE RANGE OF SOLUTIONS FOR THE BOY PROBLEM

Child activists at the turn-of-the-twentieth-century mounted a child-saving campaign, and they embedded the circulating cultural tensions and childhood norms into their efforts. Educational reformers, anti-child labor activists, and child-savers increasingly used environmental arguments to justify and raise support for their interventions in the community and workplace.²³⁷ They focused on a child's environment, his urban setting and his home life. As they responded, child welfare reformers co-opted nineteenth century child-saving measures and introduced their own innovative elements in an attempt to reach and save the modern boy. Their efforts focused on the child at home, at school, and at play.

Children At Home

Across the nineteenth century, reformers' focus on the home played out particularly as child experts and educators worked out how to deal with delinquent, dependent, neglected, and orphaned youths.²³⁸ Indeed, for those seeking to renew the slums, their biggest challenge was how to restore some semblance of an appropriate home life. Over the course of the nineteenth century, several strategies emerged. One solution was to remove children from their families and to put them in institutions.²³⁹ Others looked to the redeeming influence of country living. Either way, if children could be removed from corrupting environments, reformers optimistically claimed that they could be taught morals, discipline, and a work ethic.²⁴⁰

In the early-1800s, institutional solutions were popular because they made it possible to control a child's environment and removed children from contaminating home and street influences. These institutions included orphan asylums, houses of refuge, and reform schools. In these settings, child-savers endeavored to instill industry, discipline, and self-control in children.²⁴¹ Hastings Hart outlined the benefits of this type of care in 1909, noting, "We can control the influences that make up the child's life. We can control what he thinks about, from the time when he gets up in the morning till he goes to bed at night... We can control absolutely his physical conditions."²⁴²

Yet, even by the mid-1800s, many highlighted the pitfalls of institutional living. Some objected to its financial cost. Others feared that institutions constructed an "artificial" life for children and made kids unable to become independent thinkers.²⁴³ Reform schools, which emerged in the 1840s, were already moving toward a family-style model where children were to be nurtured in homelike environments.²⁴⁴ These shortcomings turned many reformers toward more home-based solutions like foster care.²⁴⁵

By the turn-of-the-twentieth-century, home preservation was the preferred strategy of Progressive reformers.²⁴⁶ "Home care" was the first conclusion coming out of the Conference on the Care of Dependent Children (1909).²⁴⁷ The conference declared, "Children of worthy parents or deserving mothers should, as a rule, be kept with their parents at home."²⁴⁸ When remaining with birth parents was not possible, foster homes were the next-best solution.²⁴⁹ The conference favored placing "homeless and neglected children, if normal," in foster families "when practicable."²⁵⁰ Middle-class child-savers did not clearly define what they meant by "worthy," "deserving," or "normal," but

reformers praised the value of keeping the home and family intact.²⁵¹ J. Adams Puffer and others placed increased emphasis on the role of home and the family because they feared that the constructive powers of the family and the neighborhood had been lost in the new urban, modern society.²⁵²

Others looked to the silent evangelism of nature to save children. Many experts believed that the only way to save children was to remove them from the city and to place them in rural environments. In 1901, Mrs. Ophelia L. Amigh, a worker with girls' cottage schools, stressed that "the only way for saving these boys and girls is to get them away from the large cities."²⁵³ The country was a "tonic" offering "freedom and nurture and healing" to city children. Forbush argued that the best case scenario for saving city children was for their whole families "to emigrate bodily to the country" for the summer.²⁵⁴

Short of this drastic move, children could experience or approximate country life through a range of means. The Children's Aid Society believed their duty was to get "children of unhappy fortune utterly out of their surroundings, and to send them away to kind Christian *homes in the country*."²⁵⁵ Out of this impulse, between 1853 and 1929, the Society organized orphan trains that sent destitute children out West to be placed with rural families.²⁵⁶ Between 1890 and World War I, there was an increase in farm schools and rural orphanages.²⁵⁷ Child welfare reformers also pursued several more temporary rural-based solutions. Boy experts believed that rich and poor boys alike could benefit from summer camp. Forbush concluded in 1901 that "the most important" type of club for a boy was the "boys' camp," for it provided a "means of return to the natural country of boyhood, the free life of out-of-doors."²⁵⁸ Children's novelists, like Eleanor H. Porter,

touted the redeeming power of these country retreats to transform characters like "Meg of the Alley" into the angelic "Margaret."²⁵⁹ Even a simple roof garden in the city provided a type of makeshift nature experience and raised a neighborhood to a higher standard. In such ways, city boys were given surrogate country experiences with manual training and regular exercise.²⁶⁰

Children at School

Fearing that the family was failing, child welfare reformers dedicated themselves to monitoring children's education. New strategies to place and keep children in school emerged in the 1830s and extended as the century progressed. The common school movement, which began in the 1830s, led to the proliferation of schools and provided more opportunities for children to get an education. Initiated by Horace Mann, the movement sought to surround schoolchildren with positive influences—noble teachers, moral textbooks, and pleasant environments. Its leaders stressed that providing an aesthetically-pleasing, properly-ventilated schoolroom could uplift teenage boys and even deter them from "secret" vices.²⁶¹

More schools were opened, but many children still never made it into the classroom. At the turn-of-the-century, strides were being made in this direction. By 1918 every state had compulsory attendance laws, and such laws were beginning to be effective.²⁶² Between 1870 and 1915, the number of children enrolled in school jumped from 7 to 20 million. This growth in attendance also occurred in high schools. Between 1890 and 1918, there was a 700 percent increase in high school attendance.²⁶³ Educators and school boards became deeply concerned with early "elimination" or dropping out especially after 1900.²⁶⁴

Educators attempted to keep children in school by challenging the norms of the traditional classroom.²⁶⁵ Progressive educators found the "prevailing system" of book learning and rote memorization to be "defective."²⁶⁶ A boy could not properly be kept at a desk the entire day.²⁶⁷ He was "a natural vagabond" who, according to Puffer, yearned for "all things excitement, experience, and adventure" and would "do anything sooner than work steadily at desk or bench."²⁶⁸ For street traders the night street, not *The McGuffey Reader*, was the "only book they liked," and they "knew it by heart."²⁶⁹ And reformers like Davis held that this rebellion against the traditional school's restrictions was "a healthy revolt" against "inactive school life."²⁷⁰

In order to "interest, attract, and inspire" those whom school "tires, repels, and disheartens," C. M. Woodward and other educators turned to more active learning techniques in the classroom.²⁷¹ They worked to reinvigorate the curriculum; schools began to exchange rote memorization for a more child-centered curriculum. John Dewey, believing that learning derived from active encounters between minds and objects, led this shift. Manual training became a lauded outlet. It hinged on active rather than passive learning and turned to vocational preparation, which until the late 1890s, had been neglected.²⁷²

Boy experts also urged school administrators to replace women teachers with men teachers because they feared reports of boys' growing effeminacy. With the common school movement and the proliferation of schools in the 1800s, many districts had hired female teachers because they could pay them less. At the turn of the twentieth century, though, experts charged that being guided so much by women made boys effeminate.²⁷³

In 1912, Puffer harangued that to set the gang-aged boy under a female Sunday school teacher was "a pedagogic crime."²⁷⁴

The challenge of getting children in school, keeping them engaged, and setting before them masculine leaders took on increased significance as reformers tied education to citizenship. Settlement workers and child labor activists warned that if children were on the street peddling wares instead of in school, their education was being shortchanged; their tutelage in citizenship was being neglected to the detriment of the boy and the nation. Unsure of immigrant and impoverished homes, teachers were tasked with instructing children in the essentials of citizenship.²⁷⁵ In this perspective, Davis claimed that public schools were the "greatest instrument for raising the general level of intelligence" and hence shaping an "intelligent citizenship" and saving "American democracy."²⁷⁶

Children at Play

Outside of the home and school, child welfare activists stressed that children's playtime also needed to be monitored.²⁷⁷ Many reformers turned to "boys' work" and play organizing to combat the perceived deterioration of America's future citizens. At the turn-of-the-twentieth-century, adults invested in children's play – working to provide safe environments, directed activities, good company, and careful supervision. They tried to insulate adolescents from premature adulthood and to direct boys' ideals into "orderly and definite channels."²⁷⁸ The task, according to reformers like Forbush, was "manhood making."²⁷⁹ And, they sought to make upstanding, masculine citizens particularly through boys' clubs, playgrounds, and organized play.²⁸⁰

"Boys' work" encompassed a broad range of programs and clubs from the Boy Scouts to more local initiatives.²⁸¹ Youths overwhelmingly organized and led their own organizations in the nineteenth century, but adults took over the formation, sponsorship, and daily conduct of such youth organizations in the late-1800s. Churches, afraid of the contaminating influences of cities and foreigners, entered youth work with a new vigor in these years. Associations founded boys-work departments and supplied male secretaries to lead them.²⁸² The Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA), which was founded in 1868, remained active at the turn-of-the-century and focused on reaching older, urban boys.²⁸³ Formed in 1910, the Boy Scouts of America trumpeted the value of nature and catered to a slightly younger audience.²⁸⁴ Both of these clubs complemented the play movement, which emerged between the 1890s and the 1910s with active participation from settlement house workers, like Jane Addams, Jacob Riis, Lillian Wald, and Graham Taylor, and stressed the value of directed free time.²⁸⁵ The playground movement, a facet of the broader play movement, also grew exponentially in the early twentieth century, especially after the founding of the Playground Association of America in 1906 by Luther Gulick Jr., Joseph Lee, and Henry Curtis.²⁸⁶ Such organizations were undergirded by the philosophy that boys needed to be kept active and provided with age-appropriate activities.

Drawing on emerging standards of childhood, club leaders and play organizers rallied for adults to oversee children even at play. These child-savers believed, Anthony Platt argues, that adolescents were "naturally dependent, requiring constant and pervasive supervision."²⁸⁷ Experts called for children and teens to be put into adult-monitored extracurricular settings where they could be more easily controlled and their period of

dependence prolonged. Reformers did not trust children to allocate their play time appropriately—too much was at stake.²⁸⁸ Children would learn bad habits if left to play alone on the streets. Instead, an adult "Street Supervisor" or scout leader could encourage "cooperation, fellowship, loyalty and honesty" among children and lay "the very foundations of citizenship."²⁸⁹

Boy experts clearly specified what type of person was best suited to work with boys. Previously, a "superannuated clergyman," a "willing but ignorant girl," or anyone who could not "succeed in business" was deemed competent to lead "child-helping work." After the turn-of-the-century, boy experts like Hart emphasized that working with children required special training and "discriminating knowledge."²⁹⁰ The best boy leaders, according to Forbush, were "male or at least virile."²⁹¹ Drawing on adolescent theories, in 1901, he prescribed, "What we need for teachers are virile, versatile men who have knowledge of boy nature. The boy now craves a hero, one who can do the things he tries to do better than he can and who will not immerse him in the slush of sentiment nor transfix him in the agony of personal appeal."²⁹² Truly, it was believed that later adolescents' ideals could be shaped by a venerated hero who came in the form of a male leader – a father, a pastor, or a scout-master.²⁹³

Club leaders, heavily influenced by the theories of Hall, also strategized actively about how to co-opt adolescent gangs. Adolescents supposedly formed gangs instinctually, so reformers sought to draw boys in by structuring boys' clubs like these natural gangs. Adult male leaders could take over existing gangs or form new gangs and use these groups to direct and control adolescents.²⁹⁴ The "obvious answer" to the boy

and gang problem, as Puffer proposed, was boys' clubs – "Turn your gang into a Boy Scout Patrol."²⁹⁵

At root, these workers sought to build boys' characters and form them into good citizens by keeping them active and off the streets.²⁹⁶ A new generation of boy workers focused on fitness and rebuffed the early-1800s scorn of physicality. Some early nineteenth-century figures looked down upon activities like running and jumping as ungentlemanly.²⁹⁷ By mid-century, most Americans believed that play and exercise helped to prevent atrophy and indolence.²⁹⁸ Sentiments about the worth of physical activity continued to shift in the second half of the century. After the Civil War a cult of body emerged.²⁹⁹ Politicians and social leaders emphasized physical courage and stressed men's ability to endure "hardship and pain."³⁰⁰ By the late-1800s and early-1900s, gentlemen were to play sports and thrive in the wilderness. Cultural heroes, like Theodore Roosevelt, were men who projected vigor and forcefulness.³⁰¹ Writers and preachers even cast Jesus Christ as a particularly virile and masculine figure in these years. Boys in childhood were filled with energy, and this energy just needed to be properly directed.³⁰²

Club leaders and play organizers in the late-1800s and early-1900s believed that physical exercise and play could strengthen a child's physical body *and* moral fiber.³⁰³ The central notion behind the play movement was that play educated children "physically" and "socially."³⁰⁴ These organizers believed that play was an effective tool with which to shape children's morals, socialize them to cultural norms, and prepare them for democratic citizenship.³⁰⁵ Jane Addams pressed, "Play is the great social stimulus." It

formed "true democratic" relations and helped children "readily overcome differences of language, tradition, and religion."³⁰⁶

Boy experts under the influence of recapitulation theories believed that the surest means of cultivating these "higher" instincts was through habit formation.³⁰⁷ Researchers, according to the historian Dominick Cavallo, understood a habit to be "a psychological or physical predisposition instilled in the child through repeated physical drill." Once a child was trained, habits were triggered unconsciously whenever a child encountered a particular environmental stimulus. Within this perspective, play organizers and boy workers believed they could stamp morality into a child's physical being through military-like drills and physical exercise. These activities would habituate children so that they automatically reacted appropriately even amid immoral urban environments. For example, William James popularized the concept that "nerve-currents," developed through physical drilling, connected muscles with senses and formed habits, creating muscular dispositions in response to stimuli.³⁰⁸

Team sports, one of the outlets of the play movement, purportedly developed the nerve-currents in street lads and middle-class boys that led to upright citizenship.³⁰⁹ Play workers were convinced that team sports could instill "masculine individualistic competitive tendencies and feminine social altruistic tendencies" and form children into ideal citizens.³¹⁰ These sports, Puffer wrote, were not just about physical fitness. Instead, he stressed in 1912, "Their most important function is to train the nervous system, the intelligence, and the will..." Sports taught a boy the "great art of getting on with his fellows."³¹¹ In these years, football became, as the historian David MacLeod claims, a

"metaphor for manliness," but play movement reformers still favored baseball as a solution to the boy problem.³¹²

Play organizers and club leaders further prescribed the proper environments for play, which were the playground, sporting field, and outdoors. They imagined these new spaces to be able to productively channel children's energy and to counteract negative influences.³¹³ In the playground movement, activists designed playgrounds as an alternative for children who otherwise would play their games of baseball in the streets.³¹⁴ Streets, as previously discussed, were unsuitable for children's play. A local playground close to a child's home or school and at a safe distance from saloons and pool rooms was deemed to be an appropriate alternative. A supervised, local playground, many like Davis believed, would help cultivate a "neighborhood spirit" even amid the overstimulation and fragmentation of the modern city.³¹⁵ A playground was to Americanize foreign children, teach teamwork, reduce ethnic conflict, and inspire competition; it was to provide the perfect melding of individualism and collectivism.³¹⁶

Beyond the playground and the sports field, the play movement also stressed the importance of nature. Most prominently, the founders of the Boy Scouts sought to save America's boys by reuniting them with their natural environment.³¹⁷ "Every American boy," Ernest T. Seton waxed in 1910, used to possess "all the practical knowledge that comes from country surroundings." He could "ride, shoot, skate, run, swim; he was handy with tools; he knew the woods; he was physically strong, self-reliant, resourceful, well-developed in body and brain."³¹⁸ The Boy Scouts reintroduced boys to these natural experiences by teaching them how to build fires, tie knots, and survive in nature. Influenced by Hall, troops integrated many of his ideas about the value of exercise and

the role of nature in a child's development into their troop activities.³¹⁹ Scout leaders believed that these survival skills also built character and prepared boys for adulthood. The YMCA also became associated with G. Stanley Hall's theories and adopted an activities-based focus based on a belief in the redeeming power of nature.³²⁰ These experts encouraged nature activities as a type of proof against precocity and vice.

Boys' work in its various outlets met with some notable successes and failures in the early 1900s. In the Progressive Era, both the Boy Scouts and the YMCA enjoyed broad-based support and attracted many participants. There were almost 400,000 Boy Scouts and over 240,000 juniors in the YMCA by 1921.³²¹ During its first decade, the Playground Association of America saw the multiplication of playgrounds and received substantial funding. Twenty-four cities operated 87 playgrounds in 1905, but within three years, 200 cities had playgrounds, the majority of which were publicly funded.³²² The theories of the play movement also circulated beyond the settlements as well, though, for even Booker T. Washington in 1907 self-reflectively posed, "I think I would now be a more useful man if I had had time for sports."³²³ At the same time, these organizers often failed to attract the participants that they most desired. Boys' club leaders spoke of saving city boys, but club activities never succeeded in sustaining the interest of these urban youths.³²⁴ The name "Boy Scouts" sounded juvenile, and leaders found it difficult to retain boys once they reached fourteen or fifteen years old.³²⁵ Urban children frequently resisted the structure that reformers attempted to place on their play. Play organizers invested time and money in playgrounds, but kids only went to these playgrounds if they were near their homes.³²⁶ Street kids continued to find ways to play and work as they wished.

These successes and failures took on increased significance in the early 1900s as a heightened concern for the home, education, and play of laboring, dependent, and urban children became one of the central foci of humanitarian progressivism, which spanned from approximately 1890 to 1920.³²⁷ Although hotly debated, the Progressive Era responded to economic, political, and social changes in American culture.³²⁸ Some scholars view the reforms of these years as a middle-class attempt to assert social control.³²⁹ Others see progressive reformers as more altruistic.³³⁰ To reformers like Philip Davis, progressivism represented "the sound principle that the cure for our American democracy is more democracy."³³¹ Reformers peppered their discourse with calls for "interdependence" and "cooperation."³³² They pressed individuals to recognize their civic duties and to fulfill their social responsibility to the community.³³³ For those like Robert Hunter, action became a "moral necessity."³³⁴ And Progressives optimistically believed that when informed citizens collectively addressed social problems the best solutions would be discovered. An intelligent and educated citizenry, hence, became essential.³³⁵

CONCLUSION

Child welfare reformers labored tirelessly to shelter children and adolescents from adult life and thus prepare them for citizenship. By the early 1900s, middle-class reformers succeeded in broadening the public base of support for their new view of childhood and adolescence. With playgrounds, schools, and clubs, they carefully worked to control a child's activities, environment, knowledge, and relationships.

Child labor, especially the street trades, was antithetical to their efforts though. It stole children's playtime, left them on the streets, exposed them to adult vices, and connected them with the denizens of saloons, gambling dens, and houses of ill repute.

Addressing this problem, thus, became a matter of public importance. Premature labor in the streets injured the child and his family, and it ultimately pauperized "the community itself."³³⁶ Anti-child labor activists stressed the American public's responsibility in saving children.³³⁷ The "entire community" would benefit from the abolition of child labor in the streets. Clopper projected that the restriction of the street trades "would promote a general civic awakening that would make each town and city a better place to live in, a better home for our citizens of the future."³³⁸ The activists' primary mission became, thus, how to best present the realities of street work to the public. The National Child Labor Committee responded with a series of investigations of the night messenger service.

End Notes: Chapter One

¹ Before the "knowin" messenger could tell young Ned all the things he knew, Jane called Ned in and told him to stop "palavering with strange boys." Lydia Hale Crane, "The Messenger Boy," *Child Labor Bulletin* 3, no. 2 (1914): 23–26.

² This dual nature of childhood has been noted by historians and sociologists alike. Harvey Graff speaks of growing up as both "a human universal and a cultural invention." Stressing the constructed nature of childhood, Mintz argues, "[C]hildhood is not an unchanging biological stage of life but is, rather, a social and cultural construct that has changed radically over time." See Harvey J. Graff, "Introduction," in *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, ed. Harvey J. Graff (Detroit, MI: Wayne State

University Press, 1987), xiv–xv; S. N. Eisenstadt, “Archetypal Patterns of Youth,” in *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, ed. Harvey J. Graff (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 48; Steven Mintz, *Huck’s Raft: A History of American Childhood* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004), viii, 2, 4. In *Industrial Violence*, James Schmidt complicates the idea that biological age correlated to growing up by recalling the inability of most children or parents to provide an accurate age for their children. Instead, progression through the phases of human development hinged more upon size, ability, and perceived physical fitness. Schmidt, *Industrial Violence and the Legal Origins of Child Labor*; Schmidt, “Restless Movements Characteristic of Childhood”; John Modell, Frank F. Furstenberg Jr., and Theodore Hershberg, “Social Change and Transitions to Adulthood in Historical Perspective,” *Journal of Family History* 1, no. 1 (1976): 9; Michael B. Katz and Ian E. Davey, “Youth and Early Industrialization in a Canadian City,” in *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, ed. Harvey J. Graff (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 268; Kenneth Keniston, “Psychological Development and Historical Change,” in *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, ed. Harvey J. Graff (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 63; Michael Zuckerman, “The Paradox of American Adolescence,” *The Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth* 4, no. 1 (2011): 13, doi:10.1353/hcy.2011.0014.

³ Eisenstadt, “Archetypal Patterns of Youth,” 48–49; Graff, “Introduction,” xv; Keniston, “Psychological Development and Historical Change,” 63; Glen H. Elder Jr., “Adolescence in Historical Perspective,” in *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, ed. Harvey J. Graff (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 9–

10; Joseph F. Kett, "Growing Up in Rural New England, 1800-1840," in *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, ed. Harvey J. Graff (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 175; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, viii, 2; Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), 406.

The laborers in the night messenger service were predominantly boys, so the focus of this treatment will predominantly revolve around the experience and evolution of male childhood.

⁴ Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 35–41.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 3, 10, 12; Bernard Wishy, *The Child and the Republic: The Dawn of Modern American Child Nurture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1967), 11, 17, 23; Joseph F. Kett, "Adolescence and Youth," in *The Family in History: Interdisciplinary Essays*, ed. Theodore K. Rabb and Robert I. Rotberg (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), 99.

⁶ Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 47–50.

⁷ Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood*, 411. My study focuses specifically on boy workers in the night messenger service, so in my references to childhood I will use masculine pronouns.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 128.

⁹ I acknowledge that this time frame is a large span, but it illustrates the wide array of opinions on the roots of idealized conceptions of childhood. Generally, researchers agree that childhood stretches from birth to about fourteen years old. Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child*, 3; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 76; Wishy, *The Child and the Republic*, x.

¹⁰ Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 76.

¹¹ Christopher Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), 3–20; Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child*, 10, 30.

¹² Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child*, 11, 23, 32, 43.

¹³ Ariès book *Centuries of Childhood* was first published in French in 1960. It was translated and published in English in 1962. Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood*, 401, 415; Elder, “Adolescence in Historical Perspective,” 41; Keniston, “Psychological Development and Historical Change,” 70; Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 76, 3; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 49.

¹⁴ Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 3, 77–79; David I. Macleod, *The Age of the Child: Children in America, 1890-1920* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1998), 31; Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child*; Joseph F. Kett, “Curing the Disease of Precocity,” *American Journal of Sociology* 84 (1978): S197, doi:10.2307/3083227; Wishy, *The Child and the Republic*, 108, 11, 17, 23.

¹⁵ Davis, *Street-Land*, xvi.

¹⁶ Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 77; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, xii; Kett, “Curing the Disease of Precocity,” S184.

¹⁷ Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 77.

¹⁸ By these years, urban middle-class families generally celebrated their children's birthdays. Such celebrations were still uncommon among farm families and working-class families at this time. Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 25, xii.

¹⁹ Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, 190. For more on middle-class projections of the proper conditions for children also see Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World*, 5; Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child*, 11; Kate Douglas Wiggin, “Children’s Rights,”

Scribner's Magazine, August 1892, 244; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, xii; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, ix; National Child Labor Committee flyer, box 1, folder 2, National Child Labor Committee Archives, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. This archival collection will be referred to as NCLC MSS in future citations.

²⁰ Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 3, 76–77, 93, 136; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, xi.

²¹ There was an increase of about one million child workers between 1870 and 1900. One third of the workers in southern textile mills in this time were children between the ages of ten and thirteen. The U.S. Census's statistics on child labor provide a baseline for understanding the working situation, but in these early years their methods were incomplete and likely grossly underestimated the number of child laborers. Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child*, 60.

²² Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 135, 152; Hindman, *Child Labor*, 49; Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 30–33; Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child*, 58–59; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, xi; Christine Stansell, “Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets: Class and Gender Conflict in New York City, 1850-1860,” in *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, ed. Harvey J. Graff (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 303; Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood*, 406.

²³ Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child*, 61; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, xi–xii; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 3, 76, 134.

²⁴ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 243–44. This sentiment is echoed in Alexander McKelway's "Declaration of Dependence." National Child Labor Committee Archives, Box 1, folder Alexander J. McKelway, Library of Congress, Washington, DC. This collection will be referred to in all future references as McKelway MSS.

²⁵ Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 184; J. Adams Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1912), 5.

²⁶ Alice Margaret Guernsey, *Citizens of Tomorrow: A Study of Childhood and Youth from the Standpoint of Home Mission Work* (New York: F. H. Revell, 1907), 71.

Similarly, Kelley despairingly described the child workers who never knew their own potential; "they only 'stand and wait;' they grow up 'dumb, driven cattle;' they vote as would their master's dogs if allowed the right of suffrage." As quoted in Florence Kelley Wischnewetzky, *Our Toiling Children* (Chicago: Women's Temperance Publication Association, 1889), 33, <http://ocp.hul.harvard.edu/dl/ww/004521168>.

²⁷ Theodore Roosevelt in E.G. Routzahn, "Survey of Civic Betterment," *The Chautauquan; A Weekly Newsmagazine*, February 1906, 567.

²⁸ Kelley, "The Federal Government and the Working Children." Also see Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 10; Florence Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains through Legislation* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905), 16, 26; Elsa Wertheim, "Chicago Children in the Street Trades" (Juvenile Protective Association, 1917), 3.

²⁹ Davis, *Street-Land*, xviii.

³⁰ Owen R. Lovejoy, "Seven Years of Child Labor Reform," in *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911* (New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911), 33-34, https://books.google.com/books?id=D1w_AQAAMAAJ&pg=PA31&dq=%22seven+years+of+child+labor+reform%22+lovejoy&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi5h-uK3rHLAhVGkh4KHQvTDOMQ6AEIOjAE#v=onepage&q&f=false.

³¹ Kett, "Adolescence and Youth," 107; Katz and Davey, "Youth and Early Industrialization in a Canadian City," 298; Zuckerman, "The Paradox of American Adolescence," 13; Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood*, 25.

³² Kett, "Adolescence and Youth," 97, 104.

³³ *Ibid.*, 106–7. Katz and Davey propose that the behaviors associated with adolescence are rooted in reactions to dependency and responded to how nineteenth century society constructed a time of "biological maturity and cultural childhood" for youth. Katz and Davey, "Youth and Early Industrialization in a Canadian City," 297–98.

³⁴ Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 196; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 139; Joseph F. Kett, *Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the Present* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), 127, 133, 143; Kett, "Adolescence and Youth," 95–97.

³⁵ Scholars debate when a modern understanding of adolescence emerged in American society. A cluster of scholars believe adolescence emerged in the United States around 1900. Mintz insists that adolescence was "discovered" around 1900. G. Stanley Hall, a key child-study researcher, saw adolescence emerging in the late 19th century. Chinn maintains that adolescence emerged in the late 1800s and early 1900s among urban, immigrant children. Joseph Kett argues that the "era of the adolescent" dawned in the United States between 1900 and 1920 as G. Stanley Hall and his colleagues' theories rose to prominence. Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 3; Graff, "Introduction," xiii; Sarah E. Chinn, *Inventing Modern Adolescence* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2009), 4–6; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 215; Kett, "Adolescence and Youth," 95.

³⁶ Davis, *Street-Land*, 170–71.

³⁷ Allan Hoben, "The Minister and the Boy: II. An Approach to Boyhood," *The Biblical World* 38, no. 5 (November 1911): 313.

³⁸ Davis, *Street-Land*, 171. Also see Susan Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest? Child Welfare Reform in the Progressive Era* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982), 7.

³⁹ Kett, "Adolescence and Youth," 108; Chinn, *Inventing Modern Adolescence*, 7.

⁴⁰ William Byron Forbush, *The Boy Problem: A Study in Social Pedagogy*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1901), 149.

⁴¹ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 118.

⁴² Owen R. Lovejoy, "To the Editor: Night Messenger Service," *The Survey*, December 24, 1910, 504.

⁴³ Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 188–89; Ronald D. Cohen, "Child-Saving and Progressivism, 1885-1915," in *American Childhood: A Research Guide and Historical Handbook*, ed. Joseph M. Hawes and N. Ray Hiner (Greenwood Press, 1985), 290; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 54.

⁴⁴ Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 55; Wishy, *The Child and the Republic*, 107; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 188–90; Cohen, "Child-Saving and Progressivism," 290; Boorstin, *The Americans*, 229; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 119; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 27.

⁴⁵ Early on, Rousseau's *Emile* showed his favoring of a prolongation of innocence, and mid-century American moralists followed this lead. Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 136. For more on G. Stanley Hall see: Wishy, *The Child and the Republic*, 107; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 189; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 24.

⁴⁶ Hall drew on the ideas of Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel, and Herbart. Steven L. Schlossman, "G. Stanley Hall and the Boys' Club: Conservative Applications of

Recapitulation Theory,” *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 9, no. 2 (1973): 141, 290; Kett, “Adolescence and Youth,” 95; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 75. His work circulated broadly, but even in the Progressive Era, the scientific community doubted recapitulation theory and dismissed it as unscientific and amateur. *Ibid.*, 56–57; Cohen, “Child-Saving and Progressivism,” 290; Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 187–89; Chinn, *Inventing Modern Adolescence*, 16; Boorstin, *The Americans*, 229.

⁴⁷ Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 24; David I. Macleod, “Act Your Age: Boyhood, Adolescence, and the Rise of the Boy Scouts in America,” in *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, ed. Harvey J. Graff (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 401; Chinn, *Inventing Modern Adolescence*, 16; Cohen, “Child-Saving and Progressivism,” 290; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 50.

⁴⁸ Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 77; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 9. Also see Kett, “Adolescence and Youth,” 95; Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 77.

⁴⁹ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 9.

⁵⁰ Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 77; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 24; Macleod, “Act Your Age,” 401; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 10; G. Stanley Hall, *Adolescence: Its Psychology and Its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion and Education*, vol. 1 (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1905), x; Ronald Bishop, *When Play Was Play: Why Pick-up Games Matter* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009), 18.

⁵¹ Davis, *Street-Land*, 89; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 77, 80; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 10.

⁵² Davis, *Street-Land*, 33; Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:xi.

⁵³ Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:x; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 26, 37, 10–11.

⁵⁴ This gang age or pre-adolescence stretched anywhere from eight to fifteen years old. Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 8, 24–26, 39, 74–75, 78; Davis, *Street-Land*, 33; Hoben, “The Minister and the Boy,” 308.

⁵⁵ Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 38. Also see Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 5, 45.

⁵⁶ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 26; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 76; Hoben, “The Minister and the Boy,” 308, 311; Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 8, 43, 74–77, 95, 147–48, 27. Nasaw's recounting of kid's lives in urban settings counters this rosy image of neighborhood gangs offered by Hoben and Puffer. See David Nasaw, *Children of the City: At Work and at Play* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1985).

⁵⁷ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 22; Davis, *Street-Land*, 166–67; Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 95.

⁵⁸ In this theorizing, the child study movement conveyed a Eurocentric analysis of societal development. “The so-called American boy,” Forbush argued, “who was really a Persian in his love of war, or an Athenian each day telling or hearing some new thing, or a Hindu in his dreams or a Hebrew in his business sense, is rapidly coming down through the millenniums, and has reached the days of Bayard and Siegfried and Launcelot.” Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 18, 21, 148; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 77; Kett, “Adolescence and Youth,” 95.

⁵⁹ Boorstin, *The Americans*, 232.

⁶⁰ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 22, 119.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 11, 24, 19, 95, 119; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 80; Schlossman, “G. Stanley Hall and the Boys’ Club,” 143; Hoben, “The Minister and the Boy,” 312.

⁶² Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 112–13; Macleod, “Act Your Age,” 402; Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 196; Schlossman, “G. Stanley Hall and the Boys’ Club,” 143; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 20–21, 119; Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:xiii–xix; Hoben, “The Minister and the Boy,” 313.

⁶³ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 20; Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:xiii; G. Stanley Hall, *Youth: Its Education, Regimen, and Hygiene* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1908), 135, <http://books.google.com/books?id=w9kKAQAIAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=Hall+Youth:+Its+Education&hl=en&sa=X&ei=O119UpOaKYnc4APbu4HgBA&ved=0CEgQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=false>; Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 190.

⁶⁴ Hall, *Youth: Its Education, Regimen, and Hygiene*, 135.

⁶⁵ Forbush wrote, "It [adolescence] is the time of change. By fifteen the brain stops growing, the large arteries increase one-third, the temperature rises one degree, the reproductive organs have functioned, the voice deepens, the stature grows by bounds, and the body needs more sleep and food than ever before." Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 18.

Also see Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:xv.

⁶⁶ Hoben, “The Minister and the Boy,” 313.

⁶⁷ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 19, 22; Ernest Poole, “Waifs of the Street,” *McClure’s Magazine*, May 1903, 42; Davis, *Street-Land*, 170; Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:xv, 264; Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains through Legislation*, 21.

⁶⁸ Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 50.

⁶⁹ Poole, “Waifs of the Street,” 42; Davis, *Street-Land*, 170; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 139.

⁷⁰ Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 187.

⁷¹ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 18–20, 152; Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:xvii–xiii; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 89; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 206; Kett, “Adolescence and Youth,” 95, 102; Kett, “Curing the Disease of Precocity,” S201.

⁷² Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 68.

⁷³ Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 126; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 164. Similarly, Platt concludes, "Brothels, comic books, alcohol, amusement parks, and other 'commercialized vices' were seen as a ubiquitous threat to the fragility of youth." Anthony M. Platt, *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency*, Expanded 40th Anniversary Edition (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2009), 91.

⁷⁴ My understanding of these gender dynamics draws upon Baron's work. She writes, "Gender is a dynamic social process constituting social relations to power. Gender is not contained only within relations between men and women. It encompasses relations among workers and between workers and employers, and becomes embedded in economic activities and institutions. As we shall see, workingmen's understandings of gender structured their relations with others, grounded their views of the categories of market and skill, and shaped the ways they dealt with issues of wages and workers' control." Anti-child labor reform efforts extend this perspective by opening up an examination of class-based negotiations of masculinity in relation to economic status, labor, and place. Baron, “Questions of Gender,” 179–80.

⁷⁵ Ernest Thompson Seton, *Boy Scouts of America: A Handbook of Woodcarving, Scouting, and Life-Craft* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1910), xii, <http://archive.org/details/boyscoutsofameri00seto>.

⁷⁶ Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 192; Ava Baron, "Masculinity, the Embodied Male Worker, and the Historian's Gaze," *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 69 (Spring 2006): 146, doi:10.2307/27673026; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 63.

⁷⁷ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 153; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 65.

⁷⁸ Roosevelt, "The Manly Virtues and Practical Politics," 46.

⁷⁹ Seton, *Boy Scouts of America*, xii. Also see Macleod, "Act Your Age," 397.

⁸⁰ Kett, "Curing the Disease of Precocity," S183.

⁸¹ Early warnings about precocity referred primarily to girls. It was only later in the 19th century when concerns about the norms of adolescence were applied to boys. Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 135–38, 210; Kett, "Curing the Disease of Precocity," S187, S184; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 140; Macleod, "Act Your Age," 402.

⁸² Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 140–42. The association between precocity and sexuality took on amplified significance within a culture where discussions of sex were taboo. The public was overwhelmingly silent about sex in the mid-1800s. The U.S. government partially codified this silence in 1873 with the Comstock Law, which made it illegal to send "obscene" material through the mail. Robin Jensen's study of the rhetoric of public sex education identified four strains of public discourse about sex around the turn-of-the-century. Anthony Comstock and his vice reformers cast sex as a temptation and tried to suppress public conversations about sex. Free lovers held sex to be "a potential expression of love, pleasure, and health" and favored public sex education initiatives. Social hygienists reported on sex as "a scientific category separate from issues of morality" and supported regulated public sex education programs. Jensen categorizes the last strain in the discourse as social-purity advocates. Child labor reformers

addressing the night messenger service aligned most closely with this rhetorical vein.

Robin E. Jensen, *Dirty Words: The Rhetoric of Public Sex Education, 1870-1924* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2010), 3–7; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 170.

In these years, the public held a double standard for sexual norms. They demanded a high standard of sexual purity from women, but people generally accepted the notion that men needed to release sexual energy before marriage. Thus, men who visited brothels met little resistance. The increase in prostitution and venereal diseases strained this custom of license and silence. Edith Wharton captured this double standard in the character development of Newland Archer and May Welland in her novel, *The Age of Innocence*. See Jensen, *Dirty Words*, 4; Fishburn, *The Fatherhood of God and the Victorian Family*, 165; Edith Wharton, *The Age of Innocence* (New York: Windsor Editions, 1920).

⁸³ Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 134.

⁸⁴ Masturbation, or self-abuse as it was called, was especially thought to lead to debility and insanity and was a pervasive concern in the late-1800s and early-1900s. Jensen, *Dirty Words*, 6, 74; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 140–41; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 134–35, 106, 141; Kett, “Adolescence and Youth,” 99; Kett, “Curing the Disease of Precocity,” S184; Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:xiv; Macleod, “Act Your Age,” 401.

⁸⁵ Seton, *Boy Scouts of America*, xi.

⁸⁶ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 147.

⁸⁷ Barbara Brenzel, “Domestication as Reform: A Study of the Socialization of Wayward Girls, 1856-1905,” in *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, ed. Harvey J. Graff (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 359–60. Phrenology,

one outlet for theories of heredity, circulated in the popular discourse. For instance, Elizabeth Cady Stanton boasted about using phrenology to make hiring decisions in her home (although she also admitted that this turned out poorly as the phrenologically-sound kitchen help she hired ended up burning her child on the stove). Elizabeth Cady Stanton, *Eighty Years and More (1815-1897): Reminiscences of Elizabeth Cady Stanton* (New York: European Publishing Company, 1897), 138–39.

⁸⁸ Brenzel, “Domestication as Reform,” 359–60.

⁸⁹ Platt, *The Child Savers*, 20, 23.

⁹⁰ Wishy, *The Child and the Republic*, 132–33, 112–14; Cohen, “Child-Saving and Progressivism,” 290; Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 178; Platt, *The Child Savers*, 25.

⁹¹ Wishy, *The Child and the Republic*, 132; Platt, *The Child Savers*, 35–36.

⁹² Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 37; Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:xi; Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 110–11; Davis, *Street-Land*, 47–49.

⁹³ Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, xiv.

⁹⁴ Davis, *Street-Land*, 47–49; Wishy, *The Child and the Republic*, 16. Mrs. Clara Leonard attributed dependent children's failure later in life to being placed in "large public institutions" not their "inherited defects." The system of placing children out in families, which Leonard favored, relied upon a belief that the proper environment could save a child. Mrs. Clara T. Leonard, “Family Homes for Pauper and Dependent Children,” in *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference of Charities, Held at Chicago, June 10-12, 1879*, 1879, 171, [http://books.google.com/books?id=-24JAAAIAAJ&pg=RA1-](http://books.google.com/books?id=-24JAAAIAAJ&pg=RA1-PA170&dq=Clara+T.+Leonard,+%22Family+Homes+for+Pauper+and+Dependent+Chil)

[24JAAAIAAJ&pg=RA1-](http://books.google.com/books?id=-24JAAAIAAJ&pg=RA1-PA170&dq=Clara+T.+Leonard,+%22Family+Homes+for+Pauper+and+Dependent+Chil)

[PA170&dq=Clara+T.+Leonard,+%22Family+Homes+for+Pauper+and+Dependent+Chil](http://books.google.com/books?id=-24JAAAIAAJ&pg=RA1-PA170&dq=Clara+T.+Leonard,+%22Family+Homes+for+Pauper+and+Dependent+Chil)

dren,%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=kM3xUY_vJdGs4APTt4HQCw&ved=0CDUQ6AEwAQ#v=onepage&q&f=true. Similarly, William Letchworth spoke of the need to work with children due to the "bias given to youthful character by unhappy environment [sic]." Hon. William P. Letchworth, "Children of the State," in *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, at the Thirteenth Annual Session Held in St. Paul, Minn., July 15-22, 1886*, ed. Isabel C. Barrows (Boston: Press of Geo. H. Ellis, 1886), 139.

⁹⁵ Davis, *Street-Land*, 28.

⁹⁶ The phrase "child savers" is drawn from Anthony Platt's foundational study entitled, *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency*. In this work Platt defines child savers as the self-professedly disinterested reformers who claimed that conscience and morality, not class or political interests, drove them to altruistically rescue unfortunate children. Platt, *The Child Savers*, 3; Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest?*, 38–60; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 154; Stansell, "Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets," 301.

⁹⁷ The country-boy myth was tied to the agrarian myth which held that the city was corrupting and threatening rural independence. Platt, *The Child Savers*, 42. Twentieth-century politicians also repeatedly rehearsed their own version of this myth with their harkening back to their country boyhoods. As just one example, Senator Albert Beveridge (R-IN) claimed the value of his own work on a farm as a youth even as he pushed for federal child labor legislation. He argued, "I do not for a moment pretend that working children on the farm is bad for them. I think it is the universal experience that where children are employed within their strength and in the open air there can be no better training." See Marion Mills Miller, ed., *Great Debates in American History: From*

the Debates in the British Parliament on the Colonial Stamp Act (1764) to the Debates in Congress at the Close of the Taft Administration (1912-1913), vol. 11 (New York: Current Literature Publishing Company, 1913), 296; R. Richard Wohl, "The 'Country Boy' Myth and Its Place in American Urban Culture: The Nineteenth Century Contribution," *Perspectives in American History* 3 (1969): 82–84, 87.

⁹⁸ Schlossman, "G. Stanley Hall and the Boys' Club," 141; Horatio Alger Jr., *The Telegraph Boy* (Philadelphia, PA: The John C. Winston Co., 1879), <http://ufdc.ufl.edu/?c=juv&b=UF00047771>; Eleanor H. Porter, *Just David* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916); Eleanor Hodgman Porter, *Pollyanna* (Boston: The Page Co., 1913); Eleanor H. Porter, *The Turn of the Tide: The Story of How Margaret Solved Her Problem* (A. L. Burt Company, 1908).

⁹⁹ Macleod, "Act Your Age," 402.

¹⁰⁰ Wohl, "The 'Country Boy' Myth," 86, 105; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 163–64; Seton, *Boy Scouts of America*, xi.

¹⁰¹ Wohl, "The 'Country Boy' Myth," 86–96; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 25; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 164.

¹⁰² Brace, *The Dangerous Classes of New York*, 225.

¹⁰³ Seton, *Boy Scouts of America*, xi.

¹⁰⁴ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 133–35; Davis, *Street-Land*, 28. Mrs. Clara T. Leonard cautioned that city children acquired "a perverted taste for... crowded streets," but if they were introduced to country life and its "rural pleasures" at a young age then they would be "healthier in mind and body." Leonard, "Family Homes for Pauper and Dependent Children," 174.

¹⁰⁵ Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:x–xi; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 25, 37.

¹⁰⁶ Wohl, “The ‘Country Boy’ Myth,” 94; Cohen, “Child-Saving and Progressivism,” 274.

¹⁰⁷ U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Cities, Towns, Villages, and Boroughs, 1890* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1890), 370, http://www2.census.gov/prod2/decennial/documents/1890a_v1-12.pdf; Gary Scott Smith, “When Stead Came to Chicago: The ‘Social Gospel Novel’ and the Chicago Civic Federation,” *American Presbyterian* 68, no. 3 (1990): 194. This population growth was the result of internal migrations from rural to urban areas and increases in foreign immigration. By 1910, one third of America's population was either foreign-born or the child of an immigrant. These figures were much higher in urban centers. By 1890, almost eighty percent of Chicago's population was either foreign-born or a child of foreign-born parents. Richard Schneirov, *Labor and Urban Politics: Class Conflicts and the Origins of Modern Liberalism in Chicago, 1864-1897* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 25; Painter, *Standing at Armageddon*, xxxiii–xxxiv; Noah M. Pickus, *True Faith and Allegiance: Immigration and American Civic Nationalism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), 69; Smith, *Civic Ideals*, 441.

¹⁰⁸ Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 136. Some claimed that immigrants were responsible for the deleterious condition of the cities. Many, like Josiah Strong, feared immigrants and their influence. He warned that immigrants swelled America's "dangerous classes" and fretted that sections of American cities were "in language, customs and costumes, essentially foreign." Similarly, in 1890, the president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Francis Walker, referred to recent immigrants as the dregs of society, "which no current

of intellectual or moral activity has stirred for ages." Walker believed that among the "new citizens" of the republic were found "the very lowest stage of degradation to which human beings can be reduced by hopelessness, hunger, squalor, and superstition." Strong, *Our Country*, 44; Platt, *The Child Savers*, 36; "Economic Discussion," *Harper's Weekly*, June 20, 1891, 454.

¹⁰⁹ Davis, *Street-Land*, 47–49; Wohl, "The 'Country Boy' Myth," 86–87; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 90; Letchworth, "Children of the State," 138; Platt, *The Child Savers*, 40–41; Kett, "Curing the Disease of Precocity," S186.

¹¹⁰ Boorstin, *The Americans*, 283; Platt, *The Child Savers*, 44. Poverty flourished in the slums. This poverty was not pauperism, as Robert Hunter defined. Instead, families in poverty might be able to piece together a "bare sustenance," but they were unable to "maintain a state of physical efficiency." Hunter estimated that one-fifth of the American population was in poverty. Hunter's estimates also speak to the mass accumulation of wealth by a small percentage of Americans. Smith notes, "By 1890, 1 percent of the U.S. population controlled more wealth than the remaining 99 percent." Hunter, *Poverty*, 5, 60; Smith, *Civic Ideals*, 348.

¹¹¹ *Third Annual Report of the Children's Aid Society* (New York: M.B. Wynkoop, Book and Job Printer, 1856), 5,
http://books.google.com/books?id=uDsVAAAAIAAJ&pg=RA1-PA5&dq=Children%27s+Aid+Society+Third+Annual+Report&hl=en&sa=X&ei=vN-SUbiIC9P_4AOq_oHgBQ&ved=0CE0Q6AEwBg#v=onepage&q=Children%27s%20Aid%20Society%20Third%20Annual%20Report&f=false.

¹¹² Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:xvii.

¹¹³ Davis, *Street-Land*, 12.

¹¹⁴ Platt, *The Child Savers*, 4; Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:xvii.

¹¹⁵ Hunter, *Poverty*, 195.

¹¹⁶ Hull House residents warned of the transfer of infectious diseases through clothes made in the tenements. They wrote, "The unsanitary conditions of many of these tenement houses, and the ignorance and abject poverty of the tenants, insure the maximum probability of disease; and diphtheria, scarlet-fever, smallpox, typhoid, scabies, and worse forms of skin diseases, have been found in alarming proximity to garments of excellent quality in process of manufacture for leading firms." "Typhoid Fever Is Menacing City"; Platt, "Jane Addams and the Ward Boss Revisted," 203; *Hull-House Maps and Papers: A Presentation of Nationalities and Wages in a Congested District of Chicago, Together with Comments and Essays on Problems Growing out of the Social Conditions* (New York: T.Y. Crowell & Co., 1895), 33–34.

¹¹⁷ Reilly, *Biennial Report of the Department of Health of the City of Chicago Being for the Years 1895 and 1896*, 63–64. Lincoln Steffens, the author of *The Shame of the Cities*, described Chicago as "First in violence, deepest in dirt; loud, lawless, unlovely, ill-smelling, irreverent, new." Steffens Lincoln, *The Shame of the Cities* (New York: McClure, Phillips & Co., 1904), 234, http://openlibrary.org/books/OL7222729M/The_shame_of_the_cities.

¹¹⁸ Jensen, *Dirty Words*, 42–43.

¹¹⁹ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 147.

¹²⁰ Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:xi.

¹²¹ Stansell, "Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets," 302.

¹²² For example, Bushnell wrote, "Understand that it is the family spirit, the organic life of the house, the silent power of a domestic godliness, working, as it does, unconsciously and with sovereign effect—this it is which forms your children to God. And, if this be wanting, all that you may do beside, will be as likely to annoy and harden as to bless." Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 114; Horace Bushnell, *Christian Nurture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1916), 119.

¹²³ Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World*, 6.

¹²⁴ Brenzel, "Domestication as Reform," 352; Stansell, "Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets," 302; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 116.

¹²⁵ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 120.

¹²⁶ Michael B. Katz, "Child-Saving," *History of Education Quarterly* 26, no. 3 (1986): 422.

¹²⁷ Emil G. Hirsch, "The Home Versus the Institution," in *Proceedings of the Conference on the Care of Dependent Children Held at Washington, D.C., January 25, 26, 1909* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1909), 92.

¹²⁸ Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 110; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 128.

¹²⁹ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 120, 142.

¹³⁰ Theodore Roosevelt, "The Conservation of Childhood," in *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911* (New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911), 8.

¹³¹ Davis, *Street-Land*, 14.

¹³² Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World*, 8; Fishburn, *The Fatherhood of God and the Victorian Family*, 22; McGerr, *A Fierce Discontent*, 11, 35, 45, 91; Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest?*, 27–29; Boorstin, *The Americans*, 87.

¹³³ Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World*, 10.

¹³⁴ McGerr, *A Fierce Discontent*, 84.

¹³⁵ “The Columbus Juvenile Court,” *The Juvenile Court Record*, April 1910, 11; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 101; Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child*, 34.

¹³⁶ A Columbus Juvenile Court charged that the juvenile problem was rooted in “ignorance and unfit parentage... encouraged by the laxity of the marriage laws as they exist today.” “The Columbus Juvenile Court,” 11; Stansell, “Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets,” 312; Wishy, *The Child and the Republic*, 28; Dawley, *The Child That Toileth Not*, 10; Hindman, *Child Labor*, 39.

¹³⁷ Sallee, *The Whiteness of Child Labor Reform in the New South*, 39; Schmidt, *Industrial Violence and the Legal Origins of Child Labor*, xxi, 51-2; Davidson, *Child Labor Legislation*, 75.

¹³⁸ “The Columbus Juvenile Court,” 11–12.

¹³⁹ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 101. Clopper cites this Indiana investigation in his book, but he does not provide a date. Presumably, the study occurred as a part of the NCLC's investigations of the night messenger service between 1909 and 1911.

¹⁴⁰ Davis, *Street-Land*, 234; Hunter, *Poverty*, 195; Stansell, “Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets,” 311.

¹⁴¹ Schlossman, “G. Stanley Hall and the Boys’ Club,” 143; *The Social Evil in Chicago: A Study of Existing Conditions with Recommendations by The Vice Commission*

of Chicago (Chicago, IL: Gunthrop-Warren Printing Company, 1911), 245; Davis, *Street-Land*, 14.

¹⁴² Davis, *Street-Land*, 12–13.

¹⁴³ Brace, *The Dangerous Classes of New York*, 56.

¹⁴⁴ Riis, *How the Other Half Lives*; Edward Winslow Martin, *The Secrets of the Great City: A Work Descriptive of the Virtues and the Vices, the Mysteries, Miseries and Crimes of New York City* (Philadelphia, PA: National Publishing Company, 1868), 36; *Hull-House Maps and Papers*, 34.

¹⁴⁵ *The Social Evil in Chicago*, 245.

¹⁴⁶ Davis, *Street-Land*, 14–15; Stansell, “Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets,” 312; Katz and Davey, “Youth and Early Industrialization in a Canadian City,” 277; *Hull-House Maps and Papers*, 13. Katz and Davey's study of industrialization in Canada highlights that into the 1800s it was common for rich families to take in boarders. Reformers distaste for this practice only developed in the late-1800s as boarding became an economic arrangement.

¹⁴⁷ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 19–20; Stansell, “Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets,” 302–3; Davis, *Street-Land*, 3.

¹⁴⁸ Davis repeatedly faulted the streets as a play area specifically in relation to their country alternative. He reported that "children used the gutter as their playground." Continuing on, he noted that the "open sewer" was the urban child's equivalent to the country child's "laughing brook." Later he wrote, "Compare the soft give of the sod of lawn and lane with the stubborn asphalt of street and sidewalk." Davis, *Street-Land*, 6, 17; Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 19–20; Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child*, 34.

¹⁴⁹ Davis, *Street-Land*, 33–36, 167; Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child*, 35; Nasaw, *Children of the City*, 29.

¹⁵⁰ Hunter, *Poverty*, 196.

¹⁵¹ Davis, *Street-Land*, xvi; Stansell, “Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets,” 302.

¹⁵² Davis, *Street-Land*, 47–49; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 50–51.

¹⁵³ Davis, *Street-Land*, 22, 49, 52; Poole, “Waifs of the Street,” 40, 46; Hard, “De Kid Wot Works at Night,” 36.

¹⁵⁴ Strong argued that if the liquor interests were not destroyed they would surely destroy civilization. Strong, *Our Country*, ix; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 192.

¹⁵⁵ Davis, *Street-Land*, 25.

¹⁵⁶ Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 136. Vice reformers across the country brought prostitution in urban areas to the attention of the public in the late-1800s. In 1866, the Commissioner of the New York City Police estimated that the city had 621 brothels, 2670 public prostitutes, and 99 houses of assignation. In the same year, Bishop Simpson announced a much higher estimate and shockingly projected that there were more prostitutes than Methodists in the city. These concerns carried forward through the decades. New state legislation in 1896 led to the expansion of prostitution in New York. Two laws allowed for this growth in New York. First, the state took over liquor licenses from the city and effectively kept city reform groups from having the power to influence local saloon licensing. Second, the Raines Law permitted “hotels” to sell liquor on Sundays. Many barrooms added a few beds to qualify for this licensing and so got into the hotel and house of prostitution business as well. Washington, D.C. also had its “tragic,” lawless,

crowded, "unspeakable" district to which messenger boys were sent. Ibid., 75; Lawrence M. Friedman, *Guarding Life's Dark Secretes: Legal and Social Controls over Reputation, Propriety, and Privacy* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007), 125; Felt, *Hostages of Fortune*, 155; Charles P. Neill, "Child Labor at the National Capital," *Charities and The Commons*, March 3, 1906, 798.

¹⁵⁷ Lovejoy, "To the Editor: Night Messenger Service," 504.

¹⁵⁸ Hoben, "The Minister and the Boy," 314.

¹⁵⁹ Jensen, *Dirty Words*, 6, 10–11.

¹⁶⁰ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 25.

¹⁶¹ The first law regulating child labor among newsboys was enacted in New York in 1903. Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 1; Hindman, *Child Labor*, 85; Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 41; Davis, *Street-Land*, 147; Poole, "Waifs of the Street," 40; George A. Hall, "The Newsboy," in *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911* (New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911), 100.

¹⁶² Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 2; Linder, "From Street Urchins to Little Merchants," 829–64; Hindman, *Child Labor*, 215.

¹⁶³ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 101; Hard, "De Kid Wot Works at Night," 35.

¹⁶⁴ Poole, "Waifs of the Street," 48.

¹⁶⁵ By the 1880s it was generally accepted that apprenticeships were in decline. Formerly apprenticeships allowed fathers to decide their sons' careers when they were still boys, but with the demise of apprenticeships family authority shifted. Children still needed to work, and in urban environments the streets supplied a range of options.

Stansell, "Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets," 305; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 145; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 139.

¹⁶⁶ The dearth of such information became one of the central arguments for the formation of a federal Children's Bureau. Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, vii, 24; Nasaw, *Children of the City*, 50; Davis, *Spearheads for Reform*, 132; Florence Kelley, "The Responsibility of the Consumer," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 32 (July 1908): 111; Hindman, *Child Labor*, 65; Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 93; Nathan, *The Story of an Epoch-Making Movement*, 117; Albert H. Freiberg, "Some of the Ultimate Physical Effects of Premature Toil," in *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the National Child Labor Committee, 1905, 1906*, ed. Robert H. Bremner (New York: Arno Press, 1974), 20.

¹⁶⁷ Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 142; Nasaw, *Children of the City*, 51–52; Stansell, "Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets," 304; Davis, *Street-Land*, xiii, 22; Hindman, *Child Labor*, 214.

¹⁶⁸ "Summary of the Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage Earners in the United States," 277.

¹⁶⁹ Nasaw, *Children of the City*, 50.

¹⁷⁰ United States Bureau of the Department of Commerce and Labor Bureau of the Census, *Bulletin 69: Child Labor in the United States* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1907), 155.

¹⁷¹ Hard, "De Kid Wot Works at Night," 35; Davis, *Street-Land*, 160.

¹⁷² Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 128.

¹⁷³ Neill's earlier account reported that messenger boys worked from seven to nine hours a day. Felt, *Hostages of Fortune*, 154; *The Social Evil in Chicago*, 243; Neill, "Child Labor at the National Capital," 798.

¹⁷⁴ Felt, *Hostages of Fortune*, 154; "Summary of the Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage Earners in the United States," 279.

¹⁷⁵ Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 112; Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 129; Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains through Legislation*, 19; Wertheim, "Chicago Children in the Street Trades," 5.

¹⁷⁶ In addition to Poole, also see Crane and *The Social Evil in Chicago*. Poole, "Waifs of the Street," 40; Crane, "The Messenger Boy," 23; *The Social Evil in Chicago*, 244; Davis, *Street-Land*, 166–67.

¹⁷⁷ Poole, "Waifs of the Street," 40; Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, 185.

¹⁷⁸ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 115.

¹⁷⁹ Davis, *Street-Land*, 42.

¹⁸⁰ Nasaw makes the case that by the early twentieth century generally newsies lived at home instead of living as waifs on the streets, but in the early 1900s, reformers still spoke of the how street work influenced children to run away and live on their own. Nasaw, *Children of the City*, 62.

¹⁸¹ Stansell, "Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets," 307.

¹⁸² Davis, *Street-Land*, 68, 70.

¹⁸³ Riis, *How the Other Half Lives*, 200.

¹⁸⁴ Poole, "Waifs of the Street," 40–41, 48.

¹⁸⁵ Illustrating this point, Puffer wrote, "Now, reverence, which is fundamental to religion, is itself founded on the muscles. Just as we are angry, so the psychologists tell us, because we clench our fists and snarl our lips, so we are reverent because we bow our heads." Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 161.

¹⁸⁶ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 129; Davis, *Street-Land*, 166–67; *The Social Evil in Chicago*, 244; Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, 185. Anti-child labor reformers fears of the physical deterioration of street traders fits with working-class masculinity histories, which delineate the almost ongoing anxiety and negotiation of masculinity in white working-class labor discourse. Baron, "Masculinity, the Embodied Male Worker, and the Historian's Gaze," 144–46.

¹⁸⁷ Davis, *Street-Land*, 86.

¹⁸⁸ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 111; Crane, "The Messenger Boy," 23; Hard, "De Kid Wot Works at Night," 36.

¹⁸⁹ Poole, "Waifs of the Street," 45.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 41; Selwyn K. Troen, "The Discovery of the Adolescent by American Educational Reformers, 1900-1920: An Economic Perspective," in *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, ed. Harvey J. Graff (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 420.

¹⁹¹ In 1911, a 17-year-old messenger in Chicago reported that with tips he generally brought in about \$10 weekly. "District Telegraph Boys: Features of the Messenger Service Peculiar and Varied Errands on Which Boys Are Sent--Acting as Escorts to Ladies and Bringing Home Tipsy Husbands--Statistics of the Work Done in the Holiday

Season,” *New York Tribune*, February 17, 1879, 2; Hard, “De Kid Wot Works at Night,” 35; *The Social Evil in Chicago*, 244; Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains through Legislation*, 22.

¹⁹² As quoted in Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 29.

¹⁹³ Felt, *Hostages of Fortune*, 157; Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, 209; Poole, “Waifs of the Street,” 44; Neill, “Child Labor at the National Capital,” 799; Wertheim, “Chicago Children in the Street Trades,” 3. John Spargo, a socialist and anti-child labor author, differed with other reformers and stressed that a child's wages were often essential to a working-class family.

¹⁹⁴ Cultural shifts heightened and complicated the demands on the family income. Urban-lower class adolescents were more likely to live at home in the late-1800s and therefore put pressure on family resources. At the same time, children were the most economically valuable to their parents during these teen years, between the ages of twelve and seventeen. The demands of education at the turn-of-the-century put a wrench in this balance, though, as secondary education increasingly encroached upon these years. Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 90, 134–36; Stansell, “Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets,” 303; Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child*, 58; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 160, 169.

¹⁹⁵ Chinn, *Inventing Modern Adolescence*, 84–85; Jack London, *The Apostate* (Girard, KS: The Appeal to Reason, 1906), 9; Hard, “De Kid Wot Works at Night,” 37.

¹⁹⁶ Poole, “Waifs of the Street,” 44. In a short story, Jack London cautioned parents about child laborers expedited aging and premature independence. He wrote, “He [the child laborer] had become a man very early in life. At seven, when he drew his first wages, began his adolescence. A certain feeling of independence crept up in him, and the relationship between him and his mother changed. Somehow, as an earner and bread-

winner, doing his own work in the world, he was more like an equal with her. Manhood, full-blown manhood, had come when he was eleven, at which time he had gone to work on the night-shift for six months. No child works on the night-shift and remains a child." London, *The Apostate*, 9.

¹⁹⁷ Davis, *Street-Land*, 79–80.

¹⁹⁸ Nasaw refutes the claims of progressive reformers and argues that the majority of child laborers actually gave their parents the majority of their earnings. Nasaw, *Children of the City*, 132.

¹⁹⁹ Poole, "Waifs of the Street," 41; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 112; Davis, *Street-Land*, 82.

²⁰⁰ Poole, "Waifs of the Street," 41–42, 46; Davis, *Street-Land*, 23; Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 110; Hard, "De Kid Wot Works at Night," 37; Wertheim, "Chicago Children in the Street Trades," 7.

²⁰¹ Poole, "Waifs of the Street," 40; Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, 185; Felt, *Hostages of Fortune*, 155; Neill, "Child Labor at the National Capital," 799; Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 104; *The Social Evil in Chicago*, 243; Hindman, *Child Labor*, 221.

²⁰² Davis, *Street-Land*, 84.

²⁰³ As quoted in *Ibid.*, 159. Also see "Summary of the Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage Earners in the United States," 280.

²⁰⁴ The bright and attractive boys often did the best in the night messenger service, Clopper claimed, because they became "the favorites of the prostitutes," yet this situation made them liable to "suffer complete moral degradation." Clopper, *Child Labor in City*

Streets, 103; “Summary of the Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage Earners in the United States,” 279.

²⁰⁵ Wertheim, “Chicago Children in the Street Trades,” 4.

²⁰⁶ Poole, “Waifs of the Street,” 45; Davis, *Street-Land*, 169; Wertheim, “Chicago Children in the Street Trades,” 4.

²⁰⁷ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 129; Poole, “Waifs of the Street,” 44; Davis, *Street-Land*, 95; Wertheim, “Chicago Children in the Street Trades,” 4.

²⁰⁸ Davis, *Street-Land*, 169.

²⁰⁹ Chinn, *Inventing Modern Adolescence*, 65.

²¹⁰ Downey, *Telegraph Messenger Boys*, 50.

²¹¹ Poole, “Waifs of the Street,” 40, 42; Davis, *Street-Land*, 170.

²¹² Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 129; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 112.

²¹³ Davis, *Street-Land*, 170.

²¹⁴ Middle-class families in the late 1800s could afford to leave their children in school until 14 or even 18 years old and situate them well for attractive new white collar jobs. Working-class families relied more heavily upon their children's earnings and were thus unable to prolong their children's education, effectively cutting off many of the white collar career opportunities. This difference often broke down along lines of nationality, with native-born American families more able to provide these opportunities than their immigrant counterparts. This educational advantage was limited to certain fields. Bodnar discovered that in Scranton, Pennsylvania, Welsh immigrants' early entry into the workforce positioned them favorably compared to their Irish immigrant counterparts who remained in school longer. Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 150–52; Katz and Davey, “Youth and

Early Industrialization in a Canadian City,” 296; John E. Bodnar, “Socialization and Adaptation: Immigrant Families in Scranton, 1880-1890,” in *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, ed. Harvey J. Graff (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 385–96.

²¹⁵ Davis, *Street-Land*, 191–92.

²¹⁶ The majority of children who dropped out of school early *did* end up in unskilled positions, which were often unstable. Troen, “The Discovery of the Adolescent,” 420.

²¹⁷ Poole, “Waifs of the Street,” 43, 46; Davis, *Street-Land*, 161–62; Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 104; Lovejoy, “To the Editor: Night Messenger Service,” 505.

²¹⁸ Macleod, “Act Your Age,” 401.

²¹⁹ Davis, *Street-Land*, 19.

²²⁰ Poole, “Waifs of the Street,” 44.

²²¹ *The Social Evil in Chicago*, 35–36.

²²² Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 25.

²²³ Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, 184.

²²⁴ Davis, *Street-Land*, 54.

²²⁵ *The Social Evil in Chicago*, 35–36; Crane, “The Messenger Boy,” 24.

²²⁶ Poole, “Waifs of the Street,” 47.

²²⁷ Wertheim, “Chicago Children in the Street Trades,” 6. Nasaw argues that only a few boys sold themselves to men. Reformers feared the potential of this occurring, but Nasaw makes a case that the problem posed by easy women and prostitutes was more pressing as a threat to the boys' virtue. Nasaw, *Children of the City*, 141.

²²⁸ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 111; Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, 185; Poole, "Waifs of the Street," 47–48.

²²⁹ Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 112.

²³⁰ Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, 185; Hard, "De Kid Wot Works at Night," 36.

²³¹ Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 112; Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains through Legislation*, 18; Hindman, *Child Labor*, 235–36; Wertheim, "Chicago Children in the Street Trades," 4.

²³² George B. Mangold, *Child Problems*, ed. Richard T. Ely (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910), 232; Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 130–32; Poole, "Waifs of the Street," 45.

²³³ Hindman, *Child Labor*, 236; Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 29–30, 131–32.

²³⁴ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 105; "Summary of the Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage Earners in the United States," 279; Felt, *Hostages of Fortune*, 158.

²³⁵ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 133–34; Poole, "Waifs of the Street," 46.

²³⁶ Neill, "Child Labor at the National Capital," 797; Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains through Legislation*, 17.

²³⁷ Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 24; Cohen, "Child-Saving and Progressivism," 291; Platt, *The Child Savers*, 43; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 90; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 70. Platt revised his stance on the reformers stress on nurture over nature in later years. In "The Child Savers Reconsidered," Platt wrote, "In my most recent book...I find that the biological imperative had considerable staying power in the twentieth and into the

twenty-first century...I now realize that *The Child Savers* underestimated the persistence of social Darwinist ideology." Anthony M. Platt, "The Child Savers Reconsidered," in *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2009), 199–200.

²³⁸ Reformers defined dependence broadly. Hart defined the dependent child as "that child that is an orphan or neglected, abandoned, cruelly treated or left homeless for some other reason." Hastings H. Hart, "The Care of the Dependent Child in the Family," in *Care of Dependent Children in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*, ed. Robert H. Bremner, *Children and Youth: Social Problems and Social Policy* (New York: Arno Press, 1974), 464.

²³⁹ Wohl, "The 'Country Boy' Myth," 101; Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World*, 13; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 155; Brenzel, "Domestication as Reform," 358.

²⁴⁰ Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 161.

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 157, 160–61; Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest?*, 42; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 122, 131.

²⁴² Hart, "The Care of the Dependent Child in the Family," 466–67.

²⁴³ Hirsch, "The Home Versus the Institution," 92; Katz, "Child-Saving," 422; Platt, *The Child Savers*, 43; Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest?*, 80, 93.

²⁴⁴ In reality, reform schools commonly devolved into prison-like, disorderly, and brutal environments. Brenzel, "Domestication as Reform," 353, 355; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 132; Platt, *The Child Savers*, 63, 73; Cohen, "Child-Saving and Progressivism," 277.

²⁴⁵ In 1879, Mrs. Clara Leonard of the Massachusetts Board of Charities claimed that "the more educated portion of the community" was for putting dependent children in "family-homes" instead of large institutions. Leonard, "Family Homes for Pauper and Dependent Children"; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 161; Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest?*, 62, 73; "What Becomes of the Lazy Boy? How Does He End His Days?," *The Juvenile Court Record*, June 1909, 13; Hart, "The Care of the Dependent Child in the Family," 467.

²⁴⁶ Katz, "Child-Saving," 421–22; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 120; Hart, "The Care of the Dependent Child in the Family," 467; Platt, *The Child Savers*, 80; Cohen, "Child-Saving and Progressivism," 295.

²⁴⁷ *Proceedings of the Conference on the Care of Dependent Children Held at Washington, D.C., January 25, 26, 1909* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1909), 8; Hart, "The Care of the Dependent Child in the Family," 465.

²⁴⁸ *Proceedings of the Conference on the Care of Dependent Children*, 8; Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 21.

²⁴⁹ Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 17.

²⁵⁰ *Proceedings of the Conference on the Care of Dependent Children*, 8.

²⁵¹ Katz, "Child-Saving," 421.

²⁵² Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 167.

²⁵³ Ophelia L. Amigh, *Proceedings of the Illinois Conference of Charities at Lincoln, October 23-24, 1901* (Springfield, IL: Phillips Bros. State Printers, 1902), 41.

²⁵⁴ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 77, 123.

²⁵⁵ *Third Annual Report of the Children's Aid Society*, 8.

²⁵⁶ This initiative was carried out under the leadership of Charles Loring Brace of the New York Children's Aid Society for many years. Brace's work with prisoners on Blackwell Island as a young man led him to believe that adult criminals were intractable. This experience helped to shape his belief that the children of the poor had to be removed from the city to be restored. Wohl, "The 'Country Boy' Myth," 113–15; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 89; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 161, 164; Platt, *The Child Savers*, 40; Stansell, "Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets," 310, 312–13; Hart, "The Care of the Dependent Child in the Family," 469; Leonard, "Family Homes for Pauper and Dependent Children," 170–78; Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest?*, 88–92.

²⁵⁷ Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 17.

²⁵⁸ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 65.

²⁵⁹ This argument for reform was common. See Eleanor Hodgman Porter, *Cross Currents: The Story of Margaret* (New York: A.L. Burt Company, 1907); Eleanor Hodgman Porter, *The Story of Marco* (New York: A.L. Burt Company, 1911); Gene Stratton-Porter, *Michael O'Halloran* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1915), <http://books.google.com/books?id=TqNEAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=Michael+O%27Halloran&hl=en&sa=X&ei=5epkVPDgBsfIsATAqYDACg&ved=0CB0Q6AEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=false>; Gene Stratton-Porter, *Freckles* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap Publishers, 1904).

²⁶⁰ Jacob August Riis, *Neighbors: Life Stories of the Other Half* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1919), 157–67; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 164.

²⁶¹ Wishy, *The Child and the Republic*, 67–69; Brenzel, “Domestication as Reform,” 355; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 122–23.

²⁶² Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 75; Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 173. The first mandatory school attendance laws emerged right before the Civil War in many northern states and demonstrate the regional and racial application of childhood. Attendance laws enacted after the Civil War often proved ineffective. During these years gainful employment did not hinge fully on education, so, as Troen proposes, the inefficiencies of attendance laws were socially accepted. These early laws widely stipulated twelve as the legal age at which a child could quit school. Southern legislators only began enacting such legislation in the early 1900s. Throughout the late-1800s the school year in the South was shorter, attendance laws were more lax, and fewer children attended school. At the same time, ex-slaves highly-prized education and used schooling to redefine the economic position of the child in the community. Troen, “The Discovery of the Adolescent,” 415–16; Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 92, 113; Davidson, *Child Labor Legislation*, 14, 275; Sallee, *The Whiteness of Child Labor Reform in the New South*, 135; Lahne, *The Cotton Mill Worker*, 61; Schmidt, *Industrial Violence and the Legal Origins of Child Labor*, 24.

²⁶³ Even still, work continued to be the more common progression, and only 17 percent of youths graduated from high school by 1920. Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 174–75; Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd, *Middletown: A Study in Modern American Culture* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1956), 182; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 149; Macleod, “Act Your Age,” 400; Troen, “The Discovery of the Adolescent,” 415; Cohen, “Child-Saving and Progressivism,” 283, 289.

²⁶⁴ Troen, “The Discovery of the Adolescent,” 419.

²⁶⁵ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 110.

²⁶⁶ C. M. Woodward, *Manual Training in Education* (New York: Scribner & Welford, 1890), 2, 43.

²⁶⁷ Davis, *Street-Land*, 28–29.

²⁶⁸ Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 59–61.

²⁶⁹ Poole, “Waifs of the Street,” 45.

²⁷⁰ Davis, *Street-Land*, 105.

²⁷¹ Woodward, *Manual Training in Education*, 38, 44; Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 174; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 67.

²⁷² Federal support grew for vocational training and culminated in the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, which provided federal funding for vocational education. Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 174–75; Platt, *The Child Savers*, 57; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 66–67; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 125; Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 181; Troen, “The Discovery of the Adolescent,” 415; Cohen, “Child-Saving and Progressivism,” 285.

²⁷³ Mintz, *Huck’s Raft*, 91; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 124; Macleod, “Act Your Age,” 400.

²⁷⁴ Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 164.

²⁷⁵ Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World*, 14.

²⁷⁶ Davis, *Street-Land*, 96. Technical innovations increasingly made unskilled positions as cash boys and cigar makers obsolete and complicated the problem of early elimination. Progressive educators perceived young drop-outs without work to be “a liability to society,” as the historian Troen contends. Troen, “The Discovery of the Adolescent,” 414–16. Downey makes a strong case that technical innovations did not

lead to a decrease in the number of boys employed in the messenger service. Instead, in this occupation it seems that efforts to unionize were the final catalyst which removed child labor from the work force. Downey, *Telegraph Messenger Boys*.

²⁷⁷ "If all homes were perfect homes," Frank S. Mason of the Bunker Hill Boys' Club explained, "then would the boys' club be useless." As quoted in Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 60.

²⁷⁸ Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 197; Kett, "Curing the Disease of Precocity," S184. Boy leaders were instructed to teach children "politeness, moral conduct, and even religious observance." Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 11, 20; Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:xii.

²⁷⁹ Hoben pressed that churches and schools needed to introduce "a heartiness and masculinity" to their lessons and programs. Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 51; Hoben, "The Minister and the Boy," 311.

²⁸⁰ Middle-class WASPs overwhelmingly directed this movement toward urban, working-class youths. Organized play became an antidote to the lower class's unhealthy tenements and deteriorating families. Play supervisors sought to control lower-class boys – teaching obedience, cooperation, and self-sacrifice. Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 22–23; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 127.

²⁸¹ Macleod, "Act Your Age," 399.

²⁸² Up until the 1870s women led many of the boys-work initiatives in communities. The boys-work movement took off after 1880. Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 43, 171, 199, 210.

²⁸³ Originally the YMCA sought to practically and spiritually assist young men who had just come to the cities, and over time the organization proved most successful in

larger cities. Macleod, "Act Your Age," 406–7; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 199; Wohl, "The 'Country Boy' Myth," 150.

²⁸⁴ Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 192; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 147; Cohen, "Child-Saving and Progressivism," 292.

²⁸⁵ The organized play movement began to recede around 1905, but the playground movement emerged about this time and carried forward many of the movement's goals and theories. Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 127; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 2, 31.

²⁸⁶ Several events associated with the playground movement predated 1900. For instance, New York City officials designated land for a playground as early as 1887. Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 178; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 66; Cohen, "Child-Saving and Progressivism," 292–93; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 27.

²⁸⁷ Platt, *The Child Savers*, 4.

²⁸⁸ Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 139; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 197; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 25; Davis, *Street-Land*, xvi.

²⁸⁹ Davis, *Street-Land*, 261.

²⁹⁰ Hart, "The Care of the Dependent Child in the Family," 470; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 84.

²⁹¹ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 45; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 193. Sinclair Lewis satirized boy experts' emphasis on the need for energetic men to work with boys in his novel *Elmer Gantry*. Sinclair Lewis, *Elmer Gantry*, Project Gutenberg of Australia, 1927, <http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks03/0300851h.html>.

²⁹² Forbush allowed that some women could succeed in boys' work, but he stressed that the women who succeeded were generally those "who can do something the boys like to do better than they can." Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 45, 95.

²⁹³ Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 162–63; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 11; Schlossman, "G. Stanley Hall and the Boys' Club," 143.

²⁹⁴ Schlossman, "G. Stanley Hall and the Boys' Club," 142; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 92, 101; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 45; Macleod, "Act Your Age," 402.

²⁹⁵ Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 160.

²⁹⁶ Macleod, "Act Your Age," 399; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 119–20.

²⁹⁷ Jeffrey P. Hantover, "The Boy Scouts and the Validation of Masculinity," *Journal of Social Issues* 34, no. 1 (1978): 186.

²⁹⁸ There were several notable exceptions to this perspective, including Emerson and Thoreau. Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 20.

²⁹⁹ Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 163.

³⁰⁰ Edward Bellasis, *Notes for Boys and Their Fathers on Morals, Mind, and Manners* (Chicago, IL: A. C. McClurg and Company, 1888), 35; Hantover, "The Boy Scouts and the Validation of Masculinity," 186.

³⁰¹ Hantover, "The Boy Scouts and the Validation of Masculinity," 186; Theodore Roosevelt, *The Strenuous Life*, Homeward Bound Ed. (New York: Review of Reviews Company, 1901).

³⁰² Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 203; Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 39; Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 10.

³⁰³ Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 163; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*.

³⁰⁴ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 46. Also see Wertheim, "Chicago Children in the Street Trades," 10–11.

³⁰⁵ Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 2–3; Schlossman, "G. Stanley Hall and the Boys' Club," 146; Kett, "Curing the Disease of Precocity," S202.

³⁰⁶ Jane Addams, "Child Labor Legislation - A Requisite for Industrial Efficiency," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 25 (May 1905): 548.

³⁰⁷ Forbush, *The Boy Problem*, 11.

³⁰⁸ Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 60–72.

³⁰⁹ Sports already played a major role within several ethnic communities in the mid-1800s. *Ibid.*, 21; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 127.

³¹⁰ Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 149, 89. Also see Wertheim, "Chicago Children in the Street Trades," 11.

³¹¹ Puffer continued, "the successful athlete is not necessarily an especially strong man. He is a man who has learned to use his strength, whose nervous adjustment is precise, whose body responds perfectly to the demands of his will." Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 125–26.

³¹² Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 122; Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 42, 125; Baron, "Questions of Gender," 180. For instance, as an urban minister began to engage the new social Christianity in his urban parish in the novel *The Inside of the Cup*, he started to play baseball with the neighborhood boys. Winston Churchill, *The Inside of the Cup* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1913).

³¹³ Cohen, "Child-Saving and Progressivism," 292; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 105.

³¹⁴ Davis, *Street-Land*, 3; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 25; Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 22; Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child*, 33–35.

³¹⁵ A successful playground, Davis boasted, "counteracts the effects of bad home and street alike." Davis, *Street-Land*, 247, 249, 252; Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang*, 129; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 73; Everett B. Mero, ed., *American Playgrounds: Their Construction, Equipment, Maintenance and Utility* (Boston, MA: American Gymnasia Co., 1908), 55.

³¹⁶ Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child*, 35; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 66; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 178; Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 8.

³¹⁷ Macleod, "Act Your Age," 403–4; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 170.

³¹⁸ Seton, *Boy Scouts of America*, xi.

³¹⁹ Schlossman, "G. Stanley Hall and the Boys' Club," 141. Hall urged, "we must teach nature... But we must not, in so doing, wean still more from, but perpetually incite to visit field, forest, hill, shore, the water, flowers, animals, the true homes of childhood in this wild, undomesticated stage from which modern conditions have kidnapped and transported him. Books and reading are distasteful, for the very soul and body cry out for a more active, objective life, and to know nature and man at first hand. These two staples, stories and nature, by these informal methods of the home and the environment constitute fundamental education." Hall, *Adolescence*, 1:xi.

³²⁰ Luther Gulick bridged the gap between secular and religious boys work. As the director of physical education in New York City and then the Boy Scouts, he believed that the physical activity also had spiritual value. Davis, *Street-Land*, 133; Mintz, *Huck's*

Raft, 193; Hantover, "The Boy Scouts and the Validation of Masculinity," 190; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 200-07.

³²¹ Macleod, "Act Your Age," 397.

³²² There was less enthusiasm in the West and South for playgrounds, but the movement stagnated across the country by 1917. Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*, 27, 45–46.

³²³ Booker T. Washington, *Up from Slavery: An Autobiography* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1907), 5.

³²⁴ Macleod, "Act Your Age," 406, 399; Kett, *Rites of Passage*, 200.

³²⁵ Macleod, "Act Your Age," 403–6; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*, 147.

³²⁶ Nasaw, *Children of the City*, 34–36; Katz, "Child-Saving," 417–18.

³²⁷ Wiebe, *The Search for Order*, 169.

³²⁸ Cohen asserts that the term "Progressive Movement" is "as slippery and charged as an electric eel." Cohen, "Child-Saving and Progressivism," 275.

³²⁹ Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972); Wiebe, *The Search for Order*; Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World*; Platt, *The Child Savers*; Cohen, "Child-Saving and Progressivism," 294.

³³⁰ Davis, *Spearheads for Reform*; Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest?*; Cohen, "Child-Saving and Progressivism."

³³¹ Davis, *Street-Land*, 222; Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform*; Hogan, "Introduction," x; Dorsey, "Preaching Morality in Modern America," 49–50; Robert Alexander Kraig, "The Second Oratorical Renaissance," in *Rhetoric and Reform in the Progressive Era*, ed. J. Michael Hogan (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2003), 1–48.

³³² Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World*, 14; Fishburn, *The Fatherhood of God and the Victorian Family*; Rodgers, "In Search of Progressivism," 124–26; Davis, *Spearheads for Reform*; Jane Addams, *Democracy and Social Ethics* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1902); Jane Addams, "The Subjective Necessity for Social Settlements," in *Philanthropy and Social Progress: Seven Essays* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Company, 1893), 1–2; Davis, *Street-Land*; William Thomas Stead, *If Christ Came to Chicago: A Plea for the Union of All Who Love in the Service of All Who Suffer* (Chicago, IL: Laird & Lee, 1894); Taylor, *Pioneering on Social Frontiers*; John Ruskin, "Unto This Last": *Four Essays on the First Principles of Political Economy* (New York: J. Wiley & Sons, 1872); Kelley, "The Responsibility of the Consumer," 108–12.

³³³ Neill, "Child Labor at the National Capital," 799; Davis, *Street-Land*, xviii.

³³⁴ Hunter, *Poverty*, 11–12.

³³⁵ Nasaw, *Children of the City*, viii. To an assembly of club women, one speaker lobbied, "we cannot get on well unless we have the right kind of home, the right kind of family life in this republic; we cannot get on well unless the children of this generation are trained as they ought to be trained, and live the kind of lives that will make good citizenship in the next generation." Reed and Worthington, "The Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs at Mammoth Cave," 3.

³³⁶ Jane Addams, "Evils of Child Labor," in *Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History*, ed. Robert Bremner, vol. 2 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971), 649.

³³⁷ Davis, *Street-Land*, xvii.

³³⁸ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 23.

CHAPTER TWO

“SOMETHING SPICY”: CONSTRUCTING CREDIBILITY FOR SOCIAL STUDIES OF CHILDHOOD

"Here we are with two hours on our hands, and don't know a single place to go," bemoaned Edward Brown to E. M. Barrows and Western Union messenger #479. It was 1910, and Brown and Barrows were in the lobby of New York City's Union Square Hotel feigning to be out-of-town visitors. Both men worked for the National Child Labor Committee (NCLC) and were establishing a cover story in order to discretely coax information out of the messenger. Barrows turned to the Western Union adolescent and asked, "You know New York pretty well? . . . Can you take us about to show us anything worth seeing after dark?" The boy proposed to show the two men around Chinatown. Brown and Barrows "begged off" this trip, though, telling the boy they "preferred seeing something spicy."

Over the next hour and a half, the men bantered back and forth with their young tour guide as he showed them the city's seamy side. They ribbed the boy "in a laughing manner" about how he responded the first time he saw a naked woman on the job. They coarsely conversed about what went on in the back room at the district office. Generally, Brown and Barrows set the messenger up to divulge details about his experiences on duty, talking between themselves in a way that implicitly and explicitly invited the messenger boy to display his knowledge of vice in New York City.¹ They hinged the validity of their investigation on their ability to dupe the messenger into believing that they were just two men visiting town and looking for a good time. Deception became a part of their research method as it helped them to build their credibility and gain the trust

of the messenger; their undercover guises allowed them to become a part of the terrain they studied.

In this work, Brown and Barrows participated in the technical sphere of the active social science network of the day and traded on the credibility gained by this participation. Scientists, and by association social scientists, held a high status at the turn-of-the-century. NMS investigators rhetorically constructed their expert status in their reports and prominently featured their personal experiences to establish their authority. Their work formed the first stage in a campaign against child labor in the night messenger service and led to greater delineations of urban childhood and adolescence.

The NMS investigators relied on undercover research, a growing trend in social scientific studies, which came to be known as "down-and-out" experiments at the turn of the twentieth century. This method used experiential knowledge to advance a reform agenda.² Middle-class reformers and journalists immersed themselves into the lives of workers and so-called "hobos" in order to understand "things as they exist[ed]."³ They adopted new jargon, assumed new identities, and attempted to blend into a community for a night, a day, or even a month or more. Down-and-outers lived surreptitiously as urban waitresses, train-jumping hobos, sweat shop seamstresses, and an assortment of other workers. They then shared their first-hand knowledge with the public. As participant observers, they drew on and pioneered methods of social science investigation.

As I examine the night messenger investigative reports, two central questions animate my analysis. First, what rhetorical strategies did NCLC investigators use to justify their research as valid and important? And how were these strategies informed by

the standards and norms of social science and down-and-out studies? Second, how did these methods influence the ways in which childhood was assessed and portrayed in the investigative reports of the night messenger service? In answering these questions, I argue that investigators of the night messenger service positioned their down-and-out work within the technical sphere of argument to certify the truth and urgency of the situation. At this time, the borders of the technical sphere were shifting. Discussions that had formerly taken place within the private or public sphere of argument were being situated in the technical sphere in line with increasing professionalization and the rise of the expert. Through it all, the technical sphere conferred cultural authority. The NMS investigators navigated the technical fields of social science and downclassing narratives by the choices they made with their language, the lines of reasoning they used, the accounts of their preferred methods of analysis, and the construction of their own credibility. They adopted scientific assumptions about childhood and research that helped them justify their methods and format their conclusions. Standards for technical research led NMS investigators to seek out the testimony of messengers in order to diagnose the NMS problem. And theories of child psychology led them to interpret the messengers' claims of independence as evidence of their need for protection.

To begin, I examine the hallmarks of technical sphere arguments. With a mind to this context of argument, I then use theories of argument to analyze the evolution of social science and down-and-out experiments at the turn of the century. I next analyze the NMS investigative reports against the backdrop of these contextual shifts in technical arguments before turning to probe how these anti-child labor investigators defined childhood. In the early 1900s there was a popular fervor for reform and child-saving, and

the NMS reports carried forward these concerns about children and their importance as future citizens.

THE TECHNICAL SPHERE OF ARGUMENT

The technical sphere of argument is dynamic, and for NMS reformers, these shifting norms of argument became a rhetorical resource. Early rhetoricians studying spheres of argument tended to approach spheres as discreet and/or static, but more recent scholars emphasize motion in at least two senses.⁴ First, arguments move across spheres. Second, spheres morph over time. Both of these features are apparent in histories of the technical and public sphere. As a discursive space, spheres of argument developed during the Enlightenment in response to growth in urban populations, increases in social and economic diversity, and challenges to traditional means of government.⁵ The same set of challenges beset turn-of-the-twentieth-century communities, as is so readily recalled by the historian Robert Wiebe. These challenges precipitated another round of shifts within the norms of argument.⁶ Therefore, at the time of the NMS reforms, the technical sphere of argument remained in a state of flux over boundaries, participation, and lines of reason.

The borders of the technical sphere were being negotiated, and these debates revolved around several hallmarks of the technical sphere. It sounds like a truism, but the technical sphere privileges technical or scientific knowledge. Participation in the technical sphere is confined to individuals who have specialized training, which credentials them for participation and familiarizes them with a field's argument standards. Only experts are allowed to contribute to technical arguments, adopting a field's standards for evidence, warrants, and lines of reasoning.⁷ Whether in a court of law or a

laboratory, these arguments are typically constructed through inductive reasoning.⁸ In line with this focus, technical sphere arguments traditionally require a detailed account of procedures and methods of obtaining knowledge.⁹ Even by the late-nineteenth century, experiments had become the gold standard for evidence, and experts often directed the public's understanding and discussion of science.¹⁰

Experts did not exert complete control, though, and the NMS investigative reports and their context demonstrate the permeability of technical sphere arguments. The technical sphere was permeable in terms of participation and argument strategies, particularly during (and perhaps specifically because of) the societal flux at the turn of the century. Technical experts led public campaigns, and lay participants conducted technical inquiries.¹¹ Participants crossed spheres of argument, carrying argumentative commitments with them. Yet the NMS investigative reports emphasize how this overlap of participants and their commitments persisted uneasily alongside a trajectory toward increasingly divided spheres of argument by the end of Progressive Era. Technical arguments functioned as *topoi* from which rhetors selected to construct their cause for different audiences.¹² Given the policymaking success of the NMS reformers, their discourse provides an apt case for examining the position and status of technical sphere arguments in the Progressive Era.

The Authority of Science in the Progressive Era

The ascendancy of the technical sphere in the Progressive Era was apparent in the public's relatively unadulterated celebration of science.¹³ During the Progressive Era, the public revered and granted great authority to technical sphere arguments - scientific methods, experts, and claims.¹⁴ Ella Flagg Young, a Progressive educator, noted this

authority in 1903. She remarked, "Science cannot complain of neglect by modern society. Her methods, her discoveries, her inventions, are greeted with appreciative applause. Even her terminology. . . is rapidly absorbed into the popular phraseology of the day."¹⁵ The editors of *Cosmopolitan* in 1910 similarly noted the prevalence and authority of science. When challenges arose, they reflected, people ceded science the "right of way."¹⁶

There was a riptide of science that visibly and invisibly churned in the public discourse. A discourse of science shaped modes of research, standards of labor, and definitions of childhood.¹⁷ Scientific arguments played prominently into campaigns for various reforms. For instance, the rhetorician Robin Jensen traces how in arguments for public sex education the terms "science" and "scientific" served as "shields" against public opposition.¹⁸ Such argument strategies were also present in progressive child labor debates. In 1910, Owen Lovejoy of the National Child Labor Committee (NCLC) dismissed pro-child labor arguments as "wholly unscientific."¹⁹

Science gained this cultural authority because it was assumed to be unimpeachable. In 1886 Munroe Smith claimed, "Science aims at the discovery of truth."²⁰ The scientist, therefore, was viewed as an "intelligent seeker after truth."²¹ In schools, clubs, factories, and government, leaders and managers adopted scientific methods to organize and administrate.²² Scientific administration emerged as businesses sought to increase the efficiency and productivity of their laborers.²³ Scientific discoveries about venereal diseases contributed to more concentrated campaigns to deal with prostitution and vice.²⁴ Scientific analyses of childhood by psychologists and child study experts led to the isolation of specific stages of childhood development. This type

of research expanded the purview of science beyond the natural sciences and forwarded what came to be known as the social sciences.

Social Science's Rhetorical Cooptation of Scientific Authority

Science had once been the domain of astronomers, biologists, botanists, and others who examined the world through the microscope or telescope, but with the emergence of social science, researchers moved to apply scientific procedures to the study of social relations. Previous studies of society had been informal, but in the late 1800s, social scientists worked to systematize these efforts to help them learn more about communities, families, and principles of society. Along the way, these researchers also worked to establish the credibility of their new lines of research by aligning their work with more firmly established sciences. In this way, social science disciplines, emerging in the late 1800s, attempted to co-opt the cultural authority of science.

The phrase *social science* had been used as early as the late 1700s, but modern American social science only began gaining traction in the late 1800s.²⁵ Its development followed a course of growth and professionalization. As part of this course, a significant milestone for social science was the foundation of its first American graduate programs. Columbia's influential School of Political Science, for example, opened in 1880.²⁶ At the same time, social science research also became popular outside of colleges and universities. Several scholars, like I. W. Howerth in 1897, openly encouraged local, community-based efforts to study society.²⁷ In the late 1800s and early 1900s, leaders spoke of a popular thirst for social knowledge and for opportunities to engage society, and social science was posed as a quenching draught for this yearning.²⁸ Amid this profusion of interest, social scientists endeavored to define and set the parameters of their

field of study. In the first volume of the *Political Science Quarterly* in 1886, Munroe Smith wrote that social science "deals with all the relations of man in society."²⁹ Over two decades later, the Kansas City School of Social Science continued to identify the study of social relations as the core of its research. Advertisements for the school noted, "The idea is to impart a clearer knowledge of social facts and a more scientific comprehension of the principles upon which society is conducted or should be conducted."³⁰ This ad highlights how the study of social science drafted off of science through a language of professionalization.

These definitions of social science were broad and vague, so the field came to include a wide range of studies, professional initiatives, and academic disciplines in the late 1800s.³¹ The first general secretary of the National Child Labor Committee and University of Pennsylvania sociologist, Samuel McCune Lindsay, claimed in 1898 that "in its broadest sense" social science included economics, political science, sociology, finance, statistics, and politics.³² Others also grouped political and social economy, law, medicine, ethnography, technology, history, archaeology, demography, and anthropology with the social sciences.³³ Many thought that each of these disciplines was mutually implicated in the project of studying and working out social problems.³⁴ Certain disciplines within social science, though, focused more heavily on the second part of this project, on working out social problems. For some, social science research was cast as a tool to help correct social problems.

Sociology and Activism

Sociology, in particular, had strong ties with the reform community.³⁵ The discipline was the last social science to emerge and professionalize, so it allowed for

broader participation and became one of the more progressive fields.³⁶ August Comte coined the word *sociology* in the 1830s, but it was only in 1892 that the University of Chicago created the first U.S. department of sociology under Albion Small, signaling the discipline's growing professional traction.³⁷ In these early years, many sociologists, coming to the discipline from theological studies or social work, divided their time between research and participation in local and national reform efforts. Graham Taylor, a Chicago sociologist, apportioned his time between settlement work, university teaching, and municipal reform; he also maintained his membership in the National Child Labor Committee.³⁸ Such divisions were common, for sociology aimed to discover social principles and to better society through knowledge of these principles.³⁹ This goal was realized in fits and starts, but the influence of sociology eventually reached as far as the U.S. Supreme Court. In 1908, Josephine Goldmark of the National Consumers' League successfully pioneered the use of sociological research in legal arguments with her brother-in-law Louis Brandeis in his famous *Muller v. Oregon* case that upheld labor regulations.⁴⁰ Pursuing reform was thus an assumption to many in the field. These goals and the alliances they fostered, though, created confusion and opposition for the newly-formed discipline.

As a progressive field, sociology attracted popular participation and public condemnation.⁴¹ In 1909, a "sociological retreat" announced in *The Survey* drew churchmen, socialists, businessmen, trade unionists, settlement workers, magazine editors, and an array of other "very cranky, very sane; very merry, very serious" people.⁴² This diverse audience reflected how sociology attracted widespread interest. Many local clubs joined in the fervor and founded Departments of Sociology and Civics within their

organizations in the first two decades of the 1900s.⁴³ This public attention also attracted charlatans and misunderstandings. Some opponents charged that sociology was an unscientific, pell-mell collection of experiments that were disconnected from reality.⁴⁴ In a scathing attack in *The Nation* in 1909, Henry Jones Ford charged that sociology held "notions examined, discredited, and rejected by established science."⁴⁵ Ties between sociology and causes of reform led others to conflate sociology with socialism.⁴⁶ Researchers worked hard to counteract these charges.

In order to position themselves as credible scholars in the university and before the public, sociologists worked to demarcate their field's domain.⁴⁷ They focused on defining their realm of study and establishing standards for scholarly research. Many definitions of sociology were offered in the 1890s, but sociologists overwhelmingly defined the new discipline rather ambiguously as the study of human social interactions.⁴⁸ This focus carried through into the second decade of the twentieth century. In 1910, Charles Ellwood defined sociology as "the study of the origin, development, structure, and function of the forms of human association."⁴⁹ As their goal, sociologists sought to study the complex social relationships and associations of mankind. By observing everyday interactions and events, they wanted to be able to describe and understand human behavior.⁵⁰ Sociologists were not "social agitators" or "unscientific optimists," as Small and Vincent defended.⁵¹ Instead, these researchers endeavored to discover, collect, and correlate the social laws and principles that governed society.⁵² Early sociologists projected that their research moved science into the realm of the social, and they relied on the authority and methods they gained from their association with science in order to propel civic action.⁵³

Crafting Social Science and Sociology as Science

Sociologists and other social scientists countered opposition to their work and established their research by coopting the cultural authority of science.⁵⁴ Social scientists used a variety of rhetorical strategies to assert this alignment, which placed their field within the technical sphere. Youmans went so far as to claim that "Social science is but a branch of natural science."⁵⁵ Other social scientists similarly integrated these claims into the very definition of their studies. Sociology for Ward was "the science of the laws of society."⁵⁶ Others were more or less direct. They rooted their field's research in scientific origins, identified themselves as scientists, adopted the vocabulary of scientific research, and borrowed the hallmarks of scientific methods. These moves helped to lend authority to their fledgling "science."

Unapologetically, social scientists asserted their social research among other established sciences. Lester Ward, Albion Small, and George Vincent rhetorically positioned sociology on a plane with biology, physics, and astronomy.⁵⁷ Ellwood forthrightly claimed that sociology was a "pure science."⁵⁸ These claims emerged frequently as researchers defined their practice but also as they established new institutions for the discipline. The Solvay Institute of Sociology in Brussels provided a clear example; Ernest Solvay built his Institute in 1901 directly between the Institute of Anatomy and the Institute of Physiology. This location was, as D. Warnotte reported, "not by chance." Solvay claimed a "synthesis" between the fields, so he "associated the buildings in order to proclaim the affiliation of their ideas."⁵⁹

Social scientists also asserted their professional status and credibility (explicitly and implicitly) by describing their process of research and its stringent scientific

standards.⁶⁰ To be a credible science, sociology needed to have a clear procedure. As part of this effort, these social scientists demanded that their new field should abandon early tendencies to informal research and instead be marked by rational thought, scientific means, and systematic "methods and mental habits."⁶¹ Universities and reform publications affirmed these traits.⁶² Lead social scientists came to expect these traits and to assume that specific training was necessary to meet them. Lester Ward argued in 1898 that "the only correct method" in sociology called for "trained observers" who would "make systematic observations under the guidance of fixed principles, designed to avoid to the utmost the errors into which the casual observer is liable to fall."⁶³ Many researchers rooted their "fixed principles" in the scientific method; they adopted the scientific method and claimed that it fitted and undergirded social research.⁶⁴ There was not widespread agreement about what the scientific method should look like in sociology, but there was agreement that a scientific method was necessary.⁶⁵

With methodical research as their foundation, sociologists positioned their claims as objective and hence accurate.⁶⁶ This stress upon objective research threaded through social science discussions as early as the 1890s and grew as disciplines professionalized. By the 1920s, sociologists Lynd and Lynd claimed that the admonition for the "study of society" to "be made objective" was heard "[o]n every hand."⁶⁷ Educational institutions carefully situated themselves with this standard. *As an example*, the Kansas City School of Social Science declared their lecture series "would not be confined to any formulas or pre-accepted social dogmas."⁶⁸ Researchers formatted this objectivity as further evidence of the accuracy of their research, and they expressed this understanding by assuming that their research unearthed *facts*.⁶⁹ Once collected, sociologists could organize facts,

comparing and synthesizing, to derive social principles.⁷⁰ This step required social scientists to draw on the methods of biology and history; they were to compare historical facts, run statistical tabulations, and prepare charts.⁷¹ These steps ensured the reliability of social science research.

University and local researchers also adopted the terminology of the natural sciences.⁷² They used the scientific language of *subjects*, *results*, *findings*, and *fields of research*. For example, a Chicago-trained researcher, Annie Marion MacLean, referred to sweat-shops as her "field of investigation."⁷³ Similarly, Small and Vincent discussed their "subjects."⁷⁴ These researchers had a range of circulating traditions and accompanying vocabularies available to them, but as they articulated their work, they did not identify their research with the *surveys* of earlier reforms or the *friendly-visiting* of aid societies. Instead, they situated their work in the technical sphere by adopting scientific terms and rhetorically co-opted the authority of science.

Beyond authority, these rhetorical choices also defined and directed their methods. Most prominently, social scientists commonly spoke of their research as *experiments* that occurred in *laboratories*.⁷⁵ For instance, Robert Woods, a settlement house pioneer, wrote of the "results of experiments" with neighborhoods, and was one of the first to identify settlements as social science *laboratories*, pressing that "the science of the community needs its neighborhood laboratories as one of its most essential resources."⁷⁶ Experiments and laboratories became integral to social scientific instruction and research.⁷⁷ Stemming out of this perspective, New York City and Chicago quickly became prized as key social science laboratories for figures from John Dewey to Franklin Giddings (who some reckoned to be the "foremost representative of sociology as a

specialty in the American academic world").⁷⁸ Samuel McCune Lindsay called New York a "teeming sociological laboratory" in a 1914 address.⁷⁹ This scientific vocabulary became imbricated into the community's understanding of their work and regularly appeared in professional journals, settlement reports, and other social scientific outlets.

Social scientists' use of this phrasing tied their research to the natural sciences, but it also inferred a community-based approach that required close contact between researchers and their objects of research. As Thomas Gieryn, a contemporary sociologist, notes, laboratories and experiments imply control, objectivity, and replicability.⁸⁰ Such rhetorical choices came to reflect and build upon several emerging hallmarks within social science research, including direct contact, close observation, and personal experience. These standards complemented a trend of undercover investigations at the turn-of-the-twentieth century that came to be known as downclassing. Social scientists joined with journalists, reformers, and curious citizens who believed that only by going undercover could they obtain an accurate understanding of what life was truly like for the poor and the working class.

GOING UNDERCOVER TO DISCOVER THE TRUTH

Down-and-outers, a prominent group of undercover investigators, were predominantly middle- and upper-class men and women who, as the historian Mark Pittenger lays out, purposefully deceived people about their "class standing in order to write about the resulting experiences."⁸¹ These investigators fell under a range of titles. Reform organizations like the National Child Labor Committee used the umbrella term "investigation." In academic circles, this research became known as "participant observation."⁸² George Orwell later called these "down and out" accounts, but at the turn

of the century, there was not a generally-accepted term for this type of work.⁸³ Regardless of label, these investigators held in common the belief that only by becoming a part of a group could they know that group's circumstances and needs and begin to develop a plan for how those needs could be met.

The first American down-and-out accounts appeared in the 1890s and grew in popularity in the early 1900s, propelled along by a group of middle-class reformers.⁸⁴ This group included journalists, writers, and social scientists that often fit Robert Crunden's description of a progressive; down-and-outers were generally native-born whites of northern European lineage who were well-educated, from prosperous families, with a strict Protestant upbringing, and ties to the ministry.⁸⁵ They published their accounts of their lower-class experiences regularly in popular magazines like *McClure's*, social scientific journals like the *American Journal of Sociology*, and later in book format with titles like the *The Woman Who Toils*. These accounts were so common that in 1903 MacLean couched her cross-class narrative in an apology, writing that the "exploration of fields of industrial labor" was "so common that one feels constrained to apologize to the long-suffering public for thrusting upon it still another 'experience.'"⁸⁶ Experience became the governing principle behind these tales and the ends they were supposed to serve.

Down-and-outers as well as social scientists' focus on experience at the turn-of-the-century mirrored intellectual and popular trends that made experience central to knowledge. The philosopher and educator John Dewey captured this focus with his promotion of experiential learning; his contemporary, William James, as the rhetorician Paul Stob argues, equated his philosophy of empiricism to experience and elevated "pure

experience."⁸⁷ Pioneers of the settlement house movement also operated on this foundation. They believed that they could ameliorate social tensions by moving into lower-class neighborhoods and then interpreting their experiences back to their middle- and upper-class networks.⁸⁸ Scholars, reformers, and down-and-outers privileged experience at the turn-of-the-century and highlighted what Pittenger calls the "progressive epistemological faith" that experience would unveil truth.⁸⁹

Undercover investigators assumed that only by experiencing life as a member of the lower class could anyone understand its point of view.⁹⁰ This assumption appeared in the earliest downclassing accounts. A character in Stephen Crane's foundational "An Experiment in Misery" (1893) advised, "You can tell nothing of it unless you are in that condition yourself."⁹¹ Similarly, Annie Marion MacLean explained that "some things. . . could be learned only from the inside."⁹² Cross-class investigators demanded first-hand experience and direct contact. For Crane, MacLean, and their peers, accurate social data could be obtained only by participating in a group, by being *in* the circle of the lower-class workman or "working girl." Presence was crucial to their purported expertise.

Down-and-outers, mirroring sociologists, commonly articulated that these direct experiences were to serve two primary research goals: social knowledge and social reform.⁹³ In the Progressive Era, these two goals dovetailed seamlessly, for information gathering often became a part of reform. Many investigators, like the undercover NCLC agents, went down-and-out in order to be useful and to improve working-class conditions.⁹⁴ For Marie and Bessie Van Vorst, their desire was to "render practical aid" to the people they had lived among incognito.⁹⁵ Social knowledge and social reform, for the Van Vorsts and their peers, were integrally connected.

Having collected the information first-hand, down-and-outers confidently shared the data from their undercover research, and they expected their middle-class readers to trust to its accuracy. For many of these authors, as Toby Higbie argues, their middle-class standing in society established their objectivity and perceived trustworthiness. Whereas labor leaders might be biased by their interests, down-and-outers assumed and wrote as if they were above such biases.⁹⁶ Down-and-outer's class standing served as a voucher for their audiences of the validity of their accounts.⁹⁷

Undercover investigators, who were closely aligned with the social sciences, also adhered to the scientific method and used scientific vocabulary in a way that marked their work as professional; they relied on the authority of the technical sphere. Alvan Sanborn, whose down-and-out study was listed under "Sociological Notes" in the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, exhorted his readers on the advantages of the "'laboratory' method" for research.⁹⁸ Down-and-outers cast their undercover tales as factual and highly-accurate representations. Amy Tanner went so far as to claim that her story offered a "snap shot at reality."⁹⁹ By using a photography metaphor, Tanner implied that her account was not just representative, but exact.

Investigators, like Tanner, claimed to be able to convey this degree of detail about the "unknown class" after even short lengths of time undercover.¹⁰⁰ In 1914, Frederick C. Mills roamed as an itinerant worker for two months to collect information for the California Commission of Immigration and Housing.¹⁰¹ Annie Marion MacLean acknowledged that she spent only two days in a sweat-shop, but in that time, she assured her readers that she secured as much information as was needed.¹⁰² The NCLC agents who studied the night messenger service spent even less time undercover; they went

down-and-out in cities across the United States for just several evenings at a time. As these examples show, cross-class investigators went undercover for a few months or even a few hours. This variation was possible because investigators' credibility did not rest on the duration of time that they spent "under." Instead, their perceived accuracy rested on how well they had been able to disguise themselves in order to authentically experience life as a member of the working class.

Constructing an Authentic Downclassing Account

Every undercover investigator had to develop a cover story to set up their downclassing adventure, and most started their narratives by providing an account of their method of affecting their disguises. Investigators vouched that a good disguise was necessary. To begin their accounts, down-and-outers regularly recorded how they changed their clothes, language, and manners to transform themselves into members of the working class.¹⁰³ Unless a person possessed "a mien extraordinarily eloquent of villainy or misery," as Alvan Sanborn pointed out, they had to use "ingenuity and skill" to look the part of the "professional 'bum.'"¹⁰⁴ Workers might lie to a middle-class investigator, but what reason could there be for workers to lie to an undercover investigator who they saw as a peer? Thus, by writing of their process of going undercover, downclassers achieved two ends. They provided further support for the authenticity of their report and affirmed their middle-class status and its accompanying credibility.

Several investigators claimed a complete personal re-identification with their adopted identity. In the midst of one of her experiments, Van Vorst claimed, "And my disguise is so successful I have deceived not only others but myself. I have become with

desperate reality a factory girl, alone, inexperienced, friendless."¹⁰⁵ Down-and-outers occasionally articulated their fears that this identification would become so complete that they would "go native" and sink permanently into a life of poverty.¹⁰⁶ Jack London communicated this idea in *People of the Abyss* (1903), which chronicled his work and interactions in the East End of London and eventually became one of the best-remembered Progressive Era down-and-out experiences.¹⁰⁷ In his tale, he detailed how he guarded against this danger of "going native" by renting a room in a better part of town. When necessary, he could go there to assure himself that "good clothes and cleanliness still existed" and to "sally forth occasionally in changed garb to civilization."¹⁰⁸ These success narratives underscored for readers the accuracy of cross-class investigators' accounts.

Some authors chronicled their mistakes undercover, but even some of these stories managed to be fashioned so as to support the investigators' authenticity. Investigators portrayed instances when their disguises had been doubted as learning experiences or easily glossed over mistakes. Looking for work proved to be a serious test of a disguise for investigators. MacLean recounted, "One man said, with brutal frankness, and in broken English, that I was holding my head too high, and that he did not want my kind about." After this encounter, MacLean bolstered her disguise, reporting, "I retreated, communed with myself a little, and gave myself a few lessons in humility of spirit and practiced a hang-dog position of the head."¹⁰⁹ Through rejection, MacLean learned the posture for success.¹¹⁰ Such interactions proved that cross-class masquerading entailed more than just changing one's dress.¹¹¹ Self-admittedly, undercover investigators were unable to disguise themselves and go down-and-out seamlessly.

In the process, though, the bodies of undercover investigators became central sites of gaining knowledge as they assumed risks on the streets and in sweat-shops.¹¹² These authors gained credibility from the toll that their assumed lives told upon their bodies, for they cast physical danger as a means of distinguishing their work above other types of investigations. Annie Marion MacLean claimed this hierarchy most explicitly. She set up a contrast; factory inspectors *observed* conditions, but laborers *experienced* the toll of this work on their bodies. MacLean told of "the weary eyes and dizzy head and aching back caused by the long day's sewing in a badly ventilated and poorly lighted room."¹¹³ Experience became a higher level of knowledge. She noted that this deeper knowledge "could be obtained if someone were willing to endure the hardships" of working-class life.¹¹⁴ This argument became a theme in downclassing work. MacLean and her peers outlined the sacrifices that they surmounted, and they argued that only by placing their bodies at risk were they able to get an accurate view of life among the working class.¹¹⁵

Posing as members of the working class, down-and-outers typically collected data through observation. In this approach, they mirrored the standards set by prominent social scientists, like Vincent, Giddings, and Kellor, who stressed the necessity of careful observations to accurate research.¹¹⁶ In contrast to mid-century epistemologies, these figures emphasized the need for special education, an observer trained in methods of focus and attention.¹¹⁷ Sociology students were to be trained in "habits of constant attention," as Franklin Giddings stressed. They should be "constantly on the watch for neglected or unperceived factors in human action, as the chemist for undiscovered elements."¹¹⁸ Such careful observations, encompassing sight and visual evidence, became the foundation of downclassing accounts. In *People of the Abyss*, London set out

declaring that he was prepared to "be convinced by the evidence of my eyes."¹¹⁹ First-hand observations – the facts that researchers could see and thus know – became the epistemological foundation for studying society. Down-and-outers became convinced by what they saw, and their personal accounts of this visual evidence became their proof as they took their arguments to the public.

At the reaches of their own observations, undercover investigators used secondary testimony to corroborate their personal experiences.¹²⁰ Down-and-outers commonly presented secondary testimony as direct quotes. By using direct quotes, they claimed the accuracy of the dialogue that they reproduced. Jack London, for example, transcribed the words of one "mate," who allegedly harangued, "'Wimmen!' He thumped his pot upon the bar and orated eloquently. 'Wimmen is a thing my edication 'as learnt me t' let alone. It don't pay, matey; it don't pay. Wot's a man like me want o' wimmen, eh? jest you tell me."¹²¹ Jack London's block quotes, like those of his colleagues, performed two functions. They proved that he successfully passed undercover and vouched for his skills as a conveyer and interpreter of life in the depths. These accounts recalled past exchanges, but down-and-outers also presented them as technical and accurate accounts of their tales.

Contemporary standards for scientific research required this level of exactness in reporting, but the social scientific community only had limited means with which to meet this standard. Researchers in the first decade of the twentieth century did not have portable recording devices, so even quoted conversations were necessarily constructed from field notes and memory. Occasionally, investigators nodded to the limits of their methods. Maud Younger quickly reflected on the shortcomings of her conversational re-

enactments. After putting her dialogue with a co-worker in block quotes, she lamented, "I wish I could write things down just as she says them. She has an air of conviction that makes you sure at the time that she is right."¹²² Undercover investigators boasted that by living among workers they were able to see and truly know about working-class life. Yet, the demands of keeping up a disguise became a hindrance to their record keeping.

Despite these challenges, social scientists and undercover researchers identified their projects as scientific and drew upon technical lines of reason. In their reports, they touted their research methods, objective approach, and trained observations to establish the accuracy of their accounts. They represented their scientific process as eminently credible, which gave them clout as they then interpreted the social landscape and proposed reforms.

CRAFTING THE AUTHENTICITY OF NIGHT MESSENGER SERVICE REPORTS

Researchers of the night messenger service were members of these social scientific and investigative communities, and they adopted argument strategies from the technical sphere as the NMS campaign developed. Child labor organizations orchestrated three primary investigative phases in the campaigns of the night messenger service in the Progressive Era. There was a spate of investigations in New York in 1904, a series of national investigations beginning in 1909, and a set of follow-up investigations around 1912. As the research evolved from local to national in scope, NMS investigators embraced more of the norms of social scientific research. The investigators' methods shifted from a relatively informal collection of information to an in-depth collection of data rooted in systematic undercover investigations grounded in inductive reasoning. Over this evolution, anti-child labor reformers grew more attentive to the technical

elements of their research, reflexively commenting on their research process and methods. Across this work, NMS investigators situated their reports as scientific, factual and trustworthy.

The New York Child Labor Committee (NYCLC) orchestrated an early effort to curtail child labor in the messenger service in 1904.¹²³ They heard "many complaints" concerning the "large number of small boys" employed in the messenger service, so in progressive fashion, the Committee launched an investigation.¹²⁴ They had a multi-pronged approach to gathering information. J. K. Paulding, the secretary of the NYCLC, turned first to New York City's social reform network to help collect "certain facts." He recruited lay help, relying on nonacademic reformers to aid in his investigation rather than specially trained agents. He wrote to the heads of the city's settlements to request that each of them send him a message so that he might "have an opportunity of interviewing the boys who deliver these messages."¹²⁵ Along with his request, he detailed how the messages were to be sent in order to meet a wide range of boys and to avoid raising suspicion. He also asked the heads of the various settlements to pass along to him "any facts that have fallen under your own observation concerning messenger boys."¹²⁶ The Committee followed up on this information with further inquiries; they watched as managers hired messengers, examined the local telegraph companies' books, solicited input from city leaders, and shadowed health department inspectors.¹²⁷ The NYCLC's orchestration of this campaign illustrated the murkiness of argument standards. Paulding provided a careful reckoning of his methods and procedures in his write-ups, but at the same time, he relied on reformers rather than experts to assist him. The boundaries of participation in the social sciences were becoming more fixed, yet on the borders of

technical argument, such as in the anti-child labor movement, conversations still included a wide range of participants.

These investigations in 1904 were limited in scope to day messengers in New York City, but the primary investigators still marshaled social scientific investigative techniques to gird up their accounts. They employed multiple fact-collecting strategies, provided a detailed accounting of their method, and occasionally reflected on the research process.¹²⁸ Paulding interviewed eighteen messengers who delivered him telegrams, and he wrote up an account of each boy's age, hours, and length of employment.¹²⁹ In line with contemporary social scientific standards, he occasionally reflected on his research practices. In her book, *Experimental Sociology*, Frances Kellor warned social science researchers that "the replies of the investigated may be untrue or misleading."¹³⁰

Recognizing such concerns, a NYCLC investigator (likely Paulding) reflexively admitted that one hiring manager "was very severe in his scrutiny of the boys" but that it was "perhaps more so than usual on account of my presence."¹³¹ The NYCLC adhered to baseline technical standards in its investigation. Paulding and his colleagues established a system for collecting information, but when anti-child labor reformers renewed their campaign against the NMS in 1909, their methods were more systematic and specialized.

Authors and speakers continued to condemn child labor in the night messenger service throughout the first decade of the 1900s, but it was only in 1909 that the NCLC's Board of Trustees agreed to make correcting "the night employment of messenger boys" a "special emphasis" in the coming year.¹³² The National Child Labor Committee spearheaded the response this time and initiated a more aggressive, methodical investigative plan. The campaign relied heavily on research conducted by social science

graduates. Edward N. Clopper's Ph.D. thesis work, which was later published as *Child Labor in City Streets*, provided a foundation of details about the night messenger service.¹³³ Additionally, in the fall of 1909, the NCLC engaged Edward M. Barrows to assist in the investigations,¹³⁴ and shortly thereafter, the Committee also hired Charles L. Chute, a recent graduate of The New York School of Social Work.¹³⁵ Along with Edward Brown, these three agents conducted the majority of NMS investigations between 1909 and 1912. Their involvement signaled a shift in the anti-child labor movement toward the technical sphere of argument. From the economics Ph.D. of Clopper to the social work degree of Chute, special training and education was increasingly becoming a mark of participation in these arguments. Additionally, these investigators were paid field agents who reported back to the NCLC, rather than an informal network of reformers. They were credentialed experts in this field, and their reports formed the center of the NCLC's campaign.

The NCLC continued to monitor the NMS even after multiple states enacted legislation; their leaders feared that the new laws would not be properly enforced. The committee believed that they needed to "gather accurate information at first hand" in order to "stimulate public interest in vigorous enforcement and statesman-like administration."¹³⁶ Therefore, after Clopper's resignation in 1912, Owen Lovejoy engaged Harry W. Bremer and Herschel H. Jones, "both of the School of Philanthropy," to carry on this research.¹³⁷ In this third phase, reformers continued the systematic undercover investigations and reporting employed by Clopper, Brown, and Barrows. Thus, NMS investigators between 1909 and 1914 followed a fairly consistent pattern, recounting the same veins of information and speaking to the process of investigation.

The Scientific Composition of Child Labor Investigations

Across these investigations, the NMS investigators methodically recorded the details of their research. Following the dictates of technical argument, they provided an account of their procedure and emphasized a consistent method. Like the trained observers of the child psychologist G. Stanley Hall, the NCLC agents supplied basic information about each messenger they interviewed in a straightforward manner. They laid out a set form for collecting data and kept strict records of their investigations.¹³⁸ In 1914, the Connecticut report succinctly described the agent's interactions with messengers, noting, "Called Western Union at 8:30 p.m. #37 responded. He is a boy 16 years old and works from 6p.m. to 5a.m. . . . Called Postal at 4:15 p.m. and #140 responded. Said he ws [sic] 16 years old."¹³⁹ The Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Illinois reports generally followed the same scheme. At the outset they listed the date, time of day, town, and age of the responding messenger. From Louisville, Kentucky, in 1913 Jones reported, "went to the Galt House about 11 P.M. and put in a call for a Western Union messenger. John Meyer, messenger No. 29 responded to the call."¹⁴⁰ Following the same pattern, Bremer recorded, "At Danville, #118, John Martin, came in answer to the call to the Western Union. He gave his age as 16."¹⁴¹ This style of abrupt recitation of facts, detail-rich accounting, and inductive reasoning mirrored the style of the natural sciences and the approach that social scientists had adopted to identify their research as scientific.

The NCLC reinforced this technical framework for their reports by adopting scientific terminology to describe the work of their investigators. They had a technical vocabulary. NCLC "field agents" like Harry Bremer and Herschel Jones were simply

collecting "evidence" of social phenomena.¹⁴² The night messenger service became an "object" to be studied.¹⁴³ Harry Bremer wrote of his report's "findings" and later mentioned his "results."¹⁴⁴ E. E. Pratt, a professor of economics and statistics at the New York School of Philanthropy, also adopted this language of "results" in his statement about his participation in a NMS investigation.¹⁴⁵ This language grounded their reports in the technical sphere's focus on data collection and situated them within the norms and vocabulary of technical argument in that day. Their investigative accounts read like lab reports and projected objectivity even as their research primarily rested on personal experience from undercover investigations.

The NCLC relied heavily on undercover investigations to collect information about the night messenger service. Alongside early anthropologists and sociologists, the NMS investigators were conducting field work. Their method was personal, but their product was reputedly scientific. Investigators used cover stories to make this shift; they depended on the cover stories they concocted and how well they were able to carry them off. Like other downclassers, the NMS investigators generally described their process of going undercover at the start of their reports, but unlike most down-and-outers, NCLC agents did not change their clothes to go undercover. Instead, they had to blend in with the night crowds and provide a reasonable explanation for why they needed a messenger.

The NMS investigators had two immediate audiences for their cover stories. Telegraph operators and managers made up their first audience, for company employees had to accept the agents' request for a messenger. This step in going undercover was generally simple, but by recounting this process, agents made a case for their undercover savviness in not arousing suspicion *and* validated their reports about the business

practices of the telegraph companies. In these arguments, location became central. Investigators called for a messenger to be sent to their *hotel* rooms, or they called from a *saloon* "in the very heart of the tenderloin district."¹⁴⁶ Agents reported that they hired messengers with ease regardless of their location. Barrows reported that he and Clopper "Gave no intimation as to why we wanted a boy or for how long we wanted him," yet the company readily sent them a messenger.¹⁴⁷ Over time, NCLC special agents deemed it necessary to employ a variety of cover stories. To engage a messenger at the Seelback Hotel in Louisville, Kentucky in 1910, Edward Brown wrote, "I told the young man I was a stranger in town and wanted to see the points of interest."¹⁴⁸ Investigators asserted their credibility when they told how their cover stories were accepted, but these ruses also allowed them to collect information from companies and messengers. Through their approach, they discovered that companies rarely monitored where they sent their young employees.¹⁴⁹

These young employees composed the NCLC field agents' second audience and demanded more elaborate and sustained methods of undercover work. Agents used their wiles to develop believable covers; like down-and-outers, they had to stretch themselves to concoct believable backstories. For a NMS investigation in New York in 1910, Brown and Barrows concocted a tale about how they were waiting for their friend "Billy." As Billy regrettably "missed his train," they asked a messenger to show them around in the spare time they had.¹⁵⁰ On another occasion, E. E. Pratt recalled how Brown hired a messenger "on the supposition that he had forgotten the name of the cafe at which we [he and Pratt] had intended to meet" and got the lad to take him around to "many low cafes" under the pretense of searching for Pratt.¹⁵¹ These cooked-up tales gave investigators

access to the night messenger service world, but the investigators' collection of evidence depended upon their ability to remain undercover.¹⁵²

Despite the researchers' best efforts, messengers occasionally doubted and called out NCLC investigators' ruses. As an example, a Louisville messenger "was reticent about answering further questions" after Jones probed him about supplying dope to prostitutes.¹⁵³ Anti-child labor reformers readily presented even these failures in a positive research light. For instance, Barrows asked Levy, a messenger, whether prostitutes let messengers do business with them, and Levy responded, "O sometimes I suppose; not much. See that statue over there! That's that purity statue the papers are full of." Barrows recognized the redirect, noting, "He was obviously changing the subject deliberately, so I dropped that line of questioning for a time."¹⁵⁴ In this way, Barrows framed his research challenges within a tale of competence; he saw the messenger's hesitance and shifted his strategy. Investigators increasingly faced these problems as the messenger business waned due to local crack downs on vice districts and state regulations of the NMS. In 1912, a Philadelphia messenger grew suspicious while interacting with Brown, who reported that the messenger "admitted that he would have no hesitation in trying to get it [opium] for me in spite of the police watchout, but that he was not so sure that I might be a plain clothes detective." To "quiet his suspicions," Brown changed the subject.¹⁵⁵ On another occasion, a messenger explained to Brown the danger of "plainclothes men" who acted like they were from out of town to get information.¹⁵⁶ The trajectory of these stories alerted the reader to messengers' suspicions, but investigators articulated these details in a way that provided evidence that they were experts and trained observers. Oftentimes, investigators rejoiced in the triumph of their ruses. For

instance, the NCLC's E. M. Barrows boasted, "I had Kramer's complete confidence, and he talked freely about himself."¹⁵⁷ Barrows' cover story was a success; he established rapport and earned the messenger's trust. The investigators claimed that their undercover methods duped the messengers and helped them to collect accurate information.

The investigators' objectivity and intentions also shielded their methods from questioning. NMS investigators avoided the unhealthful conditions of sweat shops, crowded lodgings, and unremitting toil experienced by other downclassers, but they put themselves in the way of moral turpitude. As special agents of the NCLC, they went into urban vice districts. They ventured into the back rooms of saloons, Chinese restaurants [implied translation: opium dens], and chili parlors [which "closely resembled the lower Chinese restaurants of other cities"].¹⁵⁸ Charles Chute entered several houses of prostitution during his investigation in Chicago, though he defensively noted that he did so only at the insistence of his messenger guide.¹⁵⁹ Prostitutes regularly propositioned them on the streets. Yet, they did not express fears of "going native" or recognize any danger in immersing themselves in a culture of alcohol, drugs, sex, and gambling. Their silence on this matter traded on assumptions about their middle-class respectability and male privilege.¹⁶⁰ Potentially as a safeguard against these vices, NCLC agents frequently conducted their research in pairs. Barrows met up with Clopper and later with Brown and Pratt.¹⁶¹ And Frank Westendick accompanied Herschel Jones in 1913 on a follow up investigation in Louisville.¹⁶² Co-investigations were a regular downclassing practice, especially among female investigators.¹⁶³ Regardless of the reasoning behind these partnerships, for NMS investigators, this collaboration helped investigators to establish their cover stories and to vouch for the accuracy of their accounts. The investigator's

experiences in the vice districts did not impinge upon their respectability, rather these experiences gave them credibility.

Across the NMS reports, the agents posited their own experience as their primary authority and proof. "[E]xperience" taught Bremer that carrying messages "for the patrons of a telegraph company" was the "worst thing" that a boy could do for his future "welfare."¹⁶⁴ The NCLC agents also communicated that their experience acted as a check against false testimony. Brown acknowledged that the boys "may or may not have been truthful in their statements," but he offered his personal experience as a proof of the veracity of the messenger's testimony even if they were prone to exaggeration.¹⁶⁵ For instance, how did he know that the women familiarly interacting with a messenger were prostitutes? Brown explained, "the only proof I have that they were prostitutes" was that the "women asked me to go with them."¹⁶⁶ In such ways, the experiences of the NCLC agents were their proof, and they bolstered this testimony by providing specific details from their downclassing experiences. In their reports, Jones and Bremer even recounted the minutia of where messengers got the slips of paper to jot down addresses. One messenger "wrote the addresses of three on a card I gave him."¹⁶⁷ Another messenger wrote the addresses down "on a telegram receipt blank which he took from his cap."¹⁶⁸ These small details supported the agents' case for the authenticity of their empirical studies.

At the center of their experience, NMS agents privileged their observations; visual evidence became the investigators' primary proof. They peppered their reports with what they observed while touring cities. For example, Brown "saw" a Western Union messenger "standing in front of number 235 Second Avenue, a notorious house of

prostitution" waiting to be sent on a quick errand. Barrows described what he beheld: "Saloons on every corner, houses of prostitution, with red door panels brilliant lights behind drawn curtains, and occasional moving silhouettes showing through the curtains, lined the streets on both sides, varied by an occasional saloon and dance hall from which laughter and strains of music came."¹⁶⁹ To these observations agents added interpretation; Barrows, like his colleagues, synthesized his observations for his readers. He observed, "The character of the district was evident on the surface." Brown made the same assumptions, explaining, "It was evident from the outward appearance of the place what its character was."¹⁷⁰

Agents visually deduced the character of the messengers' environments as well as the character of the people they met. In 1909, Barrows observed a "girl" in a Chinese restaurant that was "evidently of some refinement [sic] as she looked and moved differently from the rest of the horde of prostitutes in the restaurant."¹⁷¹ Barrows' attention to this girl seems tangential to his report, but the visual cues that apprized him of her refinement in contrast to the "horde of prostitutes" also helped him to establish the character of the establishment.¹⁷² From observations, researchers used their inductive reasoning and "powers of generalization," as Ward called for, to discriminate between and make sense of their results.¹⁷³ Over the course of the nineteenth century, social scientists challenged the centrality and credibility of seeing as a method of collecting data, yet visual modes of knowing were not dismissed but rather considered in relation to other data, especially statistics.¹⁷⁴ In the NMS reports, the visual discernment of trained NCLC observers functioned alongside a cadre of other evidence.

NMS investigators occasionally integrated statistics to reinforce their technical arguments. Census bureaus, state labor boards, and private reform associations pioneered early statistical work, but the disciplines of economics, psychology, and sociology increasingly relied upon statistics as the means for attaining genuine scientific knowledge in the first two decades of the 1900s.¹⁷⁵ By modern standards, the statistical methods of these social scientists were rudimentary. In some instances, as in the NMS campaign, statistical work meant simply using tables and charts to display data, yet this presentation of evidence demarcated their research from more informal inquiries. One NCLC investigator cross-referenced the lists of "disorderly houses" furnished by four Scranton messengers in a simple table to demonstrate the accuracy of the boys' accounts.¹⁷⁶ In another report, Brown provided a chart of the messengers' ages, their length of service, and the number of bawdy houses they noted.¹⁷⁷ As social science and social work shifted toward specialization, these rudimentary statistics moved their arguments toward the technical sphere of argument with its privileging of quantifiable findings.¹⁷⁸ The NMS investigators described their observations, but they also used statistics to denote their skill and system for collecting data.

To the same end, NCLC agents presented their interview techniques in a way that emphasized how such strategies enabled the collection of information up to the standards needed for technical argument. Agents prodded and challenged messengers in their conversations, especially regarding doubtful information. One messenger boy claimed to be unfamiliar with the vice district, so Barrows "expressed some surprise and questioned him enough to assure . . . that his ignorance was genuine and not feigned."¹⁷⁹ Barrow's careful inquiry became the foundation for the account's reliability. This method was

replicated in other investigations. In 1909, Barrows and Clopper described their successful use of "hints and direct questions" in an interview with a messenger.¹⁸⁰ NCLC agents used these strategies to verify the data they collected. They also used their interview techniques to settle questionable accounts, such as when several New York messengers told Barrows how prostitutes enlisted messengers to help rob unsuspecting johns. Barrows pushed back on one messenger. He questioned, "Come off. You don't believe that yourself, do you?" The messenger replied, "Honest to God, mister. At least that's what other boys have told me, and it could easy happen from what I've seen myself." Barrows pushed further, "But has it ever happened to you?" To the boy's short answer of "no," he proceeded, "Has it ever happened to any boy you know yourself, and you know wasn't joshing you?" Finally, the messenger acceded, "No; of course, you're right, - a man can't believe every thing [sic] he doesn't see with his own eyes."¹⁸¹ Barrows, through questioning, brought this boy around to his own point of view – grounded in social scientific understandings – that careful attention to first-hand experiences provided credible evidence for knowledge.

Investigators primarily conducted their interviews while undercover, but on occasion, investigators interviewed messengers openly. In these circumstances, investigators shifted their rapport-building and question-posing strategies. For instance, Barrows established rapport by sharing with some boys that he was a friend of Guy L. Shipps, a former (and apparently well-loved) settlement house worker. In response, one newsboy "immediately handed his papers over to another boy and volunteered to spend the rest of the evening at my disposal." This boy then mentioned "two other ardent disciples of Shipps" who "could be relied upon to give absolutely straightforward

testimony to any friends of Shipp's." These boys "freely and frankly gave a great deal of information concerning street life in Louisville."¹⁸² Through such accounting, the investigators made it clear that their interview techniques gained them access to vivid details about working as night messengers that would be unavailable to non-specialists or untrained researchers.

Through these interviews, messengers became the primary source in the NMS investigation, and investigators laid out this connection clearly. The situation in the night messenger service really precluded other traditional arrangements. As adults, NCLC employees could not go undercover and seek employment as messengers as other down-and-out investigators did. Furthermore, messenger companies were not complete sources because the boys spent a large portion of their time on the job outside of the office, running errands and delivering telegrams (and, as investigators discovered, some companies contributed to the NMS problem). In order to know about the messenger service, investigators had to speak with messengers. Given this situation, investigators emphasized that they collected data directly from messengers; they implicitly and explicitly claimed that report information was "secured from messenger boys themselves," as Harry Bremer asserted in his West Virginia report.¹⁸³ The messengers were "eye witnesses."¹⁸⁴ This direct contact legitimated the data provided by the investigators in their reports and grounded their authority.

Despite this understanding, NCLC investigators sometimes injected doubt as they recounted messengers' tales. They approached the boys' testimony with skepticism. For instance, Brown wrote that the messengers "claimed to be eye witnesses" to hot scenes at bawdy shows.¹⁸⁵ He presented this account as a "claim," though, not a fact. As a trained

researcher, Brown used his discretion to determine the actual situation in the night messenger service. Mirroring some of Kellor's fear of misleading sources, Barrows questioned the account of one of his interviewees. He quoted seventeen-year-old Joseph Kramer's claim that a woman at a "nice flat" in the affluent neighborhood greeted him naked and tried to get him to sleep with her.¹⁸⁶ After these remarks, Barrows included in parenthesis, "Undoubtedly the boy was exaggerating this incident, though probably the naked woman invited him in. – E.M.B."¹⁸⁷ In each case, the NCLC agents assessed, filtered, and interpreted the responses they collected. One agent's assessment was then tested and reviewed against additional field work by the same agent, by different investigators, and in other cities. The NCLC positioned their claims as technical arguments on the foundation of this skepticism and their process of peer review.

As an additional check, investigators also questioned an array of other sources and "competent witness[es]" to further test and legitimize the NMS accounts.¹⁸⁸ For instance, in the West Virginia NMS investigation, Bremer maintained that his report was "informed" by the testimony of a Western Union manager.¹⁸⁹ In other cases, an unnamed "county detective" or hearsay from prostitutes supplied proof of the messengers' exposure to vice.¹⁹⁰ Charles L. Chute verified his observations with "Prominent social workers."¹⁹¹ These competent witnesses were professionals, other trained experts whose status and education further validated the NCLC's research findings.

Aiming for technical standards of replicability, the NCLC field agents carefully relayed how they verified the data they received in their interviews. Sometimes the agents' process of checking information was vague, but it was regularly affirmed. The messengers or manager's accounts were "afterwards verified" or "absolutely" verified by

"other sources of information."¹⁹² Investigators developed various means of corroborating the information they received. Brown showed a list of bawdy houses compiled by messengers "to reputable local persons familiar with conditions in the two cities" and vouched that "they all verified the character of the addresses given."¹⁹³ Agents also used the testimony of other messengers to corroborate messengers' accounts. If the brothels pointed out by one messenger matched the brothels identified by another, this data was deemed to be trustworthy.¹⁹⁴

As time passed, agents increasingly marshaled past, present, and future social science research to corroborate and further legitimate their results. Agent's statements on one hand alluded to the wealth of data supporting their theses, such as when Bremer asserted, "I could review other instances... but they are too tedious to mention in print."¹⁹⁵ Jones and Bremer, working in 1913 and 1914, regularly referred to the research completed by former NCLC agents. Aiming for technical credibility, they framed their investigations as replicable and testable. In his Virginia report, Bremer claimed that in "every case the findings corroborated the results of our former investigations."¹⁹⁶ Jones echoed this strategy, arguing that a "fuller account" of the night messenger service in Kentucky could be obtained by reference to the earlier NCLC report conducted by "Mr. Brown and Mr. Barrows."¹⁹⁷ When these accounts were not available, investigators asserted that the information could be readily collected if needed. When arguing that the messenger service led to delinquency, the West Virginia investigator asserted, "A canvass of such places [state reform institutions] today would corroborate this."¹⁹⁸ In each of these statements, NCLC agents asserted that their results had been and could be amassed and verified through additional scientific research.

In this way, investigators triangulated their data, making a case for the replicability of their studies. Their own first-hand experience of messenger work formed the foundation of their reports. Their undercover stories helped them collect candid information from messengers, and then the investigators triangulated this data against interviews with city reformers and telegraph company management. Bremer stood behind the information in his West Virginia account, claiming that the information was "secured from messenger boys themselves and from the managers of offices of both of the messenger companies."¹⁹⁹ The methodical, experiential, and source-rich approach to the investigations of the night messenger service imbued the findings with an air of scientific objectivity grounded in the rhetoric of the social sciences and positioned in the technical sphere of argument.

NMS agents used style to assert this accuracy in their reports. In 1904, the NYCLC's reports were rich in detail. The secretary questioned messengers and then summarized the information he collected in his reports, but Paulding did not quote the messengers. When the NCLC reinitiated investigations of the NMS in 1909, their reports maintained the detail of earlier work, but they also relayed full conversations and included extended quotations from interviews. For example, Brown related his phone conversation with a Western Union telegraph manager in which he began, "I want a messenger who knows the town thoroughly. One who can show me where things are doing?" The manager answered, "I know the kind you want. I can fix up fine."²⁰⁰ The investigators asserted the veracity of their accounts by representing this back and forth flow of dialogue, but their use of quotations heightened their claims by assuming to represent their interactions verbatim. Exactness was a growing requirement as reformers

positioned their work as technical argument. Undercover investigators stylistically assumed this precision in their reports with extended conversations and quotations even though they did not have the technology to achieve this accuracy. In this way, the four NCLC agents projected an unquestioned accuracy for their accounts. They assumed that what they saw, what they knew, what they experienced, and what they remembered consisted of credible research data, largely unadulterated by their own subjectivity.

In such ways, NMS investigators, like their social science colleagues, aligned their research with the natural sciences and positioned their investigations within the technical sphere of argument. They relied upon first-hand observations and experiences. They methodically collected evidence through undercover interviews. And they ordered their accounts in a systematic manner. Through this work, anti-child labor investigators upheld the standards of emerging social scientific research. Their reports bore the hallmarks of technical sphere arguments by privileging scientific knowledge, drawing on the skills of a trained observer, mimicking the conventions of scientific discourse, following a consistent method of research, providing a careful accounting of their procedure, and building their case inductively. They used these methods to describe and interpret the position of children in the messenger service. In the process, they laid out a definition of childhood, its markers and appropriate contexts.

SCIENTIFICALLY COLLECTED TALES OF ADOLESCENCE

Using social scientific methods, investigators collected and assessed the participation of adolescents in the messenger service. Their scientific commitments directed the focus of their research and their conclusions. They paid special attention to messengers' ages, hours of work, environments, knowledge, and responsibilities. In

focusing on these markers, NMS investigators reinforced newly-emerging delineations between adolescence and adulthood that used scientific inquiry to establish what environments were appropriate for children. The NCLC conducted a systematic, nationwide study of the night messenger service, which led them to roundly condemn the employment of adolescent messengers. They concluded that the work was inappropriate because it forced young boys into immoral spaces and contacts. They built their case for this condemnation through scientific social investigations, which helped them to identify the extent, evils, and results of child labor in the night messenger service.

Agents declared their commitment to modern notions of childhood by carefully recording the ages of the messengers. This evidence helped to quantify the extent of child labor in the NMS. For centuries, age was an inconsequential marker. Parents and children did not keep track of birthdates, so many people did not know how old they were. Under the influence of the Child Study Movement, though, specific ages became associated with developmental milestones and appropriate influences.²⁰¹ State legislatures enacted laws that recognized ten-year-olds and eventually older youths as protected laborers. Children, desiring to work, frequently claimed to be just old enough so that they were beyond the control of child labor regulations.²⁰² Between boys who did not know how old they were and boys who lied about their age, reformers faced significant challenges as they attempted to discover the age of existing messengers and, in turn, the extent of child labor in the messenger service.

Given these challenges, child labor investigators relied on their training as researchers to ascertain the ages of messengers. NYCLC and NCLC agents recorded how old a messenger *claimed* to be, but they usually also observed how old a boy *looked* to

be.²⁰³ One boy said he was sixteen, but Brown asserted, "he looks nearer 14." Another boy told Brown he was 21, but he did not "look more than eighteen."²⁰⁴ Researchers recorded and interpreted the information they collected; they coupled the messengers' testimony with their own observations. At times, they provided explanations for their interpretations. For example, a New York boy, according to a researcher, did "not seem to be truthful in stating his age." First, the messenger claimed to be fifteen, but later he "insisted that he was sixteen."²⁰⁵ NMS investigators interviewed messengers as their primary sources, but they still scrutinized this testimony. Paulding frequently interjected his own reckoning of a messenger's age. Of one messenger who came to his office, he noted, "Said he was 16 years old and looked as if he might be."²⁰⁶ Later investigators made the same judgment calls. In 1910, Barrows noted that one Kentucky messenger was a "refined looking boy of sixteen, apparently."²⁰⁷ In these examples, the authors wrote as if a messenger's age was externally unmistakable to their trained eyes.

In the absence of reliable birth records, NMS investigators gauged a boy's age by his size, clothing, and date of confirmation.²⁰⁸ They presumed to know the markers that distinguished a fourteen-year-old from a sixteen-year-old. Paulding, for instance, distrusted one "little bit of a kid" who said he was "17 but looks 14 or 15."²⁰⁹ Other investigators noted a messengers' size as well as the length of his pants, for a boy's clothes marked his status as either a child or an adult. Barrows accordingly described a lad as a "youthful looking boy in knee trousers."²¹⁰ Jones used the same logic. He noted that one messenger who claimed to be eighteen still "wore short trousers and was undersized for a boy of that age."²¹¹ If the reader trusted the investigators' estimates, two possible conclusions followed. Either messenger boys were lying to keep their positions,

or working in the night messenger service dwarfed boys' growth. Nonetheless, child labor investigators assumed in their projections that certain physical markers reliably signaled specific ages to the trained eye. In addition to physical characteristics, researchers also depended on the best records they had available. Therefore, a lad raised suspicions when he told the investigator that he was fourteen but "Seemed very hazy concerning his confirmation."²¹² Baptism and confirmation records provided some of the best documentation of age when other birth records did not exist, and social scientists relied on these religious and legal sources for their research into social conditions. When a boy dodged, evaded, or hesitated to give such information, investigators quickly suspected deception. Whether physical markers or confirmation dates, investigators wrote confidently of their ability to guess messengers' ages.

Agents commonly coupled their observations of a boy's physical characteristics, his height, facial features, and carriage, with assessments of his health and character. A New York child labor reformer in 1904 took down Albert Mitsehelli's age, hours, wages, and schooling, and concluded, "Seems thoroughly honest."²¹³ While investigators regularly made these brief conclusions, they were rarely complementary. In line with the science of the day, NMS investigators frequently linked a boys' size with social and moral shortcomings. Brown found Walter to be "a stunted lad, ill-bred and wasted for his years."²¹⁴ Similarly, Jones reported that Dewey Harrod, a sixteen-year-old messenger, was "stunted in growth" and concluded, "His body was small enough for a boy of 15, but his face was old enough for a man with years of dissipation to his discredit."²¹⁵ These messengers were still young, but they were *stunted*, *wasted*, and *dissipated*. Agents spoke of them in terms of unrealized potential. These assessments regularly appeared in the

NMS reports and reinforced circulating connections between physical fitness and morals.²¹⁶ In 1913, Jones highlighted one boy's "stooped shoulders" and his "dull, almost sullen manner."²¹⁷ Joseph Kramer, according to Barrows, was "a dark, stolid, unimaginative youth."²¹⁸ In each case, investigators conflated a boy's appearance with his character. They assumed that their expertise equipped them to make these assessments.

In these remarks, investigators extended their analysis beyond observable physical characteristics. They proceeded to make judgments about a messenger's mental potential and moral state. Investigators assumed that they were able to accurately gauge a messenger's character as easily as his age. Brown described Sheffert as an "overgrown and wasted youth" who was "colorless and irregular." He concluded, "His physical appearance bespeaks his wayward life."²¹⁹ Brown herein explicitly linked character with appearance, and by this move, he reinforced that such traits could be observed and studied with social science methods. While a New York investigator concluded that Arthur Gros was a "[v]ery bright, intelligent lad," he ultimately regretted that the boy appeared to be "up to all the dodges of the trade."²²⁰ It was a case of sapped or misplaced potential. Eight years later, Brown found a messenger named Max also to be "an intelligent lad." The investigator asserted that it was "plain" that Max "would have been much better off had he never come in contact with night life. It has left its marks on him."²²¹ Such marks were a matter of great concern for reformers, for they portended future evil. Max was marked by his contact with night life. Walter was wasted beyond his years. Sheffert was an overgrown degenerate. Dewey's face reflected years of dissipation. Investigators found these boys to show physical and mental characteristics that were

inconsonant with their ages. These adolescents' minds and bodies had "ripened" prematurely under the influence of nocturnal urban vice.

Researching undercover, NMS investigators also observed the boys' habits in order to gauge whether their work was age-appropriate according to modern theories of adolescence. In this attention, these researchers ceded to the advice of boy experts. In the early 1900s, many experts feared the loss of vigor among American adolescents and recommended regular routines and productive habits as a preventative.²²² Instead, field agents wrote that telegraph managers and messengers alike reported that boys quickly learned to smoke on duty. It was seemingly the "first habit" or "first thing" messengers learned after joining the service.²²³ Barrows even counted the number of cigarettes Joseph Kramer smoked in one outing and reported that the youth smoked eight cigarettes over three and a half hours even though they spent a large part of that time in "places where smoking was impracticable."²²⁴ Just a few years later, Bremer commented, "It seems like a messenger boy cannot content himself without smoking cigarettes."²²⁵ The NMS investigators established the extent of child labor in the messenger service by recording how old each boy was, but they made a case for how this work was inappropriate for messengers by recording the boys' habits and irregular lifestyles.

In noting the boys' habits, researchers also sought out and reported the boys' use and experience with alcohol and drugs. The investigators collected first-hand accounts from messengers who boasted that prostitutes commonly offered them "drinks and smokes."²²⁶ NCLC agents also saw saloon keepers willingly serve alcohol to adolescents. Clopper and Barrows ordered beer at a bar and suggested a soft drink for the messenger, but the bartender showed "a perfect willingness to serve him [the messenger] anything he

wanted." (In the end, the lad "followed Clopper's suggestion and took a phosphate.")²²⁷ A different messenger admitted to Barrows that a lot of the boys drank.²²⁸ Messengers in Kentucky, New York, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania also spoke of being sent to pick up opium, cocaine, and heroin for prostitutes and other customers. The boys told of their errands and were able to provide particulars about drug use. A boy in 1909 detailed for Barrows how opium was packaged in "little shells of Chinese nuts" and smoked in an "ordinary pipe."²²⁹ Adolescent messengers proved to undercover investigators that they knew where and how to get drugs, and despite statements to the contrary, investigators suspected some boys of the opium habit. An early investigator recorded seeing a special messenger who cooked opium pills for "a white woman who was a slave to a Chinaman" and had "taken the habit himself," and he cautioned that in Chinatown "there were 20 boys like him."²³⁰ During a later round of investigations, Brown suspected another messenger of being a "victim of the opium habit." The boy denied it, "of course." Trusting his expertise and training, Brown recorded in his report the signs of addiction that he observed. The youth had a "peculiar face" and "rambling talk."²³¹ Investigators carefully noted their methods of questioning and observing messengers, and on this basis, they confidently sketched out the habits of these boys.

Undercover investigators of the NMS found plenty of evidence of young children serving as messengers, and when investigators interviewed messengers they found further evidence of the boys' physical, mental, and moral deterioration. The investigators' observations and experience of the city streets at night served as the foundation of their credibility and authority as researchers. Messengers' observations and experience became the basis on which they eventually were censored and restricted.

Recording Adolescent Messengers' Experiences with Vice

Day messengers and night messengers alike saw a lot of the city, but the night messengers saw the "sights," the exciting scenes of urban nights. Both groups of boys ran errands and carried messages to neighborhoods across districts. Some people even comically said that the abbreviation A.D.T. stood for "All Day Trotters" rather than American District Telegraph.²³² "Trotting" around afforded boys a chance to see all sides of the urban landscape. Yet, a Kentucky messenger bemoaned that on the day force, "You don't see anything."²³³ In contrast, a Pennsylvania night messenger boasted, "There is always something to see worth while [sic]."²³⁴ Investigators recorded many comments like this one. In the NMS there was always "something to see."²³⁵ It was the "job to see things in."²³⁶ On night duty a boy saw "sights."²³⁷ NCLC agents carefully registered messengers' accounts of their exposure to the city's sights.

NCLC agents filled their reports with specific tales of the "worth while" sights that messengers saw, including violent pimps, bawdy shows, drunken women, and countless brothels.²³⁸ The primary NCLC investigators (Barrows, Brown, Bremer, and Jones) repeatedly recorded messengers' tales of seeing half-dressed or naked women. Messengers saw women "without much clothes on," "with nothing on except a shirt," "without a stitch of clothes on," or just plain "stark naked."²³⁹ As one boy told an undercover investigator, "We see pretty nearly everything that goes on."²⁴⁰ Such sights introduced messengers fully to the sordid underworld of cities.

Along with what messengers saw, investigators also noted what the boys knew. Messengers and managers alike told of how these boys ventured to all sides of the city. Brown asked a telegraph operator to be sure to send him a messenger who knew the

"sporty side" of the town. He received the clerk's short reply, "They all know it here."²⁴¹ The author of an anti-child labor playlet condemningly called messengers "knowin'" ones, but on the streets, messengers proudly supported this pronouncement.²⁴² One boy boasted, "we kids is wise."²⁴³ In this configuration, knowledge became the problem, according to reformers.

With few exceptions, messengers displayed an extensive knowledge of the addresses, rates, and reputations of local disorderly houses. Over the course of a three-hour tour, one messenger pointed out sixty-three "houses of prostitution."²⁴⁴ Two years later, Brown met a messenger named Thomas who "from memory without any outside assistance" gave "the direction of ninety-nine houses of ill-fame."²⁴⁵ In 1912, Brown made an "arrangement" with the management of Western Union in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to inspect their messenger force. He asked the boys to write down from memory all the houses of prostitution that they could remember being sent to. The ten Western Union messengers listed off 333 houses. Brown did not think that this method yielded as candid results as undercover interviews. He commented, "This list might have been much longer had it not been for four of the messengers who were suspicious and reluctant to place themselves on record in the presence of Mr. Green, the manager."²⁴⁶ The manager's presence potentially skewed the results, but regardless, the boys showed that their work made them familiar with vice.

Many boys explained that knowing the "seamy" side of life was a central part of their job. Messenger number 105 in Philadelphia exclaimed, "Know. Why that's my business to know. A fellow must know all about that on this job."²⁴⁷ Another boy retorted to Barrows disbelief, "Why, sure. A messenger has to go wherever he's sent, no matter

where."²⁴⁸ When asked how they knew so much about brothels, messengers frequently responded that they got "lots of calls" from brothels.²⁴⁹ The boys readily told undercover investigators that the *majority* of their calls were to the Tenderloin. Postal Telegraph messenger number 105 even explained, "If it were not for this business [in the vice district] the office could close up."²⁵⁰ Messengers regularly conveyed that their work did not just expose them to vice but that it forced them into close association with the people and habits of urban night life. After interviewing New York messengers, Barrows concluded, "most of the night messenger calls take them to places which offer temptations towards dishonesty, intemperance, and immorality."²⁵¹ In a frank conversation with Barrows, Mr. Montague of the Y.M.C.A. mourned, "There's not an evil aspect of things that these boys aren't thrown right into and in fact paid to mix into."²⁵² Indeed, it paid well to know the city. Messengers who knew the resorts well got the lucrative jobs of "escorting sight-seeing" parties around to various sporting houses.²⁵³ In a way, a messenger was responsible for knowing vice as a part of his job.

More than just knowledge, NCLC agents repeatedly referred to the boys' *familiarity* with the details of sordid night life. Investigators described how the messengers exchanged "familiar greetings" with prostitutes as they made their way down the streets.²⁵⁴ Montague relayed to Barrows that the messengers "learned the names of the girls and prided themselves on their familiarity with them."²⁵⁵ Barrows decreed that the Tenderloin was "plainly very familiar" to one boy. On the night streets he was "perfectly at home and at his ease."²⁵⁶ Jones observed that another boy showed "complete familiarity with the whole vice district."²⁵⁷ These comments implied that messengers knew and were comfortable in these environments. With gravity, Brown pronounced,

"Even now you can see little fellows in knee pants on the night job who could tell you more about the red light in town than any policeman."²⁵⁸ Messenger boys, who as children were supposed to be sheltered from immoral influences, became experts in vice. These lads quickly learned about vice because they shuttled messages back and forth between jailed prostitutes and their pimps. Western Union messenger No. 479 in New York City told Brown, "after a while you get to know all the pimps, and you know just where to find 'em."²⁵⁹ The boy and his colleagues boasted about this knowledge and street savviness, but reformers like Brown recorded these details with disbelief.

Using the messengers' testimony, investigators connected the boys' familiarity with vice to their access to the city, which they gained through their positions. When messengers boasted about what they saw and knew, NCLC agents probed them for how this was possible given that they were so young. The boys regularly explained that their uniform was their passport to vice. Like Gregory Downey argues in "Running Somewhere between Men and Women," messengers occupied a privileged space that gave them access to restricted areas and goods.²⁶⁰ A New York messenger bragged about his privileges. He told Barrows, "In this uniform I can go anywhere and no one will say a word, and people know they can ask me to do anything."²⁶¹ Bremer came to a similar conclusion, commenting, "Messenger boys, in uniform, have free access to all business houses and dwellings."²⁶² Although some companies instituted policies that forbade messengers from entering into brothels, many boys flouted these rules. Brown, Bremer, Barrows, Chute, and Jones all recorded boys' tales of their access to profligate women – in the doorway, the parlor, and the "girl's room."²⁶³

The messenger boy's uniform also gave them access to illegal substances. They were frequently able to secure opium from "Chinamen," heroin from shady druggists, and alcohol from saloons after hours.²⁶⁴ When wearing a uniform, a Kentucky messenger boasted to Barrows that he could get alcohol "almost anywhere in town" even after the saloons were closed.²⁶⁵ In several accounts, messengers told NCLC agents about being sent to pick up knock out drops, which were purportedly used to knock out and rob johns. On at least one occasion, a NCLC agent dispatched a messenger to buy knock out drops, which he then sent off to be analyzed by a lab. In this way, the chemist's scientific analysis further corroborated the technical report of the NMS investigator. The lab reported that the knockout drops consisted "of red coated pills which contain opium."²⁶⁶ And while some messengers were unfamiliar with drugs, others embroiled themselves into the habit and the business.²⁶⁷ More than familiar observers, messengers told of their active participation in this world.

The messengers boasted openly of their intimate involvement in the vice district, a world beyond the ken of their families and, according to adolescent psychology, the proper realm of children. They reportedly joined in prostitutes' schemes to rob johns and evade the police.²⁶⁸ They assembled for weekly games of craps where some "fellows would lose all they had."²⁶⁹ They learned to overcharge, skim, cheat, and swindle customers.²⁷⁰ A New York boy admitted that overcharging was dishonest but explained that he'd "got the habit."²⁷¹ Besides, as an unnamed Philadelphia messenger told Brown in 1910, "All the boys do it."²⁷² In these tales, investigators recorded that messengers knew *and* regularly participated in the world of vice.

Across the reports, though, NCLC agents most frequently probed and recorded the boasts of messengers who visited prostitutes.²⁷³ Many messengers confidently recommended disorderly houses on the basis of their own experience. A sixteen-year-old boy pointed out a house of ill fame to Barrows as they walked along: "I've been there many a time and know several of the girls there. It's a swell place and an expensive one . . . It's a safe place, too. It's on the square."²⁷⁴ John Meyer, or messenger No. 29, assured Jones, "That's the best place over there . . . That's where I go myself."²⁷⁵ Messengers' uniforms granted them access to all parts of the city, and these adolescent boys expanded on their access to become regular participants in the world in which they worked. They were active members in an adult culture of vice.

The Messenger's Ruinous Trajectory

As NCLC agents described these interactions, they narrated the messenger's progression from innocence to degradation under the influence of the night streets.²⁷⁶ They depicted the hopeful stage of adolescence polluted by urban vice when children prematurely departed from the safety of private homes and entered into the unruly public sphere. Fourteen, fifteen, and sixteen-year-old boys were, as Barrows recorded, "of a bad age . . . for such work." Montague chimed in with Barrows noting that at that age boys had "already excited minds."²⁷⁷ Echoing research on adolescence, the NMS investigators cast boys as subject to overstimulation and in need of protection. Basing his perspective off the same assumptions, an older messenger named Graubard warned that the NMS "ruins a young boy."²⁷⁸ The problem was that the NMS would lead boys to disorderly houses before their "time." An early NYCLC report described one such devolution, that of twelve-year-old Harry. Harry "must have been a bright, attractive little chap," but in

the service "the spirit of the place got into his blood." He began gambling, spending time with "the younger crooks," and staying "two nights of every week in a hideous place." The extracted report concluded: "By sixteen his face was as terrible as the face of a leper. A few months later he died."²⁷⁹ In this way, investigators' descriptions of the NMS framed adolescence as a fundamentally different stage of life that justified establishing legal distinctions between adolescence and adulthood. Harry's story and other cautionary tales warned of the effects of leaving this situation unchecked. In their reports, the special agents of the NCLC provided a technical accounting of their research and grounded it in emerging theories of adolescent psychology.

Interpreting their research through modern conceptions of childhood, field agents identified the space of messenger work as a corrupting agent. Morally and physically, the red light district was described as a place of danger. Researchers documented this danger through medical histories. Brown and Barrows both encountered boys who admitted to having caught "a dose" or "the clap" from a prostitute.²⁸⁰ Charles Fox told Brown that he had been "laid up" in the hospital for nine months with "a disease" he "got from one of the women in the tenderloin."²⁸¹ NMS agents recorded case after case of venereal diseases. They also built their argument about the threat of urban environments by recounting messengers' own accounts of the dangers. Messengers confided in undercover investigators about the risk of being assaulted while out alone. Many messengers in New York City reportedly carried revolvers.²⁸² In 1912, Philadelphia messengers feared getting in the way of warring "gangs of pimps" who would go into a "whore house" and "shoot the place up."²⁸³

Investigators also recounted tales of sexual predators, male and female.²⁸⁴

Barrows and Clopper's guide in Louisville, a lad in "knee trousers" who still had "a treble in his voice," warned that a man lately had been "loafing around" a certain spot and "tried to get" him several times.²⁸⁵ It was only on the night after this exchange that Barrows, the undercover agent, systematic researcher, and child labor reformer, realized that he also might be perceived as a threat. He called for an A.D.T. messenger but found that the boy could not, or would not, give him any information about the vice district. He wrote up the interaction accordingly:

I expressed some surprise and questioned him enough to assure myself that his ignorance was genuine and not feigned, for he was plainly nervous, over his situation, and evidently suspicious of me. Then it suddenly occurred [sic] to me that the boy undoubtedly was down here on one of his first trips and that he probably suspected me of having the same designs on him as did the negro on our guide of the night before. So I promptly tipped him and let him go.²⁸⁶

This boy represented the adolescent innocence that was so quickly lost amid the immoral contacts of urban environments.

In this way, NCLC field agents recorded messengers' trajectories from promising child to stunted youth. Lads, investigators readily stressed, were destroying their futures by working as night messengers. Urban messengers had few chances to advance internally in the telegraph industry, and many boys reported that they became stuck in the business.²⁸⁷ A Pennsylvania messenger tried to leave the service after being laid up in the hospital with a sexually transmitted infection; he reported, "I tried to do other work, but I failed."²⁸⁸ The NMS held a "fascination" that was hard to "resist," as a Kentucky

messenger claimed.²⁸⁹ It offered boys a sense of independence. They saw the city. They knew the town. They were actively a part of the urban night life. Investigators delved into this world of the messengers, recorded the boys' participation in city life, and condemned it. The NCLC NMS researchers presented the results of their studies clearly. The NMS meant ruin for boys. If anti-child labor legislation passed, Bremer concluded, "West Virginia will have citizens in the next decade." If it did not pass, West Virginia (and other states that made the same choice) would instead have "an overflow of criminals at the State Institutions."²⁹⁰

CONCLUSION

This rhetorical history analyzes the anti-child labor movement's efforts to align itself with science by adopting the strategies of sociology, the methods of downclassing, and the assumptions of psychology in the NMS reform campaign. In these alignments, this campaign illustrates broader shifts in the technical sphere of argument in the early 1900s. The NMS campaign came at an interesting moment, arising as social scientists were still working to demarcate their field of study. In the early days of sociology, both academic sociologists and religious reformers participated in the discipline's conversations. Yet, beset with the newcomer's dilemma, sociologists worked to establish their own science by distancing themselves from practical reforms starting around 1900. They tried to exclude religious reformers and charity workers from participating in their emerging technical sphere of argument.²⁹¹ Following closely after this debate, NMS investigators positioned their reports as technical accounts.

Examining the arguments of this case directs attention to questions of audience and argument cultures. Child labor organizations, telegraph and messenger executives,

and legislative committee members formed the audience for the NMS reports.²⁹² Over the course of the NMS campaign, these three audiences accepted and, if the success of the campaign can be used as a gauge, valued these technical claims. I argue that the investigator's choices of content, structure, style, and circulation functioned strategically. For the NMS investigators and their reform colleagues, technical arguments served as an identity marker, positioning their social reforms on a plane with scientific investigations of society. In the Progressive Era, this position entailed credibility, authority, and legitimacy—three necessary ingredients for this era's reform campaigns.

For the telegraph and messenger companies, this technical approach to argument importantly espoused objectivity. At root, the investigators implied in their reports that these companies were either complicit in the degradation of American youth or oblivious to facets of their own business. Child labor committees later publicly partnered with some of these companies. Cooperation between the child labor committees and messenger companies seems unlikely had the reports adopted a more emotional, explicitly value-laden, or accusatory tone rather than a tenor of scientific objectivity. I argue that this choice reflected the rhetorical savviness of anti-child labor leaders.

Finally, for state legislative committees, these technical accounts provided a successful foundation for multiple legislative initiatives. In these reports, NCLC agents aligned their work with science, relied upon inductive reasoning, provided clear statements of procedure, offered replicable methods, and evidenced their claims with statistics (however rudimentary). To the twenty-first century reader, these reports lack the technical jargon and structures that would imply expert discourse, but to the early twentieth-century reader, these reports carried the hallmarks of the technical arguments

being standardized within the social sciences. Additionally, NCLC investigators drafted technical reports *and* served as public advocates of legislative regulation. Their ability to construct their arguments in the technical sphere and later shift these arguments into the public sphere highlights the permeability of arguments and flexibility of arguers across the blurry lines of the Progressive Era's spheres of argument. Legislative committees required increasingly higher standards of expertise and specialized knowledge in the following years. The technical NMS reports nodded to this shifting landscape, but demonstrate the permeability of spheres that persisted throughout the NMS campaign.

Constructing their argument within the technical sphere, the NMS investigators then offered an analysis of childhood in line with contemporary theories of psychology. The messengers described to undercover investigators a life of independence. They knew their districts. They saw the *sights*. They had access to the whole city. There was danger, but they armed themselves. Investigators used their expert status to condemn these expressions of independence; the NMS agents recorded the messenger's tales of independence as transgressions against childhood. In such descriptions, child labor reformers laid out what places, times, and relationships were inappropriate for children. Field agents defined adolescence's needs and bounds in their reports. In this vision, adolescence became defined by habits, knowledge, sight, experience, and relationships, and the middle-class reformer became the primary assessor of these boundaries. Urban city streets, nights, sexual knowledge, sapped vigor, and guile formed the antithesis of the child; the night messenger service served as a foil to ideal constructions of adolescence. The campaigns that followed the NMS investigations worked to further catalyze these definitions and boundaries.

End Notes: Chapter Two

¹ Edward F. Brown, report from New York, March 2, 1910, box 36, folder 22, New York Child Labor Committee Records, State Library of New York, Albany, New York. From here on out, this archival collection will be referred to as NYCLC MSS.

² Mark Pittenger uses the term "down-and-outers" to refer to middle- and upper-class investigators who went undercover to live as vagrants or as members of the working-class. Other scholars have used different terminology. Eric Schocket uses the term "class transvestite." Patrick Chura refers to this activity as "downclassing." Toby Higbie writes of this activity as crossing class boundaries. See Mark Pittenger, "A World of Difference: Constructing the 'Underclass' in Progressive America," *American Quarterly* 49, no. 1 (March 1997): 26–65; Mark Pittenger, *Class Unknown: Undercover Investigations of American Work and Poverty from the Progressive Era to the Present* (New York: New York University Press, 2012); Patrick Chura, *Vital Contact: Downclassing Journeys in American Literature from Herman Melville to Richard Wright* (New York: Routledge, 2005); Patrick J. Chura, "'Vital Contact': Eugene O'Neill and the Working Class," *Twentieth Century Literature* 49, no. 4 (2003): 520–46; Eric Schocket, "Undercover Explorations of the 'Other Half,' or the Writer as Class Transvestite," *Representations* 64 (Autumn 1998): 109–33; Toby Higbie, "Crossing Class Boundaries: Tramp Ethnographers and Narratives of Class in Progressive Era America," *Social Science History* 21, no. 4 (Winter 1997): 559–92.

³ Mrs. John Van Vorst and Marie Van Vorst, *The Woman Who Toils: Being the Experiences of Two Ladies as Factory Girls* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1903), 4.

⁴ Rowland, “Spheres of Argument”; Zarefsky, “Goodnight’s ‘Speculative Inquiry’ in Its Intellectual Context”; Goodnight, “The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres: A Note on 21st Century Critical Communication”; Keränen, “Mapping Misconduct”; Avon Whidden, “Maternal Expertise, Vaccination Recommendations, and the Complexity of Argument Spheres”; Boyd, “Public and Technical Interdependence: Regulatory Controversy, Out-Law Discourse, and the Messy Case of Olestra.”

⁵ In the wake of the Enlightenment, figures like John Locke prioritized inductive processes like probability and knowledge through experience. His methods became a foundation stone for technical argument. Gerard A. Hauser, “On Publics and Public Spheres: A Response to Phillips,” *Communication Monographs* 64, no. 3 (1997): 277; John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (T. Tegg and Son, 1836), 500-08.

⁶ Scholarly accounts of the formation of technical sphere vary. Robert Rowland quickly noted that American public discourse has relied on experts since the 1920s. As will come out later, this assertion is conservative. Olson and Goodnight provide a stronger history when they trace the instantiation of the technical sphere in the dramatic changes of the nineteenth century. Rowland, “The Relationship between the Public and the Technical Spheres of Argument,” 143; Kathryn M. Olson and G. Thomas Goodnight, “Epochal Rhetoric in 19th-Century America: On the Discursive Instantiation of the Technical Sphere,” in *Spheres of Argument: Proceedings of the Sixth SCA/AFA*

Conference on Argumentation, ed. Bruce E. Gronbeck (Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1989), 57.

⁷ David Zarefsky, "Reflections on Making the Case," in *Making the Case: Advocacy and Judgment in Public Argument*, ed. Kathryn M. Olson et al. (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2012), 3, <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/umd/reader.action?docID=10603801>; Zarefsky, "Goodnight's 'Speculative Inquiry' in Its Intellectual Context," 213; Asen et al., "The Research Says"; Rowland, "The Relationship between the Public and the Technical Spheres of Argument"; Goodnight, "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument," 630.

⁸ Sovacool, "Spheres of Argument Concerning Oil Exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge," 353.

⁹ Paliewicz, "Global Warming and the Interaction Between the Public and Technical Spheres of Argument," 232.

¹⁰ Carmack, "Social and Tertiary Health Identities as Argument," 466; Goodnight, "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument," 630; Keränen, "Mapping Misconduct."

¹¹ The specific dynamics of this overlap will be covered starting in the next section. In short, though, solely in terms of participation, academic sociologists (read: experts) became the leaders of child-saving reform (nontechnical sphere). Protestant ministers (read: lay participants) became field agents for professional organizations (technical sphere).

¹² Lawrence Prelli argues that there are particular strategies for building credibility within the rhetoric of science that can be accessed as *topoi* by rhetors. My argument extends from this work. Lawrence J. Prelli, "The Rhetorical Construction of Scientific Ethos," in *Rhetoric in the Human Sciences*, ed. Herbert W. Simons (London: Sage Publications, 1989), 48–68.

¹³ John Louis Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement: Social Science and Progressive-Era Reform in New York City* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 2; Robin E. Jensen, "Using Science to Argue for Sexual Education in U.S. Public Schools: Dr. Ella Flagg Young and the 1913 'Chicago Experiment,'" *Science Communication* 29, no. 2 (2007): 222, doi:10.1177/1075547007309101; DeGraw, "Untangling the 'Snare of Preparation': The Chicago Social Settlement Movement and Its Relationship with the University of Michigan in the 1880s," 128; Christian Smith, "Secularizing American Higher Education: The Case of Early American Sociology," in *The Secular Revolution: Power, Interests, and Conflict in the Secularization of American Public Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 105.

Science had only recently assumed this position of privilege. Christian Smith writes, "American science in the mid-nineteenth century enjoyed little of the resources, disciplinary definition, social status, and institutional power that science later came to possess in the twentieth century. Science at that time was ill-formed and ill-funded, the scattered work primarily of independent amateurs collecting bits of information about the world."

¹⁴ Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 18; Jensen, "Using Science to Argue for Sexual Education," 222; Applegarth, *Rhetoric in American Anthropology*, 13.

¹⁵ Ella Flagg Young, "Scientific Method in Education," in *The Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, vol. 3 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1903), 143,
http://books.google.com/books?id=tWxMAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA144&lpg=PA144&dq=%22attitude+of+the+scientist+is+that+of+the+intelligent+seeker+after+truth%22&source=bl&ots=e2TR1jOKMN&sig=v_N-IUYetlFOu3Ki78h3tTB2eKY&hl=en&sa=X&ei=WJ8xU7mAFM6L0QHG_4GgAQ&ved=0CEMQ6AEwAw#v=onepage&q&f=false.

¹⁶"The Crusade Against Vivisection," *Cosmopolitan Magazine*, May 1910, 711–13.

¹⁷ Social Darwinism, as Martha Watson and Thomas Burkholder claim, exerted a strong influence on turn-of-the-century discourse and undergirded a diverse set of causes from capitalism to woman suffrage. Watson and Burkholder, "Introduction: The Gilded Age and the New America."

¹⁸ Jensen, *Dirty Words*, 34.

¹⁹ Owen R. Lovejoy, "Age Problems in Industrial Hygiene," *American Journal of Public Hygiene* 20, no. 2 (1910): 234.

²⁰ Albion Small also claimed that the physical "sciences have become the sources of knowledge that has transformed and reconstructed the very foundations of human thought!" Smith, "Introduction," 4; A. W. Small, "The Era of Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology* 1, no. 1 (July 1895): 12.

²¹ Young, "Scientific Method in Education," 144; Jensen, "Using Science to Argue for Sexual Education," 222.

²² Jensen, *Dirty Words*, 55.

²³ Samuel Haber, *Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

²⁴ McGerr, *A Fierce Discontent*, 85; Jensen, *Dirty Words*, 18.

²⁵ Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 16; Crunden, *Ministers of Reform*, 68.

²⁶ Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 2–4.

²⁷ I. W. Howerth, “A Programme for Social Study,” *American Journal of Sociology* 2, no. 6 (May 1897): 852.

²⁸ Addams, “The Subjective Necessity for Social Settlements,” 6; Paul S. Boyer, “In His Steps: A Reappraisal,” *American Quarterly* 23, no. 1 (Spring 1971): 71–72; Howerth, “A Programme for Social Study,” 853; Small, “The Era of Sociology,” 2–8; D. Warnotte, “The Solvay Institute of Sociology, Brussels,” *The Survey*, September 11, 1909, 805; Van Vorst and Van Vorst, *The Woman Who Toils*, 3.

²⁹ Smith, “Introduction,” 1.

³⁰ “Kansas City’s School of Social Science,” *The Survey*, September 11, 1909, 799.

³¹ Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 17.

³² Samuel McCune Lindsay, “The Study and Teaching of Sociology: The Annual Meeting of 1898,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 12 (July 1898): 34–35.

Lindsay later joined the influential faculty of Columbia University. Molly Ladd-Taylor, *Mother-Work: Women, Child Welfare, and the State, 1890-1930* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 56.

³³ Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 5; Lester F. Ward, *Outlines of Sociology* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1898), 135–36.

³⁴ Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 17; Smith, "Introduction," 8.

³⁵ Dorothy Ross, "The Development of the Social Sciences," in *The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920*, ed. Alexandra Oleson and John Voss (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), 109–14; Smith, "Secularizing American Higher Education: The Case of Early American Sociology," 97–159; Rosalind Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982), 35–36; Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion*, 73; Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 15.

³⁶ Crunden, *Ministers of Reform*, 80.

³⁷ Franklin H. Giddings, *The Theory of Sociology* (Philadelphia, PA: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1894), 7–13; Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 16–24; George E. Vincent, "The Province of Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology* 1, no. 4 (January 1896): 484–86; Lester F. Ward, "The Place of Sociology among the Sciences," *American Journal of Sociology* 1, no. 1 (July 1895): 16; Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, rev. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 295; Albion W. Small and George E. Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society* (New York: American Book Company, 1894), 6; Mullins and Mullins, *Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology*, 41; Crunden, *Ministers of Reform*, 81.

³⁸ Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 64.

³⁹ In 1897, I. W. Howerth stressed that such research would suggest "methods of reform" and better "social conditions." One of the primary goals of the American Institute of Sociology was to "promote the use of all available truth for the betterment of society's

condition." Small, "The Era of Sociology," 6; Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 54–80; Howerth, "A Programme for Social Study," 852–66; "Sociological Notes," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 6 (July 1895): 183.

⁴⁰ Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 134; Trevor Parry-Giles, "For the Soul of the Supreme Court: Progressivism, Ethics, and 'Social Justice' in the 1916 'Trial' of Louis D. Brandeis," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 2, no. 1 (1999): 83–106, doi:10.1353/rap.2010.0039.

⁴¹ Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 20.

⁴² "A Sociological Retreat at Sagamore," *The Survey*, June 10, 1909, 533.

⁴³ Lynd and Lynd, *Middletown: A Study in Modern American Culture*, 291.

⁴⁴ Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 72–74.

⁴⁵ Sociologists, he accused, simply raked "the refuse heap." Henry Jones Ford, "The Pretensions of Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology* 15, no. 1 (1909): 101.

⁴⁶ Similar concerns arose in a survey of sociologists collected by I. W. Howerth. Amid the flurry of reform at the turn of the century, many critics wrote sociology off as "simply the science of social betterment," as Charles Ellwood noted in 1910. Robin M. Williams Jr., "Sociology in America: The Experience of Two Centuries," *Social Science Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (1976): 88; Ira W. Howerth, "Present Conditions of Sociology in the United States," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 5 (1894): 112; Charles A. Ellwood, "Philanthropy and Sociology," *The Survey*, June 4, 1910, 397.

⁴⁷ Sociology struggled to establish standards and to define its subject domain though. Scholars in the rhetoric of science and the history of sociology have both taken up the problems that science faces trying to define its domain, alternately speaking of this project as one of demarcation (Prelli 1989; Taylor 1996), boundary work (Camic and Xie 1994; Evans 2009), catchment areas (Gross 2005), and legitimation tactics (Owens 2014). Each of these conversations informs my analysis of the argument strategies used by social scientists and social workers and directs my attention to methods, paradigms, leadership, and ethos. Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 34; Small, “The Era of Sociology,” 4; Howerth, “Present Conditions of Sociology in the United States,” 113; Charles Alan Taylor, *Defining Science: A Rhetoric of Demarcation* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996); Charles Camic and Yu Xie, “The Statistical Turn in American Social Science: Columbia University, 1890 to 1915,” *American Sociological Review* 59, no. 5 (1994): 773; Michael S. Evans, “Defining the Public, Defining Sociology: Hybrid Science—Public Relations and Boundary-Work in Early American Sociology,” *Public Understanding of Science* 18, no. 1 (2009): 5, doi:10.1177/0963662506071283; Matthias Gross, “Human Geography and Ecological Sociology: The Unfolding of a Human Ecology, 1890 to 1930 -- and Beyond,” *Social Science History* 28, no. 4 (2005): 576; B. Robert Owens, “‘Laboratory Talk’ in U.S. Sociology, 1890-1930: The Performance of Scientific Legitimacy,” *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 50, no. 3 (2014): 314, doi:10.1002/jhbs.21667.

⁴⁸ Prominent men in the new discipline, including Franklin Giddings, Albion Small, George Vincent, Graham Taylor, and Frederick Wines, all claimed that sociology dissected society's social dynamics. Franklin Giddings set out a fuller definition of

sociology in 1894, writing, "Sociology is an attempt to account for the origin, growth, structure and activities of human society by the operation of physical, vital and psychical causes, working together in a process of evolution." For Small and Vincent (1894), sociology involved "knowledge of man as a cooperating animal." For Graham Taylor (1895), it was about understanding "the complex relations of man to man in modern society." For Wines (1898), sociology pertained to "the associated life of mankind." Giddings, *The Theory of Sociology*, 7–9; Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 60; Small, "The Era of Sociology," 4; Frederick Howard Wines, "Sociology and Philanthropy," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 12 (July 1898): 56–57.

⁴⁹ Ellwood, "Philanthropy and Sociology," 397; Robert E. Park, "The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the City Environment," *American Journal of Sociology* 20, no. 5 (March 1915): 577–612; Pierre Lannoy, "When Robert E. Park Was (Re) Writing 'The City': Biography, the Social Survey, and the Science of Sociology," *American Sociologist* 35, no. 1 (March 2004): 47.

⁵⁰ Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 5–15; Lindsay, "The Study and Teaching of Sociology," 3; Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 31; Lannoy, "When Robert E. Park Was (Re) Writing 'The City,'" 47; Howerth, "A Programme for Social Study," 863; Ellwood, "Philanthropy and Sociology," 397; Robert A. Woods, "The Neighborhood in Social Reconstruction," *American Journal of Sociology* 19, no. 5 (1914): 589–90; Park, "The City," 577; "Sociological Notes," 183.

⁵¹ Such statements, by figures that Christian Smith identifies as "academic sociologists," also distanced the new field from its association with religious and

reformist elements. Indeed, many attribute Albion Small's founding of the *American Journal of Sociology* as specifically designed to stymie potential efforts to create a journal of Christian sociology. Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 72–74; Smith, “Secularizing American Higher Education: The Case of Early American Sociology,” 111; Neil J. Smelser, “Sociology: Spanning Two Centuries,” *The American Sociologist* 34, no. 3 (2003): 9; Evans, “Defining the Public, Defining Sociology,” 18.

⁵² Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 54; Ellwood, “Philanthropy and Sociology,” 397.

⁵³ Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 16.

⁵⁴ This parallel with other sciences addressed the conformity side of "newcomer's dilemma." Ibid., 28; Giddings, *The Theory of Sociology*, 76; Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 32; Camic and Xie, “The Statistical Turn in American Social Science,” 773–805.

⁵⁵ Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 35.

⁵⁶ Smith claimed that political science was the "science of the state." Ward, *Outlines of Sociology*, 136; Smith, “Introduction,” 2.

⁵⁷ Howerth concluded his survey with a confident assertion that sociology was following a set course from formative science to concrete science just as astronomy and physics had in their day. Ward, “The Place of Sociology among the Sciences,” 17; Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 85; Howerth, “Present Conditions of Sociology in the United States,” 121.

⁵⁸ Similarly, Frances Kellor wanted to apply the methods of science to society and argued that her experimental sociology was about investigating "crime scientifically." Ellwood, "Philanthropy and Sociology," 397; Frances A. Kellor, *Experimental Sociology: Descriptive and Analytical* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1901), 1.

⁵⁹ As quoted in Warnotte, "The Solvay Institute of Sociology, Brussels," 805.

⁶⁰ Taylor names method as one approach that has been used to demarcate science from other realms of knowledge. Clarke A. Chambers, *Seedtime of Reform: American Social Service and Social Action, 1918-1933* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963), 32; Warnotte, "The Solvay Institute of Sociology, Brussels," 805; Taylor, *Defining Science*. As an example of the push for professionalization, the NCLC Board of Trustees authorized Owen Lovejoy to join the American Statistical Association in 1909. Meeting of the Board of Trustees October 27, 1909, Box 7, Folder 1, NCLC.

⁶¹ Small and Vincent urged the importance of "a right habit of inquiry" among sociology students. The author of "Sociological Notes" in 1895 praised the reorganization of the American Institute of Sociology on a "broader and more scientific basis." Giddings, *The Theory of Sociology*, 80, 76; Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 31; "Sociological Notes," 182.

⁶² *The Commons* applauded a University of Michigan student, studying saloons while on a fellowship at the settlement Chicago Commons, for the "discrimination" that he showed while spending "six months in arduous, thorough, unremitting and self-sacrificing toil." *The Commons* was more affiliated with more reformist and religious veins within sociology, but it was still lauding scientific method and objectivity in research. "Our Saloon Investigation for the Committee of Fifty," *The Commons: A*

Monthly Record Devoted to Aspects of Life and Labor from the Social Settlement Point of View, November 1900, 1.

⁶³ Solvay wrote, "Recent years have seen writings and investigations multiply in this field, long abandoned to the conjectures of empiricism and to the arbitrary conclusions of individual speculations. I myself have attempted to give to these efforts, frequently devoid of coordination, a positive basis, by striving to connect fundamentally the economic factors preponderant in the evolution of peoples with the physiological and physical factors that govern man and nature." Ward, *Outlines of Sociology*, 135; Warnotte, "The Solvay Institute of Sociology, Brussels," 805.

⁶⁴ George Vincent went so far as to trace the application of the "scientific method . . . to social phenomena" as far back as Aristotle. Vincent, "The Province of Sociology," 473–75.

⁶⁵ Owens, "'Laboratory Talk' in U.S. Sociology," 313.

⁶⁶ Higbie, "Crossing Class Boundaries," 565–66; Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 32, 68; Jensen, *Dirty Words*, 39, 55; Pittenger, *Class Unknown*, 9; Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 27, 31–32; Lannoy, "When Robert E. Park Was (Re) Writing 'The City,'" 45.

⁶⁷ Lynd and Lynd, *Middletown: A Study in Modern American Culture*, v.

⁶⁸ "Kansas City's School of Social Science," 799. The Solvay Institute guaranteed researchers "Absolute scientific independence." Warnotte, "The Solvay Institute of Sociology, Brussels," 806.

⁶⁹ As Small and Vincent instructed, their methods revealed a "precise knowledge of social facts." Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 20, 6, 85; Ward,

“The Place of Sociology among the Sciences,” 25; Giddings, *The Theory of Sociology*, 79.

⁷⁰ Vincent, “The Province of Sociology,” 473; Howerth, “A Programme for Social Study,” 852; Kellor, *Experimental Sociology*, 1.

⁷¹ Giddings, *The Theory of Sociology*, 76–77; Vincent, “The Province of Sociology,” 473; Howerth, “A Programme for Social Study,” 852; Kellor, *Experimental Sociology*, 14.

⁷² They adopted this terminology despite the fact that most natural scientists had no high regard for their research. Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 27–28, 30; Camic and Xie, “The Statistical Turn in American Social Science,” 781.

⁷³ Annie Marion MacLean, “The Sweat-Shop in Summer,” *American Journal of Sociology* 9, no. 3 (November 1903): 290.

⁷⁴ Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 33.

⁷⁵ Lannoy, “When Robert E. Park Was (Re) Writing ‘The City,’” 47; Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 3; Thomas F. Gieryn, “City as Truth-Spot: Laboratories and Field-Sites in Urban Studies,” *Social Studies of Science* 36, no. 1 (2006): 5–38; Small, “The Era of Sociology,” 12.

⁷⁶ Woods, “The Neighborhood in Social Reconstruction,” 581–82; Lannoy, “When Robert E. Park Was (Re) Writing ‘The City,’” 45.

⁷⁷ In 1901, Kellor recommended introducing “laboratory periods” into undergraduate sociology courses where students could visit “various places of sociological interest” like “industrial enterprises and districts, courts, residence districts, places of amusement, of recreation, quarters of foreigners, etc.” Kellor, *Experimental Sociology*, 301–2. In their

social labs, social scientists could experiment and seek to remake human society.

Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 13.

⁷⁸ Crunden, *Ministers of Reform*, 59–60; Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*, 20; Warnotte, “The Solvay Institute of Sociology, Brussels,” 805; Kellor, *Experimental Sociology*, 14; Lindsay, “The Study and Teaching of Sociology,” 2.

⁷⁹ Samuel McCune Lindsay, “New York as a Sociological Laboratory,” in *Proceedings of the National Conference on Universities and Public Service*, ed. Edward A. Fitzpatrick (Madison, WI: Cantwell Printing Company, 1914), 134.

⁸⁰ Gieryn, “City as Truth-Spot,” 5–6.

⁸¹ Pittenger, *Class Unknown*, 4; Schocket, “Undercover Explorations of the ‘Other Half,’” 110.

⁸² Pittenger, *Class Unknown*, 4.

The NMS investigators did not use the term “participant observer” to describe their work. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines a participant observer as “a researcher (esp. in the social sciences) who, while apparently a member of a group under observation, gathers information about it,” and it traces the use of this phrase back to 1924. Therefore, although the NMS reforms predated this phrase, their methods adopted this approach to research and the tradition that led up to this language.

⁸³ Pittenger, “A World of Difference,” 27; Pittenger, *Class Unknown*, 1. Drawing on historical and scholarly sources, I use downclassing, down-and-out, undercover investigations, and cross-class investigations interchangeably to encapsulate these accounts.

⁸⁴ Pittenger, "A World of Difference," 26–27, 31; Pittenger, *Class Unknown*, 1, 39; Schocket, "Undercover Explorations of the 'Other Half,'" 113; Chura, "Vital Contact," 2003, 522.

Nineteenth century domestic and international actors established the precedent for downclassing. In fictional accounts, authors detailed participant observations and downclassing in works as far back as early nineteenth-century urban gothic novels and as prominent as Mark Twain's *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* (1889), where the noble king sets out incognito as a peasant. In real life, Pinkerton labor detectives and "stunt girl" journalists forged a model for undercover investigations. Nellie Bly's undercover reporting of the treatment of the criminally insane entitled, *Ten Days in a Madhouse* (1887), set off a string of journalistic copy cats. A few years after this work, German researchers, Dr. Minna Wettstein-Adelt (1893) and Paul Göhre (1895), conducted some of the first down-and-out investigations. Their investigative method was held up as an example in American circles. Annie Marion MacLean recalled how she followed in the footsteps of these two Germans as she introduced one of her own down-and-out narratives. See Chura, *Vital Contact*, 2005; Schocket, "Undercover Explorations of the 'Other Half,'" 113; Mark Twain, *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1917); Pittenger, "A World of Difference," 31–32; Nellie Bly, *Ten Days in a Mad-House* (New York: Ian L. Munro, Publisher, 1887), <http://digital.library.upenn.edu/women/bly/madhouse/madhouse.html>; MacLean, "The Sweat-Shop in Summer," 289; Pittenger, "A World of Difference," 31; Pittenger, *Class Unknown*, 12.

⁸⁵ Crunden, *Ministers of Reform*, ix, 16; Pittenger, "A World of Difference," 27.

Beyond those details, there is not much biographical information available on cross-class investigators. This limitation applies to the NMS investigators as well. Owen R. Lovejoy led the NCLC as it orchestrated a campaign against the NMS, but Frank Bruno calls Owen Lovejoy "one of the unsung heroes" of social reform during these years. His biography can only be pieced together through his organizational affiliations. It is even harder to track down biographical information about the primary NMS undercover investigators that he hired, including Edward N. Clopper, Ph.D., Edward F. Brown, Edward Barrows, Herschel H. Jones, and Harry M. Bremer. A blurry picture of these figures can be drawn from their reports and participation in the anti-child labor movement. Frank J. Bruno, *Trends in Social Work, 1874-1956: A History Based on the Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), 163.

They were from the "fortunate" class, as one downclasser, Marie Van Vorst, offhandedly noted. Van Vorst and Van Vorst, *The Woman Who Toils*, 11.

⁸⁶ MacLean, "The Sweat-Shop in Summer," 289.

⁸⁷ Paul Stob, "Pragmatism, Experience, and William James's Politics of Blindness," *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 44, no. 3 (2011): 234–35.

⁸⁸ Davis, *Spearheads for Reform*, 88. For an example, see Taylor, "A Quiz on Trades Unions."

⁸⁹ Pittenger, "A World of Difference," 36–37; Pittenger, *Class Unknown*, 19.

⁹⁰ Pittenger, *Class Unknown*, 23; Pittenger, "A World of Difference," 39.

⁹¹ Stephen Crane, "An Experiment in Misery," in *Stephen Crane: Stories and Tales*, ed. Robert Wooster Stallman (New York: Vintage Books, 1955), 27; Pittenger, "A World of Difference," 33. Charles Sheldon, the author of the best-seller *In His Steps* (1897), likewise urged Christian disciples to "go and actually touch . . . the foul, sinful sore of diseased humanity as it festers in the great metropolis?" He stressed that love could not perform "disagreeable things by proxy." Charles M. Sheldon, *In His Steps: "What Would Jesus Do?"*, Revised Edition (Chicago: Advance Publishing Company, 1899), 248.

⁹² Annie Marion MacLean, "Two Weeks in Department Stores," *American Journal of Sociology* 4, no. 6 (May 1899): 721.

⁹³ In addition to providing insights about an unknown class, other motives, including reform, science, and escapism, emerged in their accounts. Higbie, "Crossing Class Boundaries," 563.

⁹⁴ Pittenger, "A World of Difference," 35.

⁹⁵ Van Vorst and Van Vorst, *The Woman Who Toils*, 4–5. Both Mark Pittenger and Eric Schocket claim that this reforming mindset was more common among female investigators. Schocket argues that women who were cross-class investigators featured their role in their accounts more than their male colleagues did. He asserts, "Unlike their male counterparts, their goal was to reform, not merely pass through, the lives of 'the unknown class.'" This motive for reform is clearly evident in the discourse of female down-and-outers. Maud Younger ended her series on waitressing by concluding that she wanted to become a "walking delegate" for the waitress union. Amy Tanner showed more hesitance. She shied away from offering a solution on "the basis of a single experience." Yet, she bolstered her limited experience with advice from Jane Addams to stress the

need for a set work day, which her "past aches and pains urge[d]" her to add should be set at eight hours a day. MacLean also explained her project's reforming intent. She hoped that by throwing "some light" on sweat-shop labor it would "awaken in the minds of buyers an appreciation of the danger lurking near them." Child labor investigators, like those who went undercover to study the night messenger service, challenge the assertion that only women sought reform through their down-and-out experiences. The National Child Labor Committee explicitly existed in order to facilitate reform; they wanted, as the committee's first chair Felix Adler claimed, to be "a great moral force for the protection of children." NMS investigators participated in this vision. E. E. Pratt, who accompanied an NCLC agent on his investigation, stressed that their study "warrant[ed] the most serious attention on the part of the companies and the public." Overall, going undercover among the working class was viewed as a liberating experience from middle-class life for men and women. This work, as highlighted by cross-class investigators (both men and women) and NCLC field agents, was about more than collecting information. It was about moving to rectify the ills discovered. See Pittenger, "A World of Difference," 37–38; Schocket, "Undercover Explorations of the 'Other Half,'" 124; Maud Younger, "The Diary of an Amateur Waitress," *McClure's Magazine*, March 1907, 13; Amy E. Tanner, "Glimpses at the Mind of a Waitress," *American Journal of Sociology* 13, no. 1 (July 1907): 55; MacLean, "The Sweat-Shop in Summer," 290; Higbie, "Crossing Class Boundaries," 570; Boyer, "In His Steps," 71–72. Minute Book National Child Labor Committee First to the Tenth Meeting April 1904-April 1906, box 6, NCLC MSS; Supplementary [sic] Statement by E.E. Pratt, n.d., box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

⁹⁶ Higbie, "Crossing Class Boundaries," 584.

⁹⁷ Pittenger, "A World of Difference," 35.

⁹⁸ Alvan F. Sanborn, "A Study of Beggars and Their Lodgings," *Forum*, April 1895, 200.

On this foundation, undercover investigators were quick to claim that their accounts represented the facts. Crane described his write-up as a "veracious narrative of an experiment in misery," and Frances Donovan vouched that she provided "a truthful, sober, and exact statement" about waitressing conditions and averred that she had "no other purpose than that of making a certain situation intelligible." Crane, "An Experiment in Misery," 27; Frances R. Donovan, *The Woman Who Waits* (Boston: Richard G. Badger, 1920), 16.

⁹⁹ Tanner, "Glimpses at the Mind of a Waitress," 55.

¹⁰⁰ Pittenger, *Class Unknown*, 2.

¹⁰¹ Gregory R. Woirol, *In the Floating Army: F.C. Mills on Itinerant Life in California, 1914* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 1; Schocket, "Undercover Explorations of the 'Other Half,'" 113.

¹⁰² MacLean, "The Sweat-Shop in Summer," 298–99.

¹⁰³ Schocket, "Undercover Explorations of the 'Other Half,'" 117.

¹⁰⁴ Sanborn, "A Study of Beggars and Their Lodgings," 200.

¹⁰⁵ Van Vorst and Van Vorst, *The Woman Who Toils*, 22.

¹⁰⁶ Pittenger, "A World of Difference," 29, 44. This fear of "going native" came through partially in accounts of the mentally deadening work of factories, department stores, and waitressing. Amy Tanner told in 1907 how she "became a creature ruled chiefly by sensations" as her mind became dulled by work and strain. Writing of the

slang and oaths and gloom of her workplace, MacLean reported, "Refinement of thought and speech would soon disappear in such an environment." See Tanner, "Glimpses at the Mind of a Waitress," 51; MacLean, "Two Weeks in Department Stores," 730.

¹⁰⁷ Pittenger, "A World of Difference," 27; Pittenger, *Class Unknown*, 10.

¹⁰⁸ Jack London, *The People of the Abyss* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1904), 19.

¹⁰⁹ MacLean, "The Sweat-Shop in Summer," 294.

¹¹⁰ Younger also detailed her mistakes in a way that did not threaten the accuracy of her account. Apparently, her questions at work raised her peers' suspicions. She asked if it was possible to live on just a waitressing job's wages and earned a "scrutinizing glance." After another naïve statement, Younger reported that her companion "looked at me again" and remarked, "I suppose you used to work in a [sic] office?" Her co-workers did not call her out, instead Younger projected that they simply assumed she came from a different line of work. Younger, "The Diary of an Amateur Waitress," 7.

¹¹¹ In the same way, for all Mills' boasts about his disguise, acquaintances kept recognizing him on his first train trip. Woirol, *In the Floating Army*, 23. Similarly, on her first day on the job, Younger ran into a waitress who she "had met at a girl's club at the Settlement." Younger, "The Diary of an Amateur Waitress," 6.

¹¹² Schocket, "Undercover Explorations of the 'Other Half,'" 110.

¹¹³ MacLean, "The Sweat-Shop in Summer," 304–5.

¹¹⁴ MacLean, "Two Weeks in Department Stores," 721.

¹¹⁵ Tanner reported on how bruised her arms and body were after waitressing for several days. Van Vorst noted the "sacrifice" of "physical fatigue and revulsion" that she

set out to "surmount." Tanner, "Glimpses at the Mind of a Waitress," 50; Van Vorst and Van Vorst, *The Woman Who Toils*, 4–5.

¹¹⁶ Vincent, "The Province of Sociology," 473. According to Albion Small, sociologists needed "means of observation." In this vein, Robert E. Park saw a sociologist as "a kind of super-reporter." As an example of this method, Thomas Dawley subtly boasted about how his mind was trained by "years of keen observation" and allowed him to provide accurate accounts of his investigations while an employee of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics." Crunden, *Ministers of Reform*, 88; Small, "The Era of Sociology," 6; Dawley, *The Child That Toileth Not*, vii. Also see Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 16.

¹¹⁷ Fernando Armstrong-Fumero, "'Even the Most Careless Observer': Race and Visual Discernment in Physical Anthropology from Samuel Morton to Kennewick Man," *American Studies* 53, no. 2 (2014): 9, doi:10.1353/ams.2014.0100.

¹¹⁸ Giddings, *The Theory of Sociology*, 78. Also see Kellor, *Experimental Sociology*, vii, 13.

¹¹⁹ London, *The People of the Abyss*, vii.

Relying on the same reasoning, MacLean stressed, "I saw much. I saw a group of human beings working under conditions not fit for human beings; I saw boys' pants made in filth too odious to describe; and I saw the mere pittance handed to me for two days' toil." MacLean, "The Sweat-Shop in Summer," 293, 298–99, 307. Also see Van Vorst and Van Vorst, *The Woman Who Toils*, 4–5; Cathryn Halverson, "The Fascination of the Working Girl: Dorothy Richardson's *The Long Day*," *American Studies* 40, no. 1 (Spring 1999): 96.

¹²⁰ Annie Marion MacLean defended the need for a living wage by noting, "I know from actual experience, and I know from reliable testimony." MacLean, "Two Weeks in Department Stores," 736.

¹²¹ London continued to quote the sailor, who said, "There was my mar, she was enough, a-bangin' the kids about an' makin' the ole man mis'erable when 'e come 'ome, w'ich was seldom, I grant. An' fer w'y? Becos o' mar! She didn't make 'is 'ome 'appy, that was w'y. Then, there's the other wimmen, 'ow do they treat a pore stoker with a few shillin's in 'is trouseys? A good drunk is wot 'e's got in 'is pockits, a good long drunk, an' the wimmen skin 'im out of 'is money so quick 'e ain't 'ad 'ardly a glass. I know. I've 'ad my fling an' I know wot's wot." London, *The People of the Abyss*, 36.

Maud Younger provided over a half page of quoted conversation between herself and her boss, and Bessie Van Vorst offered extended quotes from her search for work. Younger, "The Diary of an Amateur Waitress," 2; Van Vorst and Van Vorst, *The Woman Who Toils*, 13–15. MacLean did not quote extended conversations. Instead she just reproduced phrases that bosses barked or coworkers frequently asked like "Got any chewin's on you?" MacLean, "Two Weeks in Department Stores," 737.

¹²² Younger, "The Diary of an Amateur Waitress," 4.

Similarly, Jack London detailed the restraints present when collecting data while downclassing. He relayed a story peppered with extended quotes and anecdotes from a broken-down sailor, but of the specific details, he admitted with regret, "it is beyond me to remember them all, for it is not quite in keeping to take notes at the poorhouse door." London, *The People of the Abyss*, 69.

¹²³ In late-1903, the New York Child Labor Committee corresponded with the New York City Department of Health about the enforcement of the mercantile legislation that applied to child labor in the messenger service. They spurred the Dept. of Health to send out a letter to messenger companies "calling their attention to the provision of the law relating to the employment of women and children," but the NYCLC discovered that inspection and enforcement of this law was terribly lax. Shortly thereafter, the NYCLC initiated their own inspection of the messenger service. Letter from Secretary of the Department of Health of the City of New York to Fred S. Hall, December 5, 1903, box 31, folder 2, NYCLC MSS; and Felt, *Hostages of Fortune*, 154.

¹²⁴ Letter from Secretary of the New York Child Labor Committee to Miss Helen F. Greene, May 11, 1904, box 31, folder 2, NYCLC MSS.

¹²⁵ Letter from Secretary, box 31, folder 2, NYCLC MSS.

¹²⁶ Letter from Secretary, box 31, folder 2, NYCLC MSS.

¹²⁷ Memo on Messenger Boy Investigation, June 1904, box 31, folder 2, New York Child Labor Committee Records 1903-1941, New York State Library, Albany, NY; and RE MESSENGER INSPECTION, June 9, 1904, box 5, folder 5, NYCLC, MSS.

¹²⁸ The NYCLC's inquiries and discourse in 1904 did not focus on the messengers' illegitimate errands. One memo author even concluded with the testimony of Mr. Turner, the General Manager at the A.D.T. main office, summarizing, "Thinks there is little exposure to immoral influences, since inmates of disorderly places are the last to desire publicity, even that involved in calling a messenger boy." Memorandum of Visits Made with Inspector Shears of the Health Department, June 9, 1904, box 31, folder 2, NYCLC, MSS.

¹²⁹ Messenger Boy Investigation, November, 1904, box 5, folder 5, NYCLC MSS.

¹³⁰ Kellor also warned that an observer might be biased by a "predilection for socialism" or "insufficient training." Kellor, *Experimental Sociology*, 7.

¹³¹ Messenger Service in New York 1904, box 31, folder 2, NYCLC MSS.

¹³² Meeting of the Board of Trustees October 27, 1909, box 7, folder 1, National Child Labor Committee Collection, Library of Congress, Washington, DC. From here on out, this archival collection will be referred to as NCLC MSS.

¹³³ Hindman, *Child Labor*, 366.

¹³⁴ Owen R. Lovejoy, "Annual Report of the General Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee," in *Child Employing Industries: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference, Boston, Massachusetts, January 13-16, 1910* (New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1910), 205, <https://books.google.com/books?id=HvsbAAAAMAAJ&pg=PA207&dq=Child+Employing+Industries&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjD2YmQprPPAhULGR4KHe7gD6gQ6AEIzAB#v=onepage&q=Child%20Employing%20Industries&f=false>. Meeting of the Board of Trustees October 27, 1909, box 7, folder 1, NCLC MSS; and E.M. Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹³⁵ "Charles Lionel Chute Papers 1899-1913. Columbia University Libraries Finding Aids: Rare Book & Manuscript Library," accessed September 22, 2015, http://findingaids.cul.columbia.edu/ead/nnc-rb/ldpd_4078606/summary#summary.

¹³⁶ To the Board of Trustees, Minutes 1912-1913, May 1, 1912, box 7, folder 2, NCLC MSS.

¹³⁷ Lovejoy was most likely referring to Columbia University's School of Philanthropy. To the Board of Trustees, Minutes 1912-1913, NCLC MSS.

¹³⁸ Goodnight, "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument: A Speculative Inquiry into the Art of Public Deliberation," 630.

¹³⁹ Investigation of the Messenger Service in Connecticut, May 1914, box 4, NCLC MSS.

¹⁴⁰ Herschel H. Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, KY, December 1913, box 4, NCLC MSS.

¹⁴¹ Harry M. Bremer, Night Messengers of Virginia, November and December 1913, box 4, NCLC MSS.

¹⁴² Harry M. Bremer, Messenger Service in West Virginia, December 1914 and February 1915, box 4, NCLC MSS; and To the Board of Trustees, Minutes 1912-1913, NCLC MSS.

¹⁴³ Edward F. Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, Pa, November 1910, box 4, NCLC, MSS.

¹⁴⁴ Bremer, Night Messengers of Virginia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁴⁵ Supplementary [sic] Statement by E.E. Pratt, n.d., box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

Pratt's statement only lists his name, but *The Preliminary Report of the Factory Investigating Commission* in 1912 includes an article by E.E. Pratt and gives his position as "Ph.D., Associate Professor of Economics and Statistics in the New York School of Philanthropy" and is followed by an article on tenement work by Owen R. Lovejoy. *State*

of New York Preliminary Report of the Factory Investigating Commission, vol. 1
(Albany, NY: The Argus Company Printers, 1912), 8.

Gieryn studied the implications of early sociologists' use of the language of laboratory and field. The first conferred control, distance, and manipulation. The second entailed unadulterated reality and experience. Across the NMS reports, the NCLC investigators borrowed from both of these groupings, invoking both realms of meaning in turn. Gieryn, "City as Truth-Spot."

¹⁴⁶ Edward M. Barrows, notarized statement about night messenger service investigation in Louisville, Kentucky, December 4-6, 1909, A I54a, Frances M. Ingram Papers, Filson Historical Society, Louisville, KY. From here on out, this archival collection will be referred to as Ingram MSS.

¹⁴⁷ Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS. Edward Brown reported a similar process. Of his Pennsylvania investigation, he noted, "I did not tell the manager for what purpose I desired a boy." See Edward F. Brown, *The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania*, May 1912, Public Education and Child Labor Association of Pennsylvania Collection, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA. From here on out, this archival collection will be referred to as the PECLAP MSS.

¹⁴⁸ Edward F. Brown, notarized statement about night messenger service investigation in Louisville, Kentucky, July and August 1910, January 1, 1914, A 154a 59, Ingram MSS. In New York, Barrows simply explained that he "wanted a strong boy to carry a suit case to South Ferry." Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁴⁹ A Detroit company, The Postal Telegraph and Cable Company, received praise from Charles Chute for avoiding "suspicious business." This company's caution was a rare exception though. Charles L. Chute, Report of the Investigation into the Messenger Service in Detroit and Chicago, box 2, Charles Lionel Chute Papers 1899-1913, Columbia University Rare Book & Manuscript Library, New York, NY. This source will be referred to as Chute MSS from here on out.

¹⁵⁰ Brown, report from New York, March 2, 1910, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁵¹ Supplementary [sic] Statement by E.E. Pratt, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁵² The NMS investigators constructed scientific reports to help protect children, but the researchers' aims might have glossed over some of their more deceptive study methods. A short remark in Brown's New York report, which records his joint investigation with Barrows, raises questions about Barrows' methods and his final assessment. Brown wrote, "The messenger was offered a cigarette for the second time, but he refused, saying, he did not indulge." In contrast, Barrows pronounced Kramer to be "an incessant cigarette fiend." Deception was key to down-and-out methods, especially for the investigators of the night messenger service. Did this deception include readily offering boys cigarettes and then faulting them for taking them? In other social science studies, researchers commonly used these types of inducements; other field investigators offered migrant workers cigarettes or meals in exchange for their life stories. Although Barrows makes no mention of offering Kramer or the other messengers cigarettes, Brown's New York report makes it seem possible that this occurred. NMS investigators carefully noted their research methods as far as they served to support the authenticity of their accounts. What can only be pieced together in bits and conjectured at, though, is

what was left out of the reports. Brown, report from New York, March 2, 1910, NYCLC MSS; Higbie, "Crossing Class Boundaries," 579; London, *The People of the Abyss*, 86–87.

¹⁵³ Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS.

¹⁵⁴ E. M. Barrows, report from New York October 19, 1909, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁵⁵ Brown, Night Messenger Service Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC, MSS. Another messenger was "suspicious" and "refused to give his name or address." Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

¹⁵⁶ In his report Brown recorded that Thomas Cranston, a Philadelphia messenger, explained to him that "plainclothes men come around, say they are strangers and want to know where the houses are" and then "the first thing you know the houses are raided." Cranston supplied Brown with the names of several houses, but he couched this service by saying, "I'm giving you these because they are all in the district where the cops won't bother them." Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

¹⁵⁷ Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁵⁸ Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS. Also see Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS.

¹⁵⁹ Chute, Report of the Investigation into the Messenger Service in Detroit and Chicago, Chute MSS.

¹⁶⁰ At the same time as the NMS campaign, two college-educated women assisted in a study of the "white slave" trade in New York City, but for their time investigating the vice district, their characters quickly came under review. Gretchen Soderlund, *Sex*

Trafficking, Scandal, and the Transformation of Journalism, 1885-1917 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), 130–34.

¹⁶¹ Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS; Brown, report from New York, March 2, 1910, NYCLC MSS; and Supplimentary [sic] Statement by E.E. Pratt, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁶² Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS.

¹⁶³ Annie Marion MacLean, "With Oregon Hop Pickers," *American Journal of Sociology* 15, no. 1 (July 1909): 86.

¹⁶⁴ Bremer, Messenger Service in West Virginia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁶⁵ Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁶⁶ Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁶⁷ Bremer, Night Messengers of Virginia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁶⁸ Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS.

Chute recorded that a messenger boy wrote out from memory a list of addresses on "a leaf from his note book." Charles L. Chute, Investigation of Night Messenger Service, Harrisburg, Pa. July 22, 1912, box 2, Chute MSS.

¹⁶⁹ Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS; and Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS.

¹⁷⁰ Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

¹⁷¹ Barrows, report from New York October 19, 1909, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁷² Similarly, in 1910, Brown went with a messenger to "a very disreputable looking Chinese restaurant." He did not describe what he saw. Instead, in this instance, Brown's

analysis was self-sufficient. Brown, report from New York, March 2, 1910, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁷³ Ward, "The Place of Sociology among the Sciences," 25. Also see Kellor, *Experimental Sociology*, 5; Small and Vincent, *An Introduction to the Study of Society*, 15, 52–53.

¹⁷⁴ Armstrong-Fumero, "'Even the Most Careless Observer,'" 12.

¹⁷⁵ Camic and Xie, "The Statistical Turn in American Social Science," 776.

¹⁷⁶ Edward Barrows, Extracts from Report on the Night Messenger Service in Pittsburgh, November 1910, box 4, NCLC MSS.

¹⁷⁷ Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

¹⁷⁸ Olson and Goodnight, "Epochal Rhetoric in 19th-Century America," 61.

¹⁷⁹ Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS.

¹⁸⁰ Edward M. Barrows, notarized statement about 1909 night messenger service investigation in Louisville and Lexington, 9 January 1914, A 154a 59, Ingram MSS.

¹⁸¹ Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁸² Edward F. Barrows, investigative report from Louisville, KY, 4 December 1909, A 154a 59, Ingram MSS.

¹⁸³ Bremer, Messenger Service in West Virginia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁸⁴ Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁸⁵ Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁸⁶ University Heights was a well-to-do neighborhood in these years. In 1891 New York University secured land in University Heights to serve as a more traditional campus site and made sure "to restrict the neighborhood against nuisances." The college

concluded in 1899, "The general verdict of the public who visit University Heights places it second in beauty to no other University site in the world." *New York University Catalogue and Announcements for 1898-1899* (New York: The Burr Printing House, 1899), 14; Gieryn, "City as Truth-Spot," 5–38.

¹⁸⁷ Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁸⁸ According to Bremer, the manager, Mr. Leith, wanted his name to "be kept confidential," but Bremer alleged that Leith agreed to "stand by his statement if any person questioned its authenticity." Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁸⁹ A Philadelphia detective claimed, "I myself have watched [messengers] go in and out of bedrooms and private rooms with the freedom of privileged characters." Bremer, Messenger Service in West Virginia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁹⁰ Similarly, when a messenger was asked how he knew that prostitutes bribed the police for protection, one youth asserted, "I was told many times by the whores." Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁹¹ For instance, he cited "Mr. Ira Jayne of the S. P. C. C. [Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children]" to reinforce his assessment of the Western Union office in Detroit, Michigan. Chute, Report of the Investigation into the Messenger Service in Detroit and Chicago, Chute MSS.

¹⁹² Brown, Night Messenger Service Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁹³ Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS. This type of evidence also appeared in newspaper and magazine reports. To support his claims

about the night messenger service, Neill wrote how he collected testimony from "nearly every police officer in that precinct." Neill, "Child Labor at the National Capital," 799.

¹⁹⁴ Brown, Night Messenger Service Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS.

Charles Chute noted as corroborating evidence that one boy took him "through the same streets the first boy had taken me." Chute, Report of the Investigation into the Messenger Service in Detroit and Chicago, Chute MSS.

¹⁹⁵ Bremer, Messenger Service in West Virginia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁹⁶ Bremer, Night Messengers of Virginia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁹⁷ Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS.

¹⁹⁸ Bremer, Messenger Service in West Virginia, NCLC MSS.

¹⁹⁹ Bremer, Messenger Service in West Virginia, NCLC MSS.

²⁰⁰ Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS.

²⁰¹ Kevin C. Armitage, "'The Child Is Born a Naturalist': Nature Study, Woodcraft Indians, and the Theory of Recapitulation," *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 6, no. 1 (2007): 43–70; Bishop, *When Play Was Play: Why Pick-up Games Matter*.

²⁰² Nasaw, *Children of the City*; Porter, *The Turn of the Tide*.

²⁰³ Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS; Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS; RE MESSENGER SERVICE, May 12, 1904, box 31, folder 2, NYCLC MSS; RE MESSENGER SERVICE, May 21, 1904, box 31, folder 2, NYCLC MSS; RE MESSENGER SERVICE, June 8, 1904, box 31, folder 2, NYCLC MSS; and Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

²⁰⁴ Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS; and Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

²⁰⁵ RE MESSENGER SERVICE, n.d., box 31, folder 2, NYCLC MSS.

²⁰⁶ RE MESSENGER SERVICE, May 12, 1904, NYCLC MSS. Similarly, Paulding wrote of another messenger, "Claimed to be sixteen and looked as if he might have been that age."

²⁰⁷ Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS. Another New York report noted that the oldest messenger at an office was 16 years old, but "The youngest looked barely 12." Evils of Night Messenger Work, NYCLC MSS.

²⁰⁸ Schmidt, *Industrial Violence and the Legal Origins of Child Labor*.

²⁰⁹ RE MESSENGER SERVICE, May 21, 1904, NYCLC MSS.

²¹⁰ Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS.

²¹¹ Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS.

²¹² RE MESSENGER SERVICE, May 12, 1904, NYCLC MSS.

²¹³ RE MESSENGER SERVICE, May 20, 1904, box 31, folder 2, NYCLC MSS.

²¹⁴ Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS.

²¹⁵ Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS.

²¹⁶ Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals*.

²¹⁷ The same NCLC agent found another boy to be small and "dwarfed mentally." Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS.

²¹⁸ Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, NYCLC MSS.

²¹⁹ Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS.

²²⁰ RE MESSENGER SERVICE, June 16, 1904, box 31, folder 2, NYCLC MSS.

-
- ²²¹ Brown, *The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania*, PECLAP MSS.
- ²²² In 1910, Ernest Seton of the Boy Scouts warned of "flat-chested cigarette smokers, with shaky nerves and doubtful vitality." Seton, *Boy Scouts of America*, xii.
- ²²³ Bremer, *Messenger Service in West Virginia*, NCLC MSS; and Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, NYCLC MSS.
- ²²⁴ Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, NYCLC MSS.
- ²²⁵ Bremer, *Messenger Service in West Virginia*, NCLC MSS.
- ²²⁶ Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS. Also see RE MESSENGER SERVICE, May 21, 1904, NYCLC MSS.
- ²²⁷ Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS.
- ²²⁸ Barrows, report from New York October 19, 1909, NYCLC MSS.
- ²²⁹ Barrows, report from New York October 19, 1909, NYCLC MSS.
- ²³⁰ *Evils of Night Messenger Work*, NYCLC MSS.
- ²³¹ Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS.
- ²³² Downey, *Telegraph Messenger Boys*, 71.
- ²³³ Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS.
- ²³⁴ Brown, *The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania*, PECLAP MSS.
- ²³⁵ Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS.
- ²³⁶ Brown, *Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia*, NCLC MSS. There was "plenty to see." Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, NYCLC MSS.
- ²³⁷ Bremer, *Night Messengers of Virginia*, NCLC MSS; and Jones, *Night Messengers in Louisville*, NCLC MSS.

²³⁸ Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS; and Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS.

²³⁹ Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS; Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS; and Bremer, Night Messengers of Virginia, NCLC MSS. Also see Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS.

²⁴⁰ Investigation of the Messenger Service in Connecticut, May 1914, NCLC MSS.

²⁴¹ Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, NYCLC MSS.

²⁴² Crane, "The Messenger Boy," 23. Also see Hard, "De Kid Wot Works at Night," 36.

²⁴³ Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS.

²⁴⁴ Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS. Two years later, a messenger leading Brown around ably supplied the names of sixty-seven "houses of ill-fame to which the work of the company took him." Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

²⁴⁵ Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

²⁴⁶ Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

²⁴⁷ Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS. Another messenger in Pennsylvania estimated that after nine or ten o'clock at night, more than three-fourths of the company's business was "taking care of the disorderly house calls." Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS.

²⁴⁸ Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS.

²⁴⁹ Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS. Also see Barrows, report from New York October 19, 1909, NYCLC MSS; Brown, Night Messenger Investigation

in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS; and Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

²⁵⁰ Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS. Also see Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS; and Evils of Night Messenger Work, NYCLC MSS.

²⁵¹ Barrows, report from New York October 19, 1909, NYCLC MSS.

²⁵² Barrows, notarized statement from 1914, Ingram MSS.

²⁵³ Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

²⁵⁴ Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS; and Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS. Also see Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS.

²⁵⁵ Barrows, notarized statement from 1914, Ingram MSS.

²⁵⁶ Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS.

²⁵⁷ Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS.

²⁵⁸ Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS.

²⁵⁹ Brown, report from New York, March 2, 1910, NYCLC MSS.

²⁶⁰ Downey, "Running Somewhere Between Men and Women."

²⁶¹ Barrows, report from New York October 19, 1909, NYCLC MSS.

²⁶² Bremer, Messenger Service in West Virginia, NCLC MSS.

²⁶³ Investigation of the Messenger Service in Connecticut, May 1914, NCLC MSS; Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS; Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS; Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS; Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS;

Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS; and Bremer, Night Messengers of Virginia, NCLC MSS.

²⁶⁴ Barrows, report from New York October 19, 1909, NYCLC MSS; Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS; and Investigation of the Messenger Service in Connecticut, May 1914, NCLC MSS.

²⁶⁵ Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS.

²⁶⁶ Certificate of Analysis, Lederle Laboratories, April 23, 1910, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS. In *Eighty Days: Nellie Bly and Elizabeth Bisland's History-Making Race Around the World*, Matthew Goodman says that knockout drops were actually chloral hydrate. Matthew Goodman, *Eighty Days: Nellie Bly and Elizabeth Bisland's History-Making Race Around the World* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2013), 82.

²⁶⁷ Some entrepreneurial lads profited off of "dope fiends" by buying opium and selling it later at inflated prices. Philadelphia messengers commonly ventured out to buy cocaine for customers before law enforcement began cracking down on the trade. Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS; Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS; and Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

²⁶⁸ Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, NYCLC MSS.

²⁶⁹ Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS.

²⁷⁰ Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS; RE MESSENGER SERVICE, May 12, 1904, NYCLC MSS; RE MESSENGER SERVICE, May 17, box 31, folder 2, NYCLC MSS; RE MESSENGER SERVICE, May 21, 1904, NYCLC MSS; RE MESSENGER SERVICE, June 16, 1904, NYCLC MSS; Barrows,

report from New York October 19, 1909, NYCLC MSS; Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS; and Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

²⁷¹ RE MESSENGER SERVICE, May 12, 1904, NYCLC MSS.

²⁷² Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS.

²⁷³ Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS; Brown, KY, 1910; Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS; Barrows, report from New York October 19, 1909, NYCLC MSS; Brown, report from New York, March 2, 1910, NYCLC MSS; Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS; Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS; and Bremer, Night Messengers of Virginia, NCLC MSS.

²⁷⁴ Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS.

²⁷⁵ Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS.

²⁷⁶ This storyline came out in other social science investigations as well. An ethnographer described F.G. Peterson as "quite an intelligent boy, but all signs show that he is going downward. If he continues to migrate he may become a hobo and afterwards a tramp of the common type." As quoted in Higbie, "Crossing Class Boundaries," 580.

²⁷⁷ Barrows, notarized statement from 1914, Ingram MSS.

²⁷⁸ Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

²⁷⁹ Evils of Night Messenger Work, NYCLC MSS.

²⁸⁰ Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, NYCLC MSS; Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS; and Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.

-
- ²⁸¹ Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.
- ²⁸² Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, NYCLC MSS.
- ²⁸³ Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.
- ²⁸⁴ Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS; Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, NYCLC MSS; Brown, Night Messenger Investigation in Philadelphia, NCLC MSS; and Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.
- ²⁸⁵ Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS.
- ²⁸⁶ Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS.
- ²⁸⁷ Jones, Night Messengers in Louisville, NCLC MSS; Barrows, notarized statement of December 4-6, 1909, Ingram MSS; and Barrows, report from New York, October 16, 1909, NYCLC MSS.
- ²⁸⁸ Brown, The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania, PECLAP MSS.
- ²⁸⁹ Brown, notarized statement of 1910 in Louisville, Ingram MSS.
- ²⁹⁰ Bremer, Messenger Service in West Virginia, NCLC MSS.
- ²⁹¹ Evans, "Defining the Public, Defining Sociology."
- ²⁹² The general public was not given access to these accounts.

CHAPTER THREE

THE RHETORIC OF SOCIAL REFORM: TURNING PROGRESSIVE FAITH INTO PUBLIC ARGUMENT

"It is with great difficulty and great diffidence that I approach the presentation of the following facts," Leroy Scott began, "for the facts relate to topics which the American idea of decorum forbids one publicly to discuss." With this hesitation, Scott introduced his June 1910 article for *Success Magazine* titled "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service." He then explained the pervasiveness of child labor in the service, the tasks that messengers completed, and the ruin that the work portended for so many boys. This impending ruin compelled him to speak out, as he stressed, even if it meant flouting "accepted ideas of propriety."¹ Scott's comments show how he placed contemporary dictates for journalistic reporting in tension with his high regard for the character of the American public. Moving through his article, he apologetically announced that his readers were only receiving a partial account of what NCLC investigators had uncovered, yet he confidently asserted that they would still find it compelling.² Scott underscored that once he explained the threatening socialization of messengers into dependence and immorality the American public would "watch with roused vigilance."³

Scott's article was one of the first national reports about the NMS, but his reservations and lines of argument became typical across the public campaign. Magazines, journals, and newspapers denounced the evils of the night messenger service. Campaigners listed and provided anecdotes from the NMS investigations, yet they claimed to sanitize their accounts of the unprintable details for the sake of decorum. This reticence set the NMS reformers at odds with the norms of muckraking journalism and

deviated from the detailed exposure of earlier investigative reports. NMS reformers shifted their arguments when they moved the conversation from technical reports to a public campaign for legislative reform. In the investigative reports, NCLC agents recorded how messengers articulated their agency and knowledge of the city, but in the public campaign, NMS reformers defined the messengers and positioned them as a threat to the character of the public. The agents-turned-campaigners altered their rhetorical strategies as they positioned the NMS as a public problem.

In analyzing this campaign, this chapter explores how reformers of the night messenger service shifted their lines of reasoning to activate a public audience in the Progressive Era. They changed their appeals when they moved the case from their technical reports to a public platform, and they were successful. Given this success, what does the NMS campaign tell us about the norms and evolutions within public argument in these years? From Robert Wiebe to J. Michael Hogan, scholars associate the Progressive Era with an unswerving faith in an educated, deliberating public, but more particularly, this analysis examines how this faith functioned in the public arguments of the NMS campaign and what it tells us about reformers' ideal public. G. Thomas Goodnight notes how "misexpectations open opportunities for social change."⁴ What opportunities and challenges did the audience's expectations provide for argument?

This chapter argues that this campaign demonstrates how the storied Progressive public functioned as a central claim within argument. NMS campaigners founded their arguments on assumptions about the public's character that were built on muckraking norms and appeals to decorum. Undergirded by contemporary social theories, campaigners addressed the public and constructed their ideal audience as a homogeneous,

moral constituency. The American public became the *phronimos*, and the NMS became a problem because it threatened the character of that ideal body. The messengers were boys and would become men. With this understanding, the dangers that they were socialized into became a threat to the character of the American public and necessitated public attention.

To delve into this case, this chapter first looks at the defining features of public argument in the Progressive Era, particularly the norms and expectations established by the theories of social science and muckraking journalism. These frameworks are then used to inform my analysis of how the NMS campaigners' engaged their audience in their argument and constructed them as the *phronimos*. These constructions of the second persona set up the final section, which discusses how night messenger boys became the looming threat to this ideal.

PUBLIC ARGUMENT IN THE PROGRESSIVE ERA

As discussed in Chapter Two, the NCLC field agents crafted their original reports in the technical sphere of argument. They were systematic and methodical in their interviews, observations, and write-ups. Their reports presented a fact-rich account of child labor in the NMS and catered to their audience of reformers, telegraph officials, and state legislators. Within the technical sphere, they presented themselves as credible field agents, indeed scientists. And their attention to adolescent psychology reinforced their attempts to situate the NMS problem as a technical discourse.

Yet, the NCLC and its partners could have initiated their argument in a different sphere. Goodnight recognized long ago that "any particular argumentative artifact *can be taken* to be grounded in any one of the spheres or a combinatory relationship."⁵ The

reformers rooted their argument in the technical sphere though, and this choice informed their case as they transitioned into the public sphere of argument. In this new sphere, the reformers reframed the NMS problem and activated a public audience through a new set of appeals.⁶ Within the public sphere, they stressed the character of their audience.

For NMS campaigners, this shift entailed framing their case within a different set of standards for evidence, appeals, participants, and audience. Indeed, the shift from the technical to the public sphere, as David Zarefsky argues, is characterized by "an increase in the range of people affected by the argument [and] an increase in the number able to participate and to constitute a relevant audience."⁷ At heart, the public sphere is marked by who is affected, who participates, what serves as expertise, and how evaluation is decided.

Constructing a Single American Public

As a matter for public argument, reformers needed to and did position the NMS as a problem of the community, a defining feature of this sphere of argument, when they moved the issue from technical reports into public debate.⁸ Child labor had been cast as a "national problem" in the early 1900s by figures like Edgar Gardner Murphy and the National Child Labor Committee.⁹ The Committee's investigations of the NMS in multiple states laid the foundation for the organization to present this *specific* occupation as a problem affecting the general public.

Debates in social science also primed the NMS reformers to generalize about the public as a whole. As discussed in Chapter Two, the NMS investigators drew on the methods and rhetorical strategies emerging out of social science as they composed their reports, yet these social scientists were defining what they studied as they developed their

methods. They were positioning and carving out their research in contrast to the more entrenched natural sciences and in relation to other new social sciences. Sociologists, in particular, had been working to identify the social as their unique subject of study.

Sociologists, from August Comte to Émile Durkheim to Franklin Giddings, debated about how to conceptualize the social, and these theories contributed to an understanding of the “social mind” in public argument. For instance, scholars asked about the nature of social phenomenon and how social characteristics were formed. In the nineteenth century, there were a range of proposals rooting social phenomenon in biological traits, instincts, imitation, and/or habits.¹⁰ Some nineteenth-century theorists held that social relations were more real than the direct reality of individual interactions.¹¹ Across the intricacies of this debate, society came to be conceived of as an object or organism. In 1904, Giddings defined society as "a complex aggregate of agreeing responses to certain stimuli that act upon many men in like ways."¹² In line with this thought, the public became conceptualized as a socially cohesive body; it was a concrete thing. For sociologists like Vincent, Ward, and Giddings, the "social mind" could not be reduced to the individual minds that comprised it.¹³ This common assumption laid the groundwork for studying society as a discipline *and* articulating a problem as affecting the general public. In sociology, the "social mind" could be studied as a whole. In reform, the American people could be addressed as an entity.¹⁴

Against the backdrop of this "social mind," NMS reformers frequently constructed a singular American public in their arguments that acknowledged no demographic differences and left no room for ideological differences. They constructed the progressive public as if it were an ideal body by how they described the American

people and how they catered their arguments to this audience. This perspective led to confidence, for leaders could lay out a public problem, assume a common moral response, and expect the audience to act. For them, the American people were an ideal, homogeneous body that shared reasons and values.

Addressing the American Public as the Phronimos

This approach to the social mind of the American public also reflected the faith of progressives in the people. Magazine writers, newspaper reporters, and fiction authors believed that an informed American public would automatically make the best choices for society.¹⁵ This faith in the American public became a defining feature of the Progressive Era. Writing in *The Atlantic Monthly*, George Alger claimed that the *entire* country held "an almost superstitious reverence for publicity, as though it were a panacea for political and social evils. Give the people the facts, and conditions will remedy themselves."¹⁶ This perspective animated the discourse of prominent progressives. Leroy Dorsey calls Theodore Roosevelt a "consummate Progressive" for being "a reformer with a strong faith in the power of rhetoric to shape public opinion and in the power of public opinion, in turn, to bring about meaningful social reform."¹⁷ In a similar vein, Woodrow Wilson, as J. Michael Hogan argues, believed that the American people were capable of parsing through complicated ideas and adhered his rhetoric to this principle (for a time). This same faith animated progressive efforts to revivify democracy through the initiative, referendum, and direct election of senators. Progressive reformers widely believed that an active citizenry, deliberating openly, was the best course for society.¹⁸

The NMS campaigners expanded and turned this progressive faith in the public into their central line of argument. They argued that the American “social mind” was moral and upstanding, capable of making good decisions when it came to community problems. For leaders, like Owen Lovejoy, the “American people” were marked by character and decorum. In sum, they assumed that the American public possessed *phronesis*. *Phronesis* is an intellectual virtue laid out by Aristotle and traditionally associated with wisdom, knowledge, virtue, and decorum.¹⁹ People who are characterized by *phronesis* are known as the *phronimos* and are morally good, seek truth, and understand what is appropriate within a particular time and place.²⁰ Additionally, this virtue has been framed as the result of proper training and education.²¹ The *phronimos* have been brought up in moral conduct and are students of what is right and just. They are experienced and have sound judgment.²²

Reformers in the NMS campaign projected this virtue onto the public even if they did not explicitly mention *phronesis* in their arguments. They made *phronesis* the precondition for their reforms, and these assumptions made the education of the nation’s children an even greater concern. Thus, whereas the NMS reformers outwardly shunned values-based reasoning in their technical reports, they made morals the center of their public arguments for reform.²³ Speaking to the general public, NMS campaigners made the public’s character their central claim, and this claim appeared in their discourse in several ways, including in how reformers tapped into existing norms of argument.

BUILDING EXPECTATIONS FOR EXPOSURE & DECORUM: MUCKRAKING

In building their public arguments, NMS campaigners had to construct their appeals in relation to traditions of public argument and social knowledge, for these

standards are used to evaluate arguments in the public sphere.²⁴ Successful arguments have to meet the public's dictates for "reasonableness."²⁵ In this period, audiences were renegotiating standards for what was reasonable and appropriate.

In the first decade of the 1900s, muckrakers shaped the public's expectations for argument in the public sphere. They helped to build these expectations by how they formulated arguments and by what appeals they made prominent. In terms of form, muckrakers positioned detailed exposure as the marker of credible public argument. In terms of appeals, these muckrakers expanded the bounds of appropriate argument and reapportioned the general public's role in these arguments. Muckraking journalists pushed the borders of decorum and set out a vision for how to activate the public.

Setting Expectations for Exposure in Public Argument

As the NMS campaign developed, norms for public argument were heavily influenced by muckraking. In January 1903, only a few months before the earliest national exposés of the NMS, S.S. McClure called his readers attention to the shared content of three features. McClure argued that the articles by Lincoln Steffens, Ray Stannard Baker, and Ida Tarbell might "set us thinking," and he declared it a coincidental "arraignment of American character."²⁶ What McClure heralded generally, President Theodore Roosevelt and the American public came to know shortly thereafter as *muckraking*.²⁷ This new movement in journalism established a model for subsequent social reforms, setting public expectations for the process and appropriate bounds of exposure.

At its start around 1900, muckraking was a murky concept, and as the scholar Harry Stein notes, scholars writing about muckraking have made a "near-wilderness" of

surmises about it since that time.²⁸ At its core, though, muckraking was a journalism of exposure, perhaps the earliest investigative reporting, that named and denounced corruption and injustice throughout American society. Exposure became a desired end, for muckrakers held, as Robert Crunden argues, that "[o]nce a sin was recognized, surely decent citizens would repent and a good world could develop."²⁹ This new trend was prominent in mass-circulation magazines, popular among the middle-class, and ran from about 1900 to 1915.³⁰

Muckraking accounts appeared in newspapers and novels too, but magazines led this "crusade" to the people.³¹ Magazines were an increasingly appropriate outlet for public sphere arguments, for they had recently become more accessible. Cheaper printing, improved photoengraving, and a larger population of high school-educated readers drastically lowered the price and increased the circulation of magazines.³² These shifts toward greater affordability and accessibility allowed magazines to become better forums for public argument, at least for middle-class families. Traditionally, magazines were for the "cultivated class," but around 1900 a few magazines started catering to a broader audience.³³ Magazines like *McClure's*, *Cosmopolitan*, *Collier's*, *Everybody's*, and *Success* became powerful platforms from which to crusade.³⁴ These crusades, as Merwin explained, were about educating the "plain citizen" about corruption in politics, business, and society. Writers sought to provide the public with "facts."³⁵

The friends of muckraking argued that the American people as a body incited this movement. In this view, muckrakers simply gave voice to the public's malaise and lust for information.³⁶ In some cases, the magazines' readership discovered an issue and wrote in to demand a full investigation. For instance, Thomas Lawson, an editor and

muckraker, was inundated with letters demanding to know about life-insurance companies.³⁷ Muckraking serials touted this origin story. Writing in *Success Magazine*, Samuel Merwin explained how the "plain man" was unable to get the full facts, "so he has written, thousands and thousands of him, to his favorite magazine, asking it to make a desperate effort to help him learn the truth."³⁸ This framing firmly situated muckraking in the public sphere of argument as an outcropping of coordinated public action. Within this view, muckraking responded to common concerns in the community, made information accessible to a broad audience, and invited a wide range of participants. The influential journalist Walter Lippmann, writing in 1914, reasoned that the American people must have wanted to hear muckraking. He concluded, "There is no other way of explaining the quick approval which the muckrakers won... There must have been real causes for dissatisfaction, or the land notorious for its worship of success would not have turned so savagely upon those who had achieved it."³⁹ Indeed, the main muckraking outlets primarily celebrated "big men" and American success before 1900.⁴⁰ Once magazines like *McClure's* began publishing exposés, though, many other publications quickly followed this lead.⁴¹ With this trend, two norms of public argument emerged--detail-rich accounts and engaging narratives.

Muckrakers across the country wrote detailed accounts, naming names and making specific accusations.⁴² Back in the 1870s and 1880s, the norms of public argument led newspaper crusaders to shy away from providing specific facts.⁴³ Yet, such facts became a characteristic of muckraking reports in the early 1900s. Lincoln Steffens, often heralded as the first muckraker, stressed in *The Shame of the Cities* that his book

was not long enough to include all the information he collected.⁴⁴ He reportedly cut twenty-thousand words from his Philadelphia piece, yet "had not written half my facts."⁴⁵

Several noted muckrakers became well-known for their factual accounts. Ida M. Tarbell and Ray Stannard Baker gained reputations as fastidious, clear, and detailed reporters. These two writers exemplified journalism's growing concern for objectivity.⁴⁶ And editors paid well for their well-written and well-researched articles.⁴⁷ Magazines invested significantly in the months of research that provided the foundation for serials like Tarbell's meticulously documented "The History of the Standard Oil Company." In the early 1900s, when a newspaper could be purchased for a penny, Tarbell's articles cost magazines an estimated \$4,000 each and Steffen's approximately \$2,000 each.⁴⁸ Some muckrakers relied on organizations like the National Child Labor Committee to provide them with research for their exposés. For instance, Elizabeth Shepley Sergeant's July 1910 article on tenements appearing in *McClure's Magazine* mentioned in a footnote: "Most of the following reports are the result of a recent investigation by the New York Child Labor Committee."⁴⁹ In this way, muckrakers unearthed and publicized, directing "sunlight" into practically every corner of American life.⁵⁰

Pushing the Bounds of Decorum in Public Argument

The public knew that muckrakers claimed to spare no details in their accounts, and by 1910, they had come to expect muckrakers to share information even about vice. This expectation was a recent development. In the Victorian Era, it was not polite to discuss the "social evil" in polite company.⁵¹ To an extent, this standard was established legally. Comstock laws, first passed in 1873, prohibited the circulation of obscene material through the U. S. mail.⁵² The *Pall Mall Gazette* would not even print the word

"syphilis" in 1885, but in the same year, William T. Stead shocked the public with "The Maiden Tribute of Babylon," which detailed how girls were purchased and forced into prostitution.⁵³ Stead's series incited a transnational conversation about sex and prostitution in the press in the ensuing years. By the 1890s, some newspapers commonly covered vice.⁵⁴ Acceptable topics for public argument were gradually shifting, and journalists helped to push the bounds of propriety in the ensuing decades.⁵⁵

Muckrakers participated actively in shifting these norms and opening up topics of sex and prostitution for public debate. In 1907, George Kibbe Turner published an article in *McClure's Magazine* on vice in Chicago, describing the city's sordid relationship with liquor, cocaine, gambling, and prostitution. He whetted the public's appetite for details (not just generalities) about urban vice.⁵⁶ Building off such work, there was a wave of muckraking exposés about prostitution in 1909.⁵⁷ Theodore Schroeder wrote "Prostitution as a Social Problem" for *The Arena* in 1909.⁵⁸ A few months later Turner published again in *McClure's* about prostitution, warning how "The Daughters of the Poor" were lured into the "white slave trade."⁵⁹ Stories about prostitution and vice also ran in *Harper's Weekly* and *Collier's*.⁶⁰ These authors described how "cadets" lured and trafficked women into prostitution. From Stead to Turner, these exposés chipped away at what the historian Louis Filler called "the national tradition of prudery."⁶¹ The bounds for appropriate public argument were shifting.

Engaging the Audience through Public Argument

Muckrakers also made strides to engage the American public through their accounts. Along with facts (and even lurid details), muckraking was characterized by "rhetorical flourishes" and "dramatic narrative[s]," as Robert Miraldi notes.⁶² Certain

muckrakers were known for their flourishes even more than their facts. David Graham Phillips, for instance, tended more toward sensationalism in his writing.⁶³ As Miraldi notes, Phillips' infamous "The Treason of the Senate" series was "long on rhetoric and short on facts."⁶⁴ In the series, Phillips wrote scathing criticisms of wealthy U.S. senators, indicting the American public for their neglect as well. He argued that senators "smugly sacrificed" the American people's honor for the Senate's "craftily convenient worship of the Mumbo-Jumbo mask and mantle of its own high respectability."⁶⁵

Muckrakers filled their exposés with facts and flourishes, and their purpose was clear. As Steffens wrote, "My purpose was....to see if the shameful facts, spread out in all their shame, would not burn through our civic shamelessness and set fire to American pride."⁶⁶ Steffens and his colleagues believed that their exposures were a prelude to the public enacting constructive remedies.⁶⁷ Their end in bringing these exposés before the public was to build support for reform in the community.

These authors laid out for the American people cases of social and political corruption, but they frequently concluded without recommending specific policies. Muckrakers relied on the general public to determine next steps, and thus, they came under fire for not offering productive solutions after they exposed evils. In 1905, Alger asserted that a central feature of muckraking was that "so few of the writers who so cleverly point to us our social sores seem to have any kind of salve in their hands."⁶⁸ Ida Tarbell did not call her readers to action.⁶⁹ Lincoln Steffens did not propose remedies.⁷⁰ These authors clearly laid out the facts for the public, but then generally left others to decide whether action was necessary and to determine which action was appropriate.⁷¹

There were some tangible results of muckraking though. Edwin Markham's "The Hoe-Man in the Making" led *Cosmopolitan Magazine* to found the Child Labor Federation, an organization that partnered with the NCLC and aimed to do its utmost "through the channels of publicity."⁷² And the success of the *Pure Food and Drug Act* in 1906 is popularly attributed to the publicity work of the muckrakers. Muckrakers themselves trumpeted their own success. *Everybody's* editors in 1909 exalted, "New standards of life have been raised up. The money god totters. Patriotism, manhood, brotherhood are exalted. It is a new era. A new world. Good signs, don't you think? And what has brought it about? Muckraking. Bless your heart, just plain muckraking."⁷³

Muckraking captured the attention of magazine and newspaper audiences in the first decade of the 1900s, even if it was not quite the force that *Everybody's* editor projected. Ernest Poole's "Waifs in the Streets," which was one of the first muckraking articles to mention the NMS, was published as muckraking was quickly taking up steam. In these early years, even detractors noted the popularity, or rather the "extraordinary copiousness," of muckraking.⁷⁴ Many commentators decreed that Phillips' sensational "The Treason of the Senate" series and President Theodore Roosevelt's public censure of muckraking in 1906 sounded muckraking's death knell.⁷⁵ Yet, after a slump around 1908, muckraking revived in 1909 and 1910 and carried on up to World War I.⁷⁶ In these later years, muckrakers turned their spotlight more readily to issues like child labor, saloons, prostitution, and boys in the streets.⁷⁷ Muckrakers directed the community's attention to social problems, and in these years, the NMS gradually emerged as one of these public problems.

FRAMING THE NMS AS A PUBLIC PROBLEM

Child labor reformers predicated their understanding of the NMS as a public problem on modern notions of adolescence that yoked the welfare of the child to the good of the community. Campaigners had to reinforce that childhood and adolescence had shifted from the personal to the public sphere of argument.⁷⁸ Formerly, the family was responsible for a child's upbringing, and the community only intervened in more extenuating circumstances. Childrearing was largely considered to be a private matter. Child savers, reformers, and social scientists, though, directly connected modern conceptions of childhood with the forward progress of American society. They charged that prolonged infancy led to the evolution of human civilization itself. The chairman of the NCLC, Dr. Felix Adler, identified this trajectory as a sociological *fact*. With concern in 1911, he questioned, "how shall we ever work democracy with men" who had no time for education and leisure in their boyhood and adolescence.⁷⁹ Children raised without an education or leisure became a burden to their family *and* the community, affecting the state's ability to govern properly. Thus, reformers argued that the matter was eminently a public concern and demanded a public response.

As they brought the NMS into the public sphere of argument, reformers used a rhetoric of doom to position the NMS as a violation of childhood and a threat to the community. To make this case, they had to contend with long-seated narratives that praised the messenger service. After countering these views, NMS reformers first had to describe what the messenger service entailed and how it threatened children's welfare in order to make the public aware of this looming problem. Following a progressive trend, NMS reformers gradually reframed the service from a legitimate occupation to a local problem to a national threat.

Accepted Discourses about the NMS

In the public discourse, the night messenger service had long been depicted as a laudable occupation. In the 1870s and 1880s, industry publications, like the *Journal of the Telegraph*, referred to messengers' "unswerving fidelity" and "cheerful promptness." In the press, messengers were characterized as "lithe," "active," and "expeditious."⁸⁰ Authors also celebrated messengers' for the central role they played in the modern communication system of the telegraph. A Boston author, Emma E. Brown, wrote sympathetically of "child toilers" in 1878, but she composed admiring descriptions of messengers. She noted, "Hither and thither all through the city, and at all hours of the day and night, the little fellows hurry along with their dispatches. And just think what important messages they carry in those great yellow envelopes!" Brown's tone conveyed wonder at the "swift, trusty little messengers," not censure of their abuse.⁸¹ Reporters for popular monthlies struck the same tone. Appreciating the telegraph as a modern invention, a magazine reporter in 1881 lauded messengers as "little lads" that were "pictures of neatness and general rosiness" and "seemed as happy as the wires were long."⁸²

Prominent authors portrayed messengers as happy, but they also positioned the service as the gateway to success in the community for these working boys. Authors in the late-1800s frequently projected that messengers had bright futures.⁸³ According to this popular narrative, leading businessmen quickly recognized ambitious messengers and stole them to work in their large business houses.⁸⁴ Horatio Alger Jr. furthered this narrative. He wrote two novels about the messenger service, published in 1879 and 1900, and in them, his young messenger heroes responsibly escorted young women to the

theater, promptly executed their errands, and bravely guarded what was good and true. Alger's stories projected that discipline and character could lead a messenger boy to public prominence.⁸⁵ Throughout the discourse, then, a popular narrative conveyed how lithe, young messengers made promising business contacts, carried out healthful outdoor errands, and learned to make a way for themselves in the world. As Florence Kelley noted in 1905, messenger boys had "long been surrounded by... glamour in the public mind."⁸⁶ Campaigners had to confront the public's entrenched positive perceptions of the messenger service as they made a case for its reform.

By and large, the NMS was not a public problem between 1900 and 1909.⁸⁷ Newspapers commonly ran advertisements announcing the range of services provided by messenger companies. A 1903 ad in the *Omaha Daily Bee* boasted that the Omaha Express and Messenger Company was "Open Day And Night" and mused that it was "surprising...how many uses a messenger boy can be put to."⁸⁸ It would have been uncommon for anyone to object to such an ad, yet as the decade progressed, a handful of muckrakers condemned child labor in the night messenger service. They placed the service in the national spotlight and followed the model of muckraking as they decided about publication outlets, research, exposure, and courses of action.

Challenging Accepted Discourses about the NMS

The first challenge for reformers was to make a case that the NMS was indeed a problem. Early exposés focused primarily on the night messenger service as a local problem. Ernest Poole, writing for *McClure's Magazine* in 1903, was one of the first figures to speak out against the night service. A well-known progressive and muckraker, Poole entitled his article "Waifs of the Street" and focused on the situation in New York

City for child street workers (including messengers).⁸⁹ Three years after Poole, Lincoln Steffens called out the problem of the NMS but only in the context of Colorado reforms launched by Judge Ben Lindsey.⁹⁰ Ernest Poole's friend and erstwhile coauthor, William Hard, was the next muckraker to bring child labor in the messenger service prominently into the public's attention.⁹¹ Writing for *Everybody's* in 1908, Hard vividly told of messengers' irregular night life, noted their disreputable associations, described their gambling, and provided testimony about the "loathsome distempers" of the Red Light district.⁹² Hard's article was descriptive and engaging, unfolding for his readers the progression of an urban night. Yet, although Hard's story painted a grim scene, he dwelt solely on the situation in Chicago and proposed no solutions.⁹³ From Poole to Hard, these early opponents addressed the service within a local context, whether New York, Chicago, or Colorado. They exposed the NMS as a problem and used muckraking journals as their platform, but they treated the NMS as an isolated problem, a local issue that formed a facet of their broader concerns about boys.

Over these years, figures in the reform community began attending to the NMS as a public problem, but their attention to it was scattered and still largely local. Often states with the input of child labor reformers even enacted *laxer* regulations for the messenger service than other industries.⁹⁴ General child labor laws commonly exempted the messenger service from regulation altogether; this situation was the case in Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New York.⁹⁵ Yet, in the wake of Poole's "Waifs of the Street," several reformers began to challenge this view. Writing for the *American Journal of Sociology*, Josephine Goldmark pointed out that "the lads in the messenger service" had recently been "brought to light."⁹⁶ Her point was reflected in the proceedings of the first annual

meeting of the National Child Labor Committee as messengers were mentioned a handful of times. At the conference, the headworker of West Side Neighborhood House in New York City cautioned his colleagues that messenger boys learned "the very worst side of the city's life."⁹⁷ Each of these pronouncements only briefly mentioned the messenger service. Yet, in 1905, Florence Kelley of the National Consumers' League addressed the NMS more fully and firmly situated it as a looming threat for the community. "The children of to-day," she charged, "are potentially the Republic of 1930."⁹⁸ In just a few years, the messenger service moved from being a non-issue to a peripheral concern. In a few years more, the NMS became the primary focus of the national anti-child labor movement.

The National Child Labor Committee took up the NMS in 1909, and they framed the service as a national problem. The campaign started with a report from an NCLC staff investigator about the "startling" conditions he observed in the NMS, but this report spurred the committee on to a more systematic study in cities across the United States.⁹⁹ Their investigative reports had revealed the preponderance of this issue across state lines. Out of this work, the National Child Labor Committee decided to make regulating the night messenger service one of their main goals in 1910.¹⁰⁰ Curiously, the NCLC *did not* point to Hard or Poole's popular exposés as the impetus for its campaign, but the committee *did* look to muckraking to ramp up national publicity for their campaign. The NCLC partnered with Leroy Scott to publish the first mainstream muckraking article focused solely on the NMS. They shared their investigative reports with him, and Scott published "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service" in *Success Magazine* in 1910.¹⁰¹ Through his work, the NMS campaigners directed their concern to the entire nation, for

as Scott claimed, the "general situation is everywhere fundamentally the same."¹⁰² Thus, the American public became their audience.

Developing the Argument for the Campaign

With partners like Scott, the NCLC launched a concentrated campaign against the NMS throughout the country, and they delivered an amazingly consistent line of argument across state campaigns. This continuity was a logical outgrowth of social scientific theories about the "social mind." In their discourse, campaigners situated the American public as their implied audience; for them, the American public was the *phronimos*. As they projected an homogenous and moral audience, it was reasonable to take a single argumentative approach regardless of whether addressing the public in New Jersey or Wisconsin.

The campaigners laid out a consistent set of appeals and drew on similar evidence across the state campaigns. Their reasoning largely included the following elements: (1) a statement about the thorough research conducted, (2) a claim that the material uncovered was unprintable, (3) an exoneration of the public from guilt, (4) a purportedly sanitized overview of what was discovered, and (5) an assertion of the inevitability of success for the campaign.¹⁰³

Organizationally, this continuity was accomplished through the circulation and syndication of muckraking articles and through the relationships that the NCLC and its partners cultivated with the press. As a start, Scott's article circulated widely. Beyond the readership of *Success*, local editors reprinted small segments and even whole blocks of Scott's article in newspapers ranging from the *The Muskogee County Republican* (OK) to the *Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader* (PA) to the *Danville Commercial-News* (IL).¹⁰⁴ The

muckrakers' arguments chained out through this process of reprinting. The National Child Labor Committee and its local partners also actively aided in working with the press to circulate their claims. They issued news bulletins to local papers. According to the New York Child Labor Committee, the New York City press showed "a commendable willingness to cooperate with the [committee]... especially in the publicity given to our bulletins on the Murray Night Messenger Bill."¹⁰⁵ Magazines led the crusade to the people, but newspapers became partners in the crusade against child labor in the NMS in many locales. Through these strategies, child labor reformers succeeded (to an impressive extent) in coordinating the NMS discourse across states and publications.

This feat of coordination is better highlighted when it is placed within its context. There was an active debate going on in the public sphere of argument over how vice should be addressed by municipal governments. In the first decade of the 1900s, leading citizens lobbied for the abolition of vice through groups like the Committee of Fifteen in New York.¹⁰⁶ They pushed to shut down prostitution and gambling completely. The Chicago Vice Commission, which was formed in 1910, took this stance, but even the Commission focused on regulation within the NMS. They recommended that the state pass an amendment "to the effect that no person under the age of twenty-one shall be employed in the night messenger service."¹⁰⁷ NMS campaigners called for regulation while their fellow reformers sought to eliminate vice completely.¹⁰⁸ Opponents charged that the NMS reforms were a ploy to regulate all vice, but the leader of the NCLC, Owen Lovejoy, adamantly denied this accusation.¹⁰⁹ Across the state campaigns, reformers sought to regulate, not abolish, the night messenger service. They easily could have chosen another approach.

There was some variation in the arguments of the NMS campaign. Campaigners in Massachusetts pulled in the state's history as a leader in the child labor movement.¹¹⁰ The Georgia campaign distanced itself from New York.¹¹¹ Owen Lovejoy stressed professional responsibility when he spoke to the American Public Hygiene Association about the NMS.¹¹² Nonetheless, reformers overwhelmingly treated the NMS as a widespread, national problem and sought state legislative solutions, and they crafted their message for and to the “social mind” of the American public.

ARGUING FOR THE INNOCENCE OF THE *PHRONIMOS*

The NCLC and its partners constructed their campaign arguments around a projection of the character of the American public. They assumed that their audience was “right-minded,” and they built their case to appeal to this conception of the public as the *phronimos*. Earlier opponents of the NMS blamed the American public for inaction and/or complicity in the NMS evil, but the reformers who began agitating against the NMS in 1910 exonerated the American public of blame. As their argument developed, campaigners presented their comments as a corrective to the public's misunderstandings of messenger work rather than as a chastisement for the public's errant behavior. This approach veered from earlier constructions of responsibility within the campaign. In the investigative reports, field agents recorded the messengers’ assertions of agency in this world of vice, but in the public argument of the campaigners, neither the messengers nor the public was at fault; the habitants of the vice district were the only guilty parties. By these moves, campaigners wove into the fabric of their argument an image of the strong moral character of the American people.

Earlier opponents of child labor in the NMS addressed the public as if they were a single entity, but they questioned the character of that social body. This hard-hitting style followed the customs of muckraking, which adamantly named names and placed blame at the feet of public figures and the American people alike. Figures, like Lincoln Steffens, made it their stated goal to trouble the public's "civic shamelessness."¹¹³ In this vein, early NMS reformers did not exonerate the public of guilt for the NMS problem. Rather, they blamed the public for the problem of child labor in the night messenger service. In 1905, Florence Kelley tasked consumers with the responsibility of stipulating "for a large boy" when calling a messenger.¹¹⁴ The "public mind," she charged, had been too willing to overlook the truth about the messenger service.¹¹⁵ According to Kelley, the public had erred. The Commissioner of Labor in the nation's capital, Charles Neill, similarly indicted the public in *Charities and the Commons* in 1906. Speaking of the messenger service in D.C., he charged that the "shameful conditions" that existed were due to "a lack of conscience in the community at large."¹¹⁶ Neill did not construct the American public as inherently wise and virtuous; in his view, they lacked a conscience. Writing for *The Arena* in the same year, Elinor Stoy asserted that the indifference and ignorance of the "public mind" and "the slow growth of civic consciousness" were the biggest obstacles to better child labor laws (including the NMS).¹¹⁷ For these early opponents of the NMS, the American people had one mind, but it was wrong. The public was culpable; due to indifference or inaction, they were to blame for the NMS problem.

Child labor reformers took this approach to the public in other campaigns, but they shifted their appeals at the start of the concentrated NMS campaign in 1909. Leaders in the anti-child labor movement, like Owen Lovejoy, acknowledged that efforts to

regulate child labor frequently met with the "indifference of the general citizenship."¹¹⁸

When working to regulate child labor in the factories, mines, and street trades, child labor reformers regularly encountered disinterest or even resistance. The NMS campaigners separated their efforts from this mainstream work by distancing child labor in the NMS from the problem of child labor more generally. They set the NMS apart as a new concern that was sure to have public support. Writing as late as 1911, Richard Conant relayed to Bostonians that the NMS was "a new problem for child labor committees" brought about by "the modern inventive genius of society" in its perfection of the telegraph.¹¹⁹ This construction absolved the public of guilt for this problem within the community.¹²⁰

Correcting the Public's Misconceptions of the NMS

NMS campaigners claimed that the public was innocent in regard to the NMS problem because it misperceived how night work differed from day work. Campaigners regularly reaffirmed the value of the day messenger service. Edward N. Clopper, the Ohio Valley Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee, admitted that in the "day-time the messenger boy's work consists of the unobjectionable task of delivering telegrams about the city."¹²¹ The National Child Labor Committee and its partners maintained this point consistently throughout their campaign, noting that day messengers did "legitimate work."¹²² Owen R. Lovejoy, the secretary of the National Child Labor Committee, confirmed that the "popular picture of a small boy in uniform running at top speed to carry a telegram" was accurate for the day messenger service. During the day, messengers associated with "business men" and learned habits of efficiency and enterprise.¹²³ According to reformers, the general public saw and rightly approved of day

messengers. Therefore, although misinformed, the public was innocent in their intentions toward these young boys.

Scott and his fellow campaigners built this projection of public innocence and also constructed their implied audience as teachable. They situated their appeals as a corrective to previous misunderstandings of the NMS. They stressed that the public's view of the messenger service was a "delusion."¹²⁴ Scott forgivingly noted that businessmen rarely could "imagine the perils" to which night messengers were subjected.¹²⁵ A Pennsylvania paper argued that "the general public has no intelligent ideas of the number of temptations a boy is subjected to in the delivery and collection of messages."¹²⁶ In effect, the problem was hiding in plain sight.¹²⁷ Several articles conveyed that even child labor reformers had not understood the full extent of this evil and had to conduct further research; some of the most "sophisticated" investigators were "amazed" at the conditions they discovered in the messenger service and "heard of things that they never dreamed existed."¹²⁸ The night service was "far different" than the day service, and as reformers stressed, it was far worse.¹²⁹ Like these reformers, campaigners assumed that the American public was able, when confronted by evidence of its errors, to reweigh the situation and determine a better course.

In such ways, leaders in the campaign constructed their task as public education rather than persuasion.¹³⁰ In this approach, they were consummate progressives. They placed their faith in education and the efficacy of exposure. One editor of *The Survey* described the strategy of the Pennsylvania Child Labor Association as a "campaign of education."¹³¹ They did not speak of convincing the public of the problem; they assumed that the need for change would be apparent upon the presentation of the NMS facts.

Alternatives were unimaginable. It was "impossible to read" the NMS articles "without appreciating" the need for change.¹³² The *Bridgport Standard* stressed that there were "no two ways of looking at the matter."¹³³ The decision was an easy one.

By their constructions, they framed their audience as the *phronimos* and made it apparent how this homogeneous public would react. If the public knew, they would respond. Reformers described the perspective that "every decent man and woman" must hold on the issue, assumed that the public met this standard, and cut off any consideration of an alternative.¹³⁴ It was unfathomable that "any right-minded citizen" would not endorse their proposal.¹³⁵ They represented a single, homogenous public in such a way that only one course of action was possible, and the metaphors that reformers chose exuded confidence. The public was *awakening* to its responsibility. It was *beginning to rouse* to the seriousness of the situation.¹³⁶ It was *becoming alive* to the need for legislation.¹³⁷ It was *dawning* with understanding.¹³⁸ Like the coming of the dawn, campaigners described their efforts not as an experiment but as a sure development. Owen Lovejoy concluded that the NMS "will doubtless be forbidden to all minors."¹³⁹ Having framed the audience as the *phronimos* and dispelling the public's misconceptions of the NMS, reformers assumed their ultimate success.¹⁴⁰

Drawing on the Public's Social Knowledge of Urban Nights

Child welfare activists further built up their construction of the American public as the *phronimos* and distanced this ideal public from culpability by their characterization of the urban night. These speakers tapped into and extended common lines of reasoning that villainized urban night life and set it apart as a radically different time. Reformers described the night as a foreign zone, unknown to the average person. They repeatedly

referred to it as "another world" or an "underworld."¹⁴¹ The city at night was distant, foreign, and beneath the life of the city known to the general public. It was presumed that the American people did not know what occurred in this uncontrollable other world. Situated as a foil to the moral order of the day, campaigners charged that the city at night gave "unbridled" control to "immoral forces."¹⁴² Projecting an almost inevitable progression, Alexander J. McKelway, an assistant secretary for the National Child Labor Committee, stressed, "But as the day is given up to industry, so the forces of pleasure, in our cities, hold sway at night, and the later hours the forces of immorality and crime."¹⁴³ In such articulations, child labor committee leaders wrote as if cities had a bewitching hour at which they underwent "a radical change."¹⁴⁴ This sentiment reflected broader fears, for as the scholar Bryan Palmer argues, urban nights were associated with the threatening "dangerous classes."¹⁴⁵ In the writings of the NMS campaigners, urban nights transformed familiar cities from civilized, industrial centers to depraved, animalistic dens. As NMS campaigners made clear, the moral and civically-oriented American public did not know this side of the cities.

In the end, the campaigners blamed the NMS problem on urban night life, its places and habitants. The general public and even the leadership of the telegraph and messenger companies was absolved of guilt. As Leroy Scott claimed early on, company officials at Western Union and American District Telegraph were "doubtless" ignorant of the evils of their business.¹⁴⁶ Instead, reformers argued that a separate "class" of people governed the underworld in which messengers served as lackeys, and this population was distanced from the general public by its character and environment. Campaigners made it clear that the very night environment was evil. The messengers were called to "houses" or

"questionable places."¹⁴⁷ While the specific names for these places varied, their negative influence was apparent. Activists referred to them as "disreputable resorts," "houses of ill repute," "vilest dens," "inside of the life of evil," "places of assignation," "notorious houses," and "disorderly houses in the Red Light district."¹⁴⁸

Reformers left no doubt about the character of these places, and they made a similar assessment of the character of the people who frequented such resorts. They were "vicious and dissolute characters," "inhabitants of notorious houses," "inmates," people of "evil intent," and "denizens of the underworld."¹⁴⁹ These night characters served as a stark contrast to the NMS reformers' implied audience of innocent, well-intentioned, teachable, and moral citizens. Thus, campaigners situated the NMS as a public problem while also exonerating the public of blame.

ENGAGING THE PUBLIC THROUGH THEIR EXPECTATIONS

The NMS campaigners sharpened their argument and reinforced these constructions of the *phronimos* by how they engaged and claimed to violate the public's expectations for argument. As Goodnight argues, "Facility with conventions enables individuals to act with greater scope" yet also "misexpectations open opportunities for social change."¹⁵⁰ Campaigners tapped into muckraking norms for increasingly detailed exposure and pushing the boundaries of decorum, yet against this backdrop, they also struck a conservative approach by claiming that their material was unprintable. In this way, the NMS campaigners engaged their ideal audience through an enthymeme. The American public needed only to recall what they had heard about the social evil and to apply these expectations to the NMS campaigners claims of "unprintable" in order to complete the unfinished argument about the severity and urgency of the NMS situation.

Framing the American public as the *phronimos*, they created an argument that activated the public in processing the problem.

Situating the Campaign within the Norms of Public Argument & Public Character

NMS campaigners abided by the basic norms of public argument developed in muckraking journalism. They placed their exposés into mainstream muckraking outlets like *McClure's*, *The Arena*, *Everybody's*, and *Success*. By 1910, they framed the NMS as a national problem, affecting the community as a whole. Additionally, these reformers often mirrored muckraking's focus on exposure over solutions. In his introduction, Leroy Scott pressed, "This investigation uncovers a condition which... should rouse to protest and to action every person who regards citizenship as the foremost of our national assets to be fostered and conserved,"¹⁵¹ yet besides a brief mention of legislation in New York, his sole directive to his broader audience was "vigilance." This muted call for action carried into other NMS campaign publications. Owen Lovejoy, writing for *The Survey* in 1910, framed his discussion of the NMS with the purpose that "the reader may understand."¹⁵² These reformers hinged their arguments on the character of the American public, but they refrained from calling their audiences to participate in the campaign. They demanded engagement, not action.

These reformers engaged their audience by violating one of the core tenets of muckraking, detailed exposure. Scott and his fellow campaigners outspokenly declined to provide the public with the full NMS reports at a time when other muckrakers straightforwardly denounced public figures and discussed vice. The bounds of public decorum were expanding, yet the National Child Labor Committee firmly decreed that the detailed NMS investigative reports were "unprintable."¹⁵³ Local child labor

committees and supporters regularly used such reasoning throughout their state campaigns. They proclaimed that specific details from the NMS reports were "too horrible and too shameful to relay,"¹⁵⁴ "too bad to be told,"¹⁵⁵ "of a character to prohibit general publication,"¹⁵⁶ and "too horrible to be publicly explained."¹⁵⁷ By these claims, NMS campaigners constructed an enthymeme that called on their audience to draw conclusions about the NMS problem based on their familiarity with the norms of muckraking.

According to reformers like Scott, the details of the NMS were ones which the "American idea of decorum forbids one publicly to discuss,"¹⁵⁸ and this attention to decorum shows how campaigners constructed the American public as a homogeneous ideal. Decorum is always defined in relation to an audience and argument context, for the concept of decorum rests on the assumption that what is appropriate depends on whom you are addressing. Therefore, the NMS reformers were constructing their audience by how they built decorum.

They appealed to decorum in a way that constructed their ideal audience as gendered and classed. Campaign leaders explicitly referenced how the reports were indecent for a female audience, whether a women's gathering or the home, a traditionally feminine realm. At the Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs, Miss Frances Ingram's report stressed that the results of the investigation were "too bad to be told the convention."¹⁵⁹ Alexander McKelway made the case that the report's "nature can only be hinted at in a paper that circulates in the home."¹⁶⁰ The campaigners also constructed decorum in relation to respectability, a privilege of the middle- and upper-classes and whiteness, not working-class laborers. One newspaper account noted, "The details are too

tough for the committee to have printed for such respectable communities. The people must not be allowed to read of their wickedness...”¹⁶¹ By articulating decorum, this author inscribed the “people” with middle-class respectability. Edward Barrows made the same case when addressing the Massachusetts Committee on Labor, pressing, “it is absolutely impossible to put frankly before a gathering of this character life as a messenger boy sees it.”¹⁶² In each case, the constructed character of the audience dictated the norms of appropriateness.¹⁶³

The NMS campaigners also explicitly tied their reticence to the laws that codified and protected the public’s character. The public’s character established what information was fit or unfit, suitable or unsuitable to share, and according to reformers, the character of the NMS reports conflicted with the character of the American public. In the *Bridgeport Standard*, an article claimed that the NMS reports were “of a character to prohibit general publication.”¹⁶⁴ Another paper asserted that the information was “of such a character that it cannot be described in a letter.”¹⁶⁵ In this claim and others that the material was “unprintable,” reformers invoked the legal restrictions on the “circulation of obscene literature and articles of immoral use” – the Comstock laws.¹⁶⁶ These assertions classed the night messenger service as a type of knowledge outside of the moral character of the reading audience. On occasion, campaigners took this point further, asserting that the facts were even beyond communication. The investigators found conditions that were “unspeakably bad.”¹⁶⁷

Violating the Public’s Expectations for Exposure

Yet, these claims were dated, for currents of decorum were shifting. The campaigner’s arguments mirrored claims that were made around the “white slave” scare

of the 1880s. At that time, newspapers across the country carried the story of white women being forced into prostitution in the logging camps of Michigan. In describing the conditions, the author concluded, "What is published is but a hint of the life led in these dens of infamy, the details being too revolting for publication."¹⁶⁸ By 1910, though, discussions about vice were becoming much more common in muckraking accounts and other public arguments. A list of examples illustrates this loosening even outside of muckraking periodicals. For instance, white slave tracts started circulating in 1909.¹⁶⁹ By 1912, Reginald Wright Kauffman's lurid and detailed book, *The House of Bondage*, was a best-seller in its fourteenth edition.¹⁷⁰ In 1913, a play was successfully performed in New York about the consequences of syphilis.¹⁷¹ In these forums, sex, prostitution, and venereal diseases were laid before the public for debate. Notions of decorum were being renegotiated, and the nation's tradition of prudery was loosening.

Within this discursive context, Leroy Scott and his fellow campaigners still determined that the details of the NMS were too lurid for the general public, yet his muckraking predecessors had made no such claims. Indeed, censorship was antithetical to the muckraker's goal of educating the people with the facts. In 1903, Ernest Poole vividly described the irregular and demoralizing life of child street workers. In 1908, William Hard noted that mothers "would be quite maternally surprised" to learn of the activities of night messengers, but like Poole, he provided an animated account of the night messengers' irregular habits, demoralizing environment, and "loathsome" diseases.¹⁷² As muckrakers, they provided an engaging factual account of conditions among messengers. As authors, they drew on their personal experience, presented trustworthy testimony, and exposed the evils of the night messenger service.

Qualitatively, the content of these earlier accounts closely resembled the "censored" publications of later NMS campaigners, yet neither Poole nor Hard made a pretense of only offering a partial description to the public. Perhaps CLC investigators came across more alarming details than Poole or Hard encountered. Perhaps Poole and Hard believed that their accounts were a sufficient condemnation. Perhaps the dictates of decorum kept Poole and Hard from even referencing the unprintable. Regardless, muckraking work preceding Scott's article established the persuasive field for the NMS campaign. Well-known muckrakers like Steffens, Baker, Tarbell, and Turner alongside lesser-known muckrakers like Poole and Hard, set the American public's expectations for exposure and decorum.

Thus, by the start of the NMS campaign, the American public was familiar with muckraking, and they were primed with information about the extent of vice in American cities. Yet, the NMS campaigners cited concern for the moral character of the general public as their inducement for not sharing more liberally from the NMS reports. Within the context, this line of reasoning functioned as an enthymeme and became a theme in the NMS discourse after 1909. The muckraking tradition hinged on flooding the public with facts to prove the presence of a problem and spur action. By 1910, the American public was accustomed to this process. Muckrakers of vice followed this form. Yet, even muckraking partners of the vice crusaders had not claimed that what they found was inappropriate for publication. Thus, the NMS campaigners heightened their case for the severity and urgency of the particular situation as a public problem and threat when they crafted an enthymeme that hinged on the assertion that the material was "unprintable."

Within a new context of loosening norms of decorum, the NMS campaigners maintained this more dated prudery in their approach and constructed the *phronimos* by these claims. In urging for social reform, they took the conservative path of argument.¹⁷³ Their audience had to complete the picture. Readers could mentally amass the stories of vice that they had read and infer that the NMS was worse. The NCLC and its partners flouted the standards of muckraking by withholding details and strengthened their case in the process. Depending on the public to fill in the blank, this claim made the NMS situation all the more alarming. The campaigners' argument was straightforward. They left their audience to conclude that what the public could not (or should not) know, messenger boys already knew.

ESTABLISHING NIGHT MESSENGER BOYS AS A THREAT

NMS reformers brought the messengers' case before this construction of the public, and their descriptions of the boys further fleshed out their ideal public. Campaigners tapped into modern theories that extended childhood and adolescence as they detailed what they thought to be essential for the moral training of the *phronimos*. By framing messengers as boys, campaigners defined them by their potentiality; the messengers were not a public problem because of their current state but for what they would become.¹⁷⁴ Messenger boys would become men and full members of the public. Thus, campaigners engaged their audience with a rhetoric of doom by sketching out the insidious effect of night work on these future members of the community and warning of how it would affect the character of the general public. Most persistently, campaigners framed child labor in the NMS as a looming threat to the industrial efficiency of the American public, to the *phronimos*.

Constructing the Messengers' Youth

The campaigner's argument rested on a careful construction of the messengers as boys, marked by their youthfulness rather than class or racial differences. Age had recently become an important metric for gauging what type of work a boy was qualified to complete, so many speakers for the NMS reform began describing the service by noting the boys' ages. Some campaigners, like Edward Brown, claimed to have come across nine- and ten-year-olds in the service.¹⁷⁵ Scott asserted that *on average*, though, messengers were between fourteen and twenty years old.¹⁷⁶ Having estimated the ages of messengers, these campaigners, including Scott, tended to dwell on accounts of younger messengers, boys closer to fourteen than twenty. Their stories were regularly about fourteen-, fifteen-, and sixteen-year-olds.¹⁷⁷ The newspapers told of "an under-sized boy of fourteen" or a fifteen-year-old who had been in the service since he was eleven.¹⁷⁸ When campaigners recounted stories of older messengers, they regularly noted how these boys were ruined by starting in the service when they were still young. Age had become an important marker of childhood and adolescence. By focusing on the messengers' young ages, reformers alluded to these boys' becoming. Messengers were not full members of the community, but in a few years, these boys would be a part of the public.

Regardless of age, reformers reinforced the messengers' potentiality by referring to and picturing them as "boys." They described them as "little more than children," "young lads," "small boys," and "little fellows hardly old enough to be out of primary classes."¹⁷⁹ These depictions implied that the boys were incomplete, highlighting that they still needed to grow and learn.

The reformers introduced images that reinforced these projection of tender young messenger boys. The question "Are Boys Like These Worth Saving?" ran across the first page and again across the second page of Scott's article. Under each headline were pictured four boys' busts silhouetted against a blank background. Each of the boys was pictured in their uniform, maybe a little ruffled but well dressed. In black and white, they all look to have non-descript Caucasian features, but it was their youth that was highlighted. On the first page, each of the boys met the readers' gaze. Their expressions were open. Two of the boys were smirking as they looked on, and dimples showed through in one of the boy's grins. Void of context, these messengers looked boyish and innocent.

In these selections, the reader greeted a depiction of the lithe young messenger boys he thought he knew. Yet, Scott provided photos in step with his argument. By the second page, there were subtle shifts in the silhouettes. Somehow the boys' faces hardened. There was no longer a hint of a smirk. While the messengers were all sized to the same height, an older-looking boy appeared on the second page. Another had his hat cocked and met the readers' gaze with a knitted brow and a challenging look. The two youngest-looking boys stared off at angles into the distance. As Scott disavowed the public of their rosy image of messenger work, he provided visuals that followed along with his argument. The reader was challenged through the verbal and visual evidence that perhaps these boys, whom he thought he knew, knew more than he had expected. Their innocence was being compromised and, in turn, threatened to compromise the character of the general public.

In these constructions of youth and innocence, the movement adopted modern conceptions of adolescence that claimed that adolescents needed a sheltered upbringing in order to develop properly into adult members of the community.¹⁸⁰ Reformers steadily called for night messenger work to be "done by men and *not* by boys."¹⁸¹ These campaigners had a broad understanding of what it meant to be a boy; they considered anyone under twenty-one years old to be a boy when it came to the NMS. Yet, in 1911, child labor reformers were still working to get children under the age of twelve out of the workplace in some states.¹⁸² The campaigners stressed that the night messenger service was a special case. In the service, reformers claimed that a twenty-year-old was at greater risk than a sixteen-year-old.¹⁸³ They constructed an expansive view of adolescence for their audience and labeled all of the messengers "boys."

Reformers implicitly and explicitly prescribed what was essential to ensuring the *phronimos* as they invoked theories of adolescence and sketched out this composite image of messengers and their needs. As traced in Chapter One, prominent social scientists dictated that tender youthful minds needed to be surrounded with positive influences. Scott laid out the touchstones of such adolescent theories in his article in *Success*; he stressed that messengers were at increased risk because as adolescents they were at "the age when the sex instincts are awakening, when morbid curiosity is at its height, when reason and experience and self-restraint are lacking, and when the boy needs the wisest care and counsel and protection."¹⁸⁴ Adolescents were at great risk to go astray during these years, but such a path would lead to ruin. Scott's words and reasoning circulated widely in the campaign. Editors across the country picked up and paraphrased Scott's interpretation of messengers' tasks for local papers. Adolescent messenger boys,

they reemphasized, were "especially susceptible to evil influence and when they need most to be shielded from it."¹⁸⁵ Other campaigners similarly adopted this conception of messengers as precariously-situated adolescents. Explicitly tying his argument to "psychology," Brown noted, "we must bear in mind that we are dealing with growing bodies, quickening senses, and a mind in its formative and impressionable stage."¹⁸⁶ The young night messenger was in danger.

Laying Out the Messenger's Ruin

In magazine articles, newspapers columns, and public speeches, reformers warned that adolescent night messengers were open to physical, moral, and industrial ruin that would affect the rest of their lives.¹⁸⁷ Owen Lovejoy's argument that the NMS was a "menace to moral character, obstacle to physical development, and the barrier to future industrial efficiency" ran in publications across the country.¹⁸⁸ As this message was discussed, Lovejoy's warning about the "moral menace" of the night messenger service attracted the most attention.

In describing the messenger's environment, journalists and speakers cautioned about how the messenger's work surrounded him with the worst influences instead of sheltering him from adult matters. Reformers were unified in their criticism of the influence of the street and its associates. While they deemed the work to be physically injurious, the campaign focused on how it destroyed, deadened, menaced, vitiated, and ruined the boys' morals.¹⁸⁹ The reformers' descriptions left little hope for the boys' future productive participation as members of the public. It was "the most immoral form of employment for children" yet discovered.¹⁹⁰ The reformers' attention and the public's response to this facet of the problem reinforced the image of an ideal homogenous public.

According to campaigners, the public was concerned about the character of their rising citizens because the *phronimos* needed a moral upbringing in which they could learn to reason and sift through experience.

Yet, the National Child Labor Committee deemed the messengers' economic ruin to be an even graver concern for the public. Lovejoy responded to an attack in the *Telegraph and Telephone Age* by saying that "although the wreckage of juvenile character as a result of contamination in this service has received more publicity than any other feature of the problem, the committee regards the economic aspects of the night messenger service paramount." Borrowing language from his opponent, Lovejoy condemned the economic effects of the NMS on boys. He noted, "It is because this particular kind of work ordinarily contributes to 'destroying the earning power of the embryo citizen' that we look upon it with disfavor."¹⁹¹ As the day service prepared boys for future careers, the night service sapped their future earning potential. Campaigners cautioned that these messengers would become full members of the public without material resources or economic prospects.¹⁹²

In this way, reformers defined their ideal American public not solely by the traditional citizenship markers of residence, whiteness, or character, but by productive, skilled labor. The boys' moral ruin was integrated into broader fears that the messenger service would swell the ranks of the unemployed.¹⁹³ In fact, the NMS reformers argued that these two facets of the individual were inseparable. In the past, citizenship extended to "free white" persons of "good character."¹⁹⁴ Child labor reformers developed this vision of the ideal citizen, coupling character more closely with industrial productivity in line with contemporary trends of Taylorism. Campaigners focused predominantly on

messengers' coming roles as producers, not voters, and they condemned the NMS on the grounds that it threatened the nation's future workers. They were concerned about the future composition of the community.

Again and again, reformers identified child labor in the NMS as an industrial problem. It was an issue to be address at meetings on "Modern Industrial Problems."¹⁹⁵ It was to be confronted as "fundamentally inconsistent with the best method of industrial training."¹⁹⁶ It was a matter of "industrial efficiency."¹⁹⁷ To a society struggling to respond to rapid industrialization, NMS campaigners made *industrial* concerns, goals, and expectations a crux of their argument.¹⁹⁸ Across such references, the boys and their work were evaluated in terms of "productive labor."¹⁹⁹ Were the boys moving toward industrial development or destruction?²⁰⁰ It was about economic preparation, at once related to physical and mental capacities but hinging on a measure of fitness for labor. In these expressions, campaigners seemingly invoked multiple definitions of *industrial*. At once they referred to the boys' roles working in an industrial society, but they also questioned whether ex-messengers were "of a quality suitable for industrial use."²⁰¹ Like sub-grade materials, ex-messenger boys were deemed unfit workers within an industrial civilization.²⁰² Their unfitness made them a threat.

The value of the children, then, was in their latent economic contributions. The ideal child, and ideal future member of the public, was industrially productive; a child with no economic prospects was a menace to the public. At times, this association was explicit. Writing for the *Rochester Union & Advertiser*, one author argued, "But to conserve the lives of children is industrially profitable. The child of to-day is the

workman of to-morrow."²⁰³ "Conserve the child" was a popular Progressive Era slogan, which the NMS campaigners readily adopted.²⁰⁴

Warning the Public of the Threatening Doom

Having identified messengers as boys, campaigners constructed the messengers' development as a direct threat to the *phronimos*. Reformers surveyed the outputs of the service, and they concluded that the NMS resulted in unemployment, delinquency, and dependence. The campaign became about protecting the public from the graduates of the NMS. Rephrasing Scott, an author for *The Citizen* warned that the NMS was situated with the gambling den on one side and the bread line and penitentiary on the other.²⁰⁵ These tales of horror linked the boys' moral and economic ruin and, at the same time, prescribed what training and traits a member of the *phronimos* needed to have.

NMS reformers objected to child labor in the messenger service on the grounds that it failed to train boys appropriately; it was unskilled labor.²⁰⁶ Messengers needed no special skills to complete their work, and they received no training on the job. They did not learn "the business of telegraphy" or "any useful trade."²⁰⁷ Messengers left the service as adults as unskilled as when they entered the job as children, so they were "unlikely to go into good jobs afterward."²⁰⁸ After working in the service, "a large majority" of young boys lost "all desire to engage in honorable pursuits."²⁰⁹ Since they had no productive business experiences, only unskilled jobs were open to messengers; the boys were only fitted for positions as wagon drivers, bartenders, saloonkeepers, and poolroom attendants.²¹⁰ Several reformers listed off these potential occupations with opprobrium, highlighting that the character of the work mattered. The night messenger service was, as Owen Lovejoy claimed, an "industrial blind alley."²¹¹

NMS reformers widely adopted this new figurative-usage of the phrase "blind alley" to condemn night messenger work.²¹² The NMS "leads nowhere."²¹³ It "begins and ends nowhere."²¹⁴ It was a "dead end."²¹⁵ In such explanations, reformers criticized the NMS because it excluded opportunities for advancement. Acceptable forms of child labor were cast as a stepping stone. In so far as a job equipped a boy for better future positions, it was alright. Reformers justified child labor in the day messenger service because the work reputedly set boys in the path of other professional opportunities. The night messenger service led boys nowhere professionally and was therefore unacceptable. The conclusion to be drawn was like one messenger reported, "Most of the night messengers I knew never amounted to anything afterwards."²¹⁶ Justifiable child labor, in this framework, needed to be a path to industrial opportunities and material advancement. Instead the NMS destroyed a boy's prospects for good positions later in life.

Campaigners stressed that socializing these messengers in productive work would prevent them from causing trouble later in life, for these reformers actively associated the unskilled, blind-alley work of the messenger service with adult unemployment.²¹⁷ The NCLC concluded that the night messenger service "makes [boys] almost certain candidates for the ranks of the unskilled, the diseased, and the unemployed."²¹⁸ In this litany, unemployment was the culminating charge. Reformers like Brown further emphasized this tie, stressing that ex-messengers were "recruited" to the "constantly increasing army of unemployed."²¹⁹ Brown's military metaphor enhanced the immediacy and threat of unemployment and evoked contextual references. A little over a decade earlier, Jacob Coxey had led his "army" of unemployed workers on their march to Washington, D.C., and the public could not forget this event or the fears of unemployed

masses and industrial disruption that it brought to mind.²²⁰ Within this framework, rising unemployment portended sure social unrest. Other authors followed this trajectory to its conclusion.

The threat of messengers to the ideal American public became clearer still as reformers detailed how messengers gravitated to crime and dependency. Messenger boys, they stressed, swelled the community's criminal population. They offered statistics about how messengers were overrepresented at state reform schools and on the criminal record, particularly among offenses for "assault and battery" and "immoral conduct."²²¹ In their writing and speaking, campaigners used testimony from probation officers, superintendents of houses of refuge, professors at industrial schools, and even Judge Ben Lindsey to connect the messenger service to juvenile delinquency.²²² All of these experts made it clear that ex-messengers were sure to disrupt society, offsetting social balances. As they campaigned, they established a clear causal relationship between the NMS and the corruption of character. Some reformers claimed that the majority of messenger boys came from "fair or good homes," so it was clear that their duties as messengers caused their ruin.²²³ Others acknowledged that some boys came into the service already "sophisticated." Regardless, they stressed that the service forced on the boys further opportunities for learning vice.²²⁴ This debate eventually became a question of degree, for both sides agreed that the night messenger service worsened the situation. Instead of the moral upbringing of the *phronimos*, messengers were being trained in vice.

Potentially more damaging, campaigners also noted that some messengers quit working altogether and subsisted on the earnings of prostitutes.²²⁵ Brown claimed that the NCLC had "many records" documenting how messengers came to live "on the all-

destroying earnings of fallen women."²²⁶ Similarly, Clopper referred to how the boys were "kept" by women.²²⁷ These messenger boys were not just unskilled or unemployed laborers; through the messenger service they became economically dependent, if not on women, then on the community at large. The boys became drains on society. The public would have to "keep" them.²²⁸ The warning was clear. In their ruined state, these messengers would burden the public.

These campaigners focused on the community, children's place within it and their future impact on it. The campaigners' rehearsal of messengers' ages in the press and their characterizations of the messengers' formative stage in life gave greater force to the charges of crime, delinquency, and dependency. Writing for the *Editorial Review*, Brown justified, "It is from the point of view of the child as a future power for good or evil in the community that this study purposes to deal with the night messenger service."²²⁹ From this view, the NMS became a crime against the community.

This community framework also shaped the proposed solutions. Several reformers proposed that it would be better to give the NMS work to men of "mature age," "cripples," and "industrial misfits," for such men were "beyond the probability of being tempted to wrong-doing" and the "meager wage would be a welcome alternative to their present poverty."²³⁰ This solution pushed for the economic independence of individuals within the community, but it also assumed that character, once lost, could not be regained.

As the NMS reformers established who worked as messengers and who they would become, they laid out the characteristics that they thought were essential to positive community membership. They structured their ideal community member around

skills and character. In their frame, both traits were necessary in a productive (and economically independent) worker. Insofar as the NMS kept boys from this ideal training, it was to be feared, and reformers stressed that if the public did not act soon, the situation portended even greater problems. The efficacy of this campaign therefore came to hinge on the character of the public, both its understanding of its responsibility and its moral fibre.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROGRESSIVE PUBLIC AS *PHRONIMOS*

In examining this campaign, I offer three primary implications. First, this campaign illustrates the ways in which the second persona can become the organizing logic within an argument. NMS reformers developed their campaign in line with their construction of the “social mind” of the American people. This logic is clear in their consistent lines of reasoning across local contexts, claims to education over persuasion, projection of the public’s innocence, stress on decorum, and projections of victory. Each point contributed to a construction of the American public as an ideal moral body, which leads into the second implication.

This study textures existing claims about the progressive’s faith in the public. Scholars have examined the progressive’s initiatives and concluded that their confidence in progress was rooted in their ideal of an active, educated public, even as they excluded members of the community from this public based on markers of race, class, and gender. This campaign further nuances this perspective. The NMS reformers constructed the American public as the *phronimos*. They implied that this public was homogeneous, moral, educated, and set to make good choices about public matters. They clothed this ideal public with middle-class respectability and gendered norms through their

constructions of decorum. Yet, campaigners also built their ideal public in their descriptions of the potentiality of night messenger boys. In this attention, they outlined the training that future members of the American public needed if the quality of the body public was to be maintained. In these years, morality and economic productivity were intertwined. These campaigners raised concerns about the moral training of these boys, but they most closely identified economic productivity as the hallmark of the ideal public. The American public might be interested in the moral ruin that these boys would face, but reformers made economic independence the central goal of an adolescent's training and education.

Finally, although progressives spoke of an active public, the NMS campaigners asked only for interest. NMS campaigners heaped praise on their audience, yet they withheld the "unprintable" details about the NMS. Reformers called for an educated public, but they refused to provide information. Their moral audience just had to trust the reformers, and their interest and support was all that reformers requested. The public only had to agree in order to validate the positive assumptions that had been made about them. This ideal American public was never incited to make any decisions or take any practical steps toward reform. Therefore, when "public intelligence" of the evils of child labor "swept over the face of the country," the campaigners' stated goals were fulfilled.²³¹

End Notes: Chapter Three

¹ Leroy Scott, "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service," *Success Magazine*, June 1910, 394.

² *Ibid.*, 396.

³ Italics added. *Ibid.*, 437.

⁴ Goodnight, "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres: A Note on 21st Century Critical Communication," 259.

⁵ Goodnight, "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument: A Speculative Inquiry into the Art of Public Deliberation," 203.

Zarefsky stresses that "an argument's location in a particular sphere is not 'given' or self-evident. The arguers place an argument in a sphere, and their placement always could be otherwise." David Zarefsky, "Goodnight's 'Speculative Inquiry' in Its Intellectual Context," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48 (Spring 2012): 213.

⁶ My phrasing closely mirrors Goodnight's original text, which reads the "grounds upon which arguments are built and the authorities to which arguers appeal." Goodnight, "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument: A Speculative Inquiry into the Art of Public Deliberation," 200.

⁷ Zarefsky, "Argument Fields," 213.

⁸ Zarefsky, "Goodnight's 'Speculative Inquiry' in Its Intellectual Context"; Nicholas S. Paliewicz, "Global Warming and the Interaction Between the Public and Technical Spheres of Argument: When Standards for Expertise Really Matter," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48, no. 4 (2012): 231–42; Rowland, "The Relationship Between the Public and

the Technical Spheres of Argument: A Case Study of the Challenger Seven Disaster”; Goodnight, “The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres.”

⁹ Murphy, “Child Labor as a National Problem.”

¹⁰ Charles A. Ellwood, “Prolegomena to Social Psychology. IV. The Concept of the Social Mind,” *American Journal of Sociology* 5, no. 2 (September 1899): 224; Ken Morrison, “The Disavowal of the Social in the American Reception of Durkheim,” *Journal of Classical Sociology* 1, no. 1 (2001): 97–98.

¹¹ Morrison, “The Disavowal of the Social in the American Reception of Durkheim,” 101.

¹² Giddings, Franklin H., “A Theory of Social Causation,” in *Publications of the American Economic Association: Papers and Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting, Part II* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1904), 391.

¹³ James J. Chriss, “Giddings and the Social Mind,” *Journal of Classical Sociology* 6, no. 1 (2006): 127–29, doi:10.1177/1468795X06061289.

¹⁴ In claiming the American public as their audience, the NMS reformers premised their second persona on the understanding that a singular public existed. It was not a new rhetorical strategy to claim to speak to or represent the public as a whole. We need to look no further in American history for an example than the U.S. Constitution, with its preamble, “We, the People...”

¹⁵ Frank E. Fee Jr., “Reconnecting with the Body Politic: Toward Disconnecting Muckrakers and Public Journalists,” *American Journalism* 22, no. 3 (Summer 2005): 90; Ron Marmarelli, “William Hard as Progressive Journalist,” *American Journalism* 3, no. 3

(1986): 145; Robert Miraldi, "Introduction: Why the Muckrakers Are Still with Us," in *The Muckrakers: Evangelical Crusaders* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000), xi–xix.

¹⁶ George W. Alger, "The Literature of Exposure," *The Atlantic Monthly*, August 1905, 211–12.

¹⁷ Dorsey, "Preaching Morality in Modern America," 51.

In a similar vein, Woodrow Wilson, as J. Michael Hogan argues, believed that the American people were capable of parsing through complicated ideas and adhered his rhetoric to this principle (for a time). J. Michael Hogan, *Woodrow Wilson's Western Tour: Rhetoric, Public Opinion, and the League of Nations* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2006), 20.

¹⁸ Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform*; Wiebe, *The Search for Order*; Hogan, "Introduction."

¹⁹ In *On Rhetoric*, Aristotle describes *phronesis* as "that...which [living] things would choose, in each case, if they had practical wisdom." Robert N. Gaines, "Phronesis," in *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, ed. Thomas O. Sloane (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2001), 601; Gerard A. Hauser, "Aristotle on Epideictic: The Formation of Public Morality," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 29, no. 1 (1999): 12; Aristotle, *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, trans. George Alexander Kennedy, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 69.

The word *phronesis* is regularly translated as practical wisdom, good sense, and/or prudence. E. Johanna Hartelius, *The Rhetoric of Expertise* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2011); Hauser, "Aristotle on Epideictic," 12.

²⁰ Gaines, "Phronesis," 601; Steve Schwarze, "Performing Phronesis: The Case of Isocrates' Helen," *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 32, no. 1 (1999): 82.

This virtue emerges as a person thoughtfully assesses a situation and its consequences. Also see Hartelius, *The Rhetoric of Expertise*, 12; Barbara Warnick, "Judgment, Probability, and Aristotle's Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 75, no. 3 (1989): 306; Lois S. Self, "Rhetoric and Phronesis: The Aristotelian Ideal," *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 12, no. 2 (1979): 137; Hauser, "Aristotle on Epideictic," 9, 12.

²¹ As quoted in Self, "Rhetoric and Phronesis," 132.

²² Hauser, "Aristotle on Epideictic," 9; Warnick, "Judgment, Probability, and Aristotle's Rhetoric," 306.

²³ James F. Klumpp, Patricia Riley, and Thomas A. Hollihan, "Beyond Dialogue: Linking the Public and Political Spheres," *Conference Proceedings -- National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation)*, January 1999, 361–68; Edward Schiappa, "Defining Marriage in California: An Analysis of Public and Technical Argument," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48, no. 4 (Spring 2012): 216–30; Paliewicz, "Global Warming and the Interaction Between the Public and Technical Spheres of Argument"; Rowland, "The Relationship between the Public and the Technical Spheres of Argument."

²⁴ Zarefsky, "Reflections on Making the Case"; Goodnight, "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument: A Speculative Inquiry into the Art of Public Deliberation"; Zarefsky, "Goodnight's 'Speculative Inquiry' in Its Intellectual Context."

²⁵ And, as Zarefsky contends, reasonableness is defined as "a culture's accumulated store of knowledge." Zarefsky, "Argument Fields"; Sovacool, "Spheres of Argument

Concerning Oil Exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge,” 340–61; Keränen, “Mapping Misconduct.”

²⁶ S. S. McClure, “Concerning Three Articles in This Number of McClure’s, and a Coincidence That May Set Us Thinking,” *McClure’s Magazine*, January 1903, 336.

²⁷ Louis Filler claims that with the January 1903 issue of *McClure’s* “muckraking was thus created, defined, and set on its historical way.” Louis Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1939), 83; Irwin Unger and Debi Unger, *The Vulnerable Years: The United States, 1896-1917* (Hinsdale, Ill.: Dryden Press, 1977), 110; James Landers, “Hearst’s Magazine, 1912-1914,” *Journalism History* 38, no. 4 (Winter 2013): 221.

²⁸ Harry H. Stein, “American Muckrakers and Muckraking: The 50-Year Scholarship,” *Journalism Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (Spring 1979): 17.

²⁹ Crunden, *Ministers of Reform*, 265.

³⁰ Miraldi, “Introduction”; Robert Miraldi, “Fictional Techniques in the Journalism of David Graham Phillips,” *American Journalism* 4, no. 4 (1987): 181; Judson A. Grenier, “Muckraking and the Muckrakers: An Historical Definition,” *Journalism Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (September 1960): 552–58; Samuel Merwin, “The Magazine Crusade,” *Success Magazine*, June 1906, 394; Brian Thornton, “Muckraking Journalists and Their Readers: Perceptions of Professionalism,” *Journalism History* 21, no. 1 (Spring 1995): 29; Stein, “American Muckrakers and Muckraking,” 9; Fee, “Reconnecting with the Body Politic,” 78; Landers, “Hearst’s Magazine, 1912-1914,” 221–24; Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 56.

³¹ Unger and Unger, *The Vulnerable Years*, 109; Robert Miraldi, "Scaring Off the Muckrakers with the Threat of Libel," *Journalism Quarterly* 65, no. 3 (Fall 1988): 610; Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform*, 190.

³² Arthur Weinberg and Lila Weinberg, eds., *The Muckrakers: The Era in Journalism That Moved America to Reform - The Most Significant Magazine Articles of 1902 - 1912* (New York: Capricorn Books, 1964), xiv; Miraldi, "Scaring Off the Muckrakers with the Threat of Libel," 610; Unger and Unger, *The Vulnerable Years*, 110.

³³ Weinberg and Weinberg, *The Muckrakers*; Unger and Unger, *The Vulnerable Years*, 110.

³⁴ Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 85; Eric Frederick Goldman, *Rendezvous with Destiny: A History of Modern American Reform* (New York: Knopf, 1952), 174; Landers, "Hearst's Magazine, 1912-1914," 222; Weinberg and Weinberg, *The Muckrakers*; "With 'Everybody's' Publishers," *Everybody's Magazine*, January 1908, 144; "With 'Everybody's' Publishers," *Everybody's Magazine*, January 1909, 144.

³⁵ Merwin, "The Magazine Crusade," 395.

³⁶ Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform*, 185; Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 111; Stein, "American Muckrakers and Muckraking," 10.

³⁷ Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 190.

³⁸ Merwin, "The Magazine Crusade," 449.

³⁹ Walter Lippmann, *Drift and Mastery: An Attempt to Diagnose the Current Unrest* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1914), 4.

⁴⁰ Ernest Poole, *The Harbor* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap Publishers, 1915), 210; Fred F. Endres, “The Pit-Muckraking Days of McClure’s Magazine, 1893-1901,” *Journalism Quarterly* 55, no. 1 (Spring 1978): 154–57.

⁴¹ Miraldi, “Scaring Off the Muckrakers with the Threat of Libel,” 610.

⁴² Weinberg and Weinberg, *The Muckrakers*; Douglas Birkhead, “The Progressive Reform of Journalism: The Rise of Professionalism in the Press,” in *Rhetoric and Reform in the Progressive Era*, ed. J. Michael Hogan (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2003), 133.

⁴³ Michael Dillon, “Anatomy of a Crusade: The Buffalo News’ Campaign for Immigrants,” in *The Muckrakers: Evangelical Crusaders*, ed. Robert Miraldi (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000), 30.

⁴⁴ Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 55.

⁴⁵ Lincoln, *The Shame of the Cities*, 17.

⁴⁶ Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 103–7; Robert Miraldi, “Muckraking the World’s Richest Church,” in *The Muckrakers: Evangelical Crusaders*, ed. Robert Miraldi (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000), 63–64; Fee, “Reconnecting with the Body Politic,” 84; Marion Marzolf, “Ida Tarbell: Portrait of a Muckraker,” *Journalism History* 12, no. 2 (Summer 1985): 71–72.

⁴⁷ Unger and Unger, *The Vulnerable Years*, 110.

⁴⁸ Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform*, 186.

⁴⁹ See Elizabeth Shepley Sergeant, “Toilers of the Tenements: Where the Beautiful Things of the Great Shops Are Made,” *McClure’s Magazine*, July 1910, 239.

⁵⁰ Merwin, "The Magazine Crusade," 395. Also see Unger and Unger, *The Vulnerable Years*, 109.

⁵¹ For a discussion of how these bounds of decorum were negotiated at points in the nineteenth century, see Soderlund, *Sex Trafficking*, 31; Lisa Shaver, "'Serpents,' 'Fiends,' and 'Libertines': Inscribing an Evangelical Rhetoric of Rage in the 'Advocate of Moral Reform,'" *Rhetoric Review* 30, no. 1 (2011): 1–18, doi:10.1080/07350198.2011.530099; A. Cheree Carlson, "Creative Casuistry and Feminist Consciousness: The Rhetoric of Moral Reform," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 78, no. 1 (February 1992): 16–32.

⁵² Jensen, *Dirty Words*, 3–7.

⁵³ Soderlund, *Sex Trafficking*, 49.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁵⁵ Professionals in technical spheres of argument were also challenging standards of decorum that forbid discussions of topics like venereal diseases. In 1899, Dr. Howard Kelly condemned a paper on venereal prophylaxis presented to a gathering of the American Medical Association, stressing, "The discussion is attended with filth and we besmirch ourselves by discussing it in public." Seven years later the censured doctor, Denslow Lewis, reported triumphantly that the medical community now acknowledged the need for publicity. Sounding something like a muckraker himself, Lewis concluded, "Prudery shall no longer deter us in the performance of our duty. With a persistent effort, with combined endeavor, we will dissipate the darkness of ignorance by an exposition of the facts that we know. Fearlessly, confidently, resolutely, let us bear the great light of truth into the world." The bounds of decorum were gradually shifting. Denslow Lewis,

“The Need of Publicity in Venereal Prophylaxis,” *Medical Record: A Weekly Journal of Medicine and Surgery* 69, no. 22 (June 2, 1906): 863, 865.

⁵⁶ George Kibbe Turner, “The City of Chicago: A Study of the Great Immoralities,” *McClure’s Magazine*, April 1907, 575; Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 288.

⁵⁷ In the early 1900s, a few newspapers and magazines published disclosures about prostitution. Discussions of prostitution, its extent and causes, was limited though, for they appeared almost exclusively in social work outlets like *Charities*, not the popular press. O’Henry even had difficulty getting a short story published because it was about a girl tempted to prostitution. Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 286–89.

⁵⁸ Theodore Schroeder, “Prostitution as a Social Problem,” *The Arena*, February 1909, 196.

⁵⁹ The Turner article reinitiated a discussion over what was proper to discuss in the media. There was also an expose by McClure on Tammany Hall in the same issue.

George Kibbe Turner, “The Daughters of the Poor: A Plain Story of the Development of New York City as a Leading Center of the White Slave Trade of the World, Under Tammany Hall,” *McClure’s Magazine (1893-1926)*, November 1909, 45; S. S. McClure, “The Tammanyizing of a Civilization,” *McClure’s Magazine*, November 1909, 117; Soderlund, *Sex Trafficking*, 168.

⁶⁰ Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 289.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 285.

⁶² Writing in 1915, Lippmann made a similar statement, commenting that muckraking often “consists merely in dressing up a public document with rhetoric and pictures.”

Miraldi, “The Muckrakers,” 62; Lippmann, *Drift and Mastery*, 6.

⁶³ Miraldi, "Fictional Techniques in the Journalism of David Graham Phillips," 183; Fee, "Reconnecting with the Body Politic," 87; Weinberg and Weinberg, *The Muckrakers*.

⁶⁴ Robert Miraldi, "The Journalism of David Graham Phillips," *Journalism Quarterly* 63, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 88.

⁶⁵ David Graham Phillips, "The Treason of the Senate," *The Cosmopolitan; a Monthly Illustrated Magazine*, March 1906, 487.

⁶⁶ Lincoln, *The Shame of the Cities*, 18.

⁶⁷ Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 234.

⁶⁸ Alger, "The Literature of Exposure," 211; Merwin, "The Magazine Crusade," 394.

⁶⁹ Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 106.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 99.

⁷¹ Kathleen L. Endres, "Women and the 'Larger Household,'" *American Journalism* 14, no. 3–4 (1997): 266, doi:10.1080/08821127.1997.10731923; Weinberg and Weinberg, *The Muckrakers*; Fee, "Reconnecting with the Body Politic," 79; Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 236; Agnes Hooper Gottlieb, "Women and Exposé: Reform and Housekeeping," in *The Muckrakers: Evangelical Crusaders* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000), 76; Endres, "Women and the 'Larger Household,'" 282.

⁷² Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 269–70; "Child Labor: The Cosmopolitan's Readers Agree That This Disgrace Must Go," *The Cosmopolitan; a Monthly Illustrated Magazine (1886-1907)*, November 1906, 109.

⁷³ "With 'Everybody's Publishers,'" 143.

⁷⁴ Alger, "The Literature of Exposure," 211.

⁷⁵ Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 260; Fee, “Reconnecting with the Body Politic,” 86.

⁷⁶ Weinberg and Weinberg, *The Muckrakers*.

⁷⁷ Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 261.

⁷⁸ C. Wright Mills, “Mass Society and Liberal Education,” in *Power, Politics and People: The Collected Writings of C. Wright Mills*, ed. Irving Louis Horowitz (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), 353–73.

⁷⁹ Lovejoy made a similar move, connecting the recognition of children as a nation's "most valuable asset" as the determining mark of "truly civilized" nations. Felix Adler, “Child Labor a Menace to Civilization,” in *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911* (New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911), 2; Lovejoy, “Seven Years of Child Labor Reform,” 38.

⁸⁰ “The Messenger Service,” *Journal of The Telegraph* 3, no. 12 (May 15, 1870): 146; “An Honest Messenger,” *Journal of the Telegraph* 9, no. 10 (May 15, 1876): 147.

⁸¹ Emma E. Brown, *The Child Toilers of Boston Streets* (Boston, MA: D. Lothrop & Co., 1878).

⁸² Noel Ruthven, “Our Monster Telegraph System,” *Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly*, March 1881, 13.

⁸³ There are multiple examples of this line of reasoning. Writing in 1870, an author in the *Journal of the Telegraph* boasted, “A large number of telegraph messengers have risen to comparative opulence and respect. They rub against the active men of the world who are quick to discern merit.” A few years later, an author in *Frank Leslie's Popular*

Monthly applauded, "Some of the best men in the service were once messengers."

Another thread of discourse, emerging around the 1890s, derided messengers as lazy and careless boys. They became the butt of jokes and comics. For example, a poem in the magazine *Puck* read, "The grocer's, the tailor's, the milliner's dun, And things that distress us, all come on a run; while the gifts we're awaiting to add to our joy Are 'most always brought by a messenger boy." "The Messenger Service," 146; Ruthven, "Our Monster Telegraph System," 6; Downey, *Telegraph Messenger Boys*, 173; Harry L. Rogers, "Adding Efficiency to Messengers," *Nation's Business*, November 1928, 92; N. W., "The Swift and the Slow," *Puck*, April 1893, 40.

⁸⁴ "Messenger Work Upheld," *Indianapolis Star*, October 13, 1910, box 59, National Child Labor Committee, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. All future references to this archival collection will be referred to as NCLC MSS.

⁸⁵ Alger, *The Telegraph Boy*; Alger, *Adventures of a Telegraph Boy or "Number 91."*

⁸⁶ In 1910, Owen Lovejoy reaffirmed that the messenger service was popularly thought to be one of the "ideal occupations for the little child." Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains through Legislation*, 15; Lovejoy, "Annual Report of the General Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee. For the Fifth Fiscal Year, Ended September 30, 1909," 198.

⁸⁷ Joseph R. Gusfield, *The Culture of Public Problems: Drinking-Driving and the Symbolic Order* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).

⁸⁸ "Advertisement: The Omaha Messenger and Express Co.," *Omaha (NE) Daily Bee*, October 4, 1903, 15.

⁸⁹ Poole drew his material from his experiences at University Settlement and his associations with the New York Child Labor Committee, but he did not explain the method he used to collect information as was common later in the technical reports of the NCLC. Rather, Poole simply provided his observations and first-hand knowledge of the habits of child street workers. He was making an argument in the public sphere, and his experiences were acceptable evidence. On this foundation, he described child labor in the street trades, painting a dismal picture of the night messenger service.

In 1903, Poole also published a short piece, *Child Labor – The Street*, through the New York Child Labor Committee, and in later years, he occasionally worked as an investigator for the National Child Labor Committee. Davis, *Spearheads for Reform*, 30; Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 268.

⁹⁰ Lincoln Steffens, “Ben B. Lindsey: The Just Judge: III,” *McClure’s Magazine* (1893-1926), December 1906.

⁹¹ Marmarelli, “William Hard as Progressive Journalist,” 144; Davis, *Spearheads for Reform*, 117; Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 110; Elinor H. Stoy, “Child-Labor,” *The Arena*, December 1, 1906; Steffens, “Ben B. Lindsey.”

⁹² Hard's "De Kid Wot Works at Night" is most commonly remembered for its references to newsboys. "Jelly," his most developed character, started as a newsboy, *but* as his street career and depravity progressed, Jelly gave up the newsies' hawk for the excitement of the messenger service. See Edd Applegate, *Muckrakers: A Biographical Dictionary of Writers and Editors* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2008), 69, <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip083/2007043761.html>; Davis, *Spearheads for Reform*, 282; Nasaw, *Children of the City*, 175; David E. Whisnant, “Selling the Gospel News, or:

The Strange Career of Jimmy Brown the Newsboy,” *Journal of Social History* 5, no. 3 (1972): 289.

⁹³ Hard, “De Kid Wot Works at Night.”

I have found no evidence that Hard’s piece prompted any immediate action to stem child labor in the night messenger service either. Hard’s 1908 exposé was not part of a larger campaign against child labor in the night messenger service.

⁹⁴ In 1899, the Kansas State Society of Labor and Industry attempted to pass legislation to *prohibit* children under fourteen from working in factories and mines, but they only sought to keep children under fourteen out of the messenger service *during school hours*. W. L. A. Johnson, *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Kansas Bureau of Labor and Industrial Statistics* (Topeka, KS: W.Y. Morgan, State Printer, 1899), 248.

⁹⁵ Mangold, *Child Problems*, 214; Owen R. Lovejoy, “The Year in Child Labor Reform,” *The Survey*, May 29, 1909, 325; “Reports from State and Local Child Labor Committees,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 38 (July 1911): 156–85; Joseph M. Speakman, “The Inspector and His Critics: Child Labor Reform in Pennsylvania,” *Pennsylvania History* 69, no. 2 (Spring 2002): 273; Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains through Legislation*, 18.

⁹⁶ Goldmark, “The Necessary Sequel of Child-Labor Laws,” 320.

⁹⁷ Myron E. Adams, “Children in American Street Trades,” in *Child Labor* (New York City: National Child Labor Committee, 1905), 35.

⁹⁸ Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains through Legislation*, 4.

⁹⁹ Owen R. Lovejoy, “Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service,” *The Survey*, May 21, 1910, 311.

¹⁰⁰ “Annual Report of the General Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee. For the Sixth Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1910,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 38 (July 1911): 186.

¹⁰¹ Amid the ranks of muckraking publications, *Success* was not as prominent as *McClure's*, but its editors secured pieces from several illustrious muckrakers, including David Graham Phillips and Edwin Markham. Additionally, Leroy Scott is best remembered as a socialist and novelist, but he also ran muckraking pieces in *Everybody's* along with *Success*. Many muckrakers conducted their own research and personally investigated conditions, but it was not uncommon for journalists to be aided in their investigations. Gustavus Myers and Harrison Phillips helped David Graham Phillips collect his materials for "The Treason of the Senate." William Hard published an article on women at work in *Everybody's* with Rheta Childe Dorr in the byline as his "collaborator." In a short preface, the editors explained that Rheta Childe Dorr conducted the original investigations, "an able sociologist" collected supplementary facts, and then William Hard combined this work with his own "first-hand knowledge" of the subject to author the article. Miraldi, "Fictional Techniques in the Journalism of David Graham Phillips," 185; Edwin Markham, "Edwin Markham's Eyrie," *Success Magazine*, November 1908, 712; Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 88; "With 'Everybody's' Publishers," 143; Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 250; William Hard and Rheta Childe Dorr, "The Woman's Invasion," *Everybody's Magazine*, November 1908, 579.

¹⁰² Scott, "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service."

¹⁰³ Edward Brown, Owen Lovejoy, Samuel McCune Lindsey, Alexander McKelway, and even Graham Taylor (reporting on the Chicago Vice Commission in 1911) kept to this message.

¹⁰⁴ For a sampling of newspapers that reprinted parts of Scott's article, see "Bad for the Boys," *The Citizen*, June 17, 1910; "Debauching the Boys," *Muskogee County Republican*, June 30, 1910; "Blind Alley That Leads to Ruin." *Bedford Daily Mail*, June 25, 1910; and "Blind Alley That Leads to Ruin," *Newport Hoosier State*, July 6, 1910. The NCLC archives include a scrapbook of the NMS campaign which has clippings of Scott's article appearing in the following outlets: "Boys' Lives Ruined at Night," *Logansport (Ind.) Reporter*, May 20, 1910; "Night Messenger Boys Sunk in Vice; Lives Are Ruined by Their Faithfulness," *Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader*, May 21, 1910; "Night Messenger Boys Sunk in Vice; Lives Are Ruined By Their Faithfulness," *Fort Wayne, (Ind.) News*, May 21, 1910; "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service," *Danville (Ill.) The Commercial-News*, May 28, 1910; and "Turning Night Into Day," *Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel*, May 23, 1910. See NMS Scrapbook, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁰⁵ Memorandum Regarding Cooperation of Newspapers with Child Labor Committee, n.d., box 7, folder 7, NYCLC MSS; and New York Child Labor Committee News Bulletin, March 10, 1910, box 7, folder 7, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁰⁶ Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 286–87; Soderlund, *Sex Trafficking*.

NCLC field agents like Edward Brown heard of the various "reform administrations" and their efforts "to repress the social evil." Edward F. Brown, *The Night Messenger Service in Pennsylvania*, May 1912, Public Education and Child Labor Association of

Pennsylvania Collection, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA. All future references to this collection will be listed as PE & CLA MSS.

¹⁰⁷ *The Social Evil in Chicago*, 56.

¹⁰⁸ Gregory Downey also notes the relative absence of calls for shutting down the night messenger service totally. Downey, *Telegraph Messenger Boys*, 118.

¹⁰⁹ Letter from George A. Hall to Managing Editor, March 10, 1910, box 28, NYCLC MSS.

¹¹⁰ Instead, the NMS campaigners regularly constructed their ideal American public and catered their standard appeals to this audience regardless of the state or local setting to which they were speaking. Campaigners were frequently colleagues in the National Child Labor Committee, so it makes sense that their organization coordinated their campaign. Other partners in this work were often tied to the NCLC through the active network of progressive reformers. For instance, Graham Taylor was a Christian sociologist who ran a settlement house, taught for a period at the University of Chicago, and served on the Chicago Vice Commission. This network did not yet acknowledge the sharp borders around the technical sphere of social science that was gradually distancing sociology from reform. These relationships fostered the flow of notions like a single "social mind" and the social as a distinct object, which made the NMS campaigns' consistent message reasonable. *Child Labor in Massachusetts: Report of the Massachusetts State Child Labor Committee on the Legislative Campaign, 1910* (Boston: Massachusetts State Child Labor Committee, 1910), 1.

¹¹¹ "Messenger Boy Bill is Passed as Amended," *Atlanta Journal*, n.d., box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹¹² Lovejoy, "Age Problems in Industrial Hygiene."

¹¹³ Lincoln, *The Shame of the Cities*, 18.

¹¹⁴ Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains through Legislation*, 24.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 16–17.

¹¹⁶ Neill, "Child Labor at the National Capital," 799.

¹¹⁷ Writing for *McClure's Magazine* in 1906, Lincoln Steffens clearly placed blame as he sketched out how Judge Ben Lindsey addressed the NMS problem by having "a club to hold over the companies." Stoy, "Child-Labor," 585; Steffens, "Ben B. Lindsey."

¹¹⁸ Lovejoy, "The Year in Child Labor Reform," 324.

¹¹⁹ R.K. Conant, "Night Messenger Service," *New Boston*, January 1911, 379.

¹²⁰ Phillip Davis inferred that the public was somewhat culpable. He noted, "The night service, it appears, is so injurious to minors from a moral as well as a physical point of view that only dense ignorance of facts can be offered as a weak excuse for our having done nothing to date." Philip Davis, "The Night Messenger Boy. Why the Legislature Should Limit His Years," *Boston Evening Transcript*, March 11, 1911, 3.

¹²¹ Edward N. Clopper, "The Night Messenger Boy," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 38, no. 3 (November 1911): 103.

¹²² "A Commendable Act," *Albany Journal*, May 19, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS. Also see Conant, "Night Messenger Service," 379; Davis, "The Night Messenger Boy. Why the Legislature Should Limit His Years," 3; Edward F. Brown, "The Night Messenger Service -- A Child Labor Problem," *Editorial Review*, January 1911, 35; Clopper, "The Night Messenger Boy," November 1911, 103; Edward Nicholas Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1912), 101; Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains*

Through Legislation, 15.

¹²³ As quoted in "Night Messenger Service Burns Up Boys," *Bridgeport Standard*, May 21, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS. Also see "Night Messenger Service," *New York Post*, October 7, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; and Owen R. Lovejoy, "Night Messenger Service," n.d., box 59, NCLC MSS.

For comments on the potential for upward mobility and the beneficial nature of the day service, see Brown, "The Night Messenger Service," 35; Lovejoy, "Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service"; Poole, "Waifs of the Street," 40.

¹²⁴ Edward N. Clopper, "The Night Messenger Service," in *Public Welfare in Indiana, Issues 84-87*, 1911, 257; Conant, "Night Messenger Service," 379.

¹²⁵ Scott, "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service," 394; Brown, "The Night Messenger Service," 31.

He said nothing of the traveling businessmen who used messengers as tour guides for the vice districts.

¹²⁶ "A Good Bill," *Allentown Democrat*, April 9, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹²⁷ "The Eight-Hour Day and Prohibition of Night Work. Report of Public Hearing Before Committee on Labor, General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts," in *Child Employing Industries: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference Boston, Massachusetts, January 13-16, 1910* (New York, 1910), 269, http://books.google.com/books?id=vtAJAAAIAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false.

¹²⁸ "Favor Child Labor Bill," 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; and "Use Messenger Boys as Guides in Tenderloin," n.d., box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹²⁹ Scott, "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service," 394.

¹³⁰ Pennsylvania organizers stressed that "every citizen of Pennsylvania must know exactly what night work in the messenger service does to boys" before the legislative session in 1911. *Child Labor in Massachusetts*, 1910, 3; "The Eight-Hour Day and Prohibition of Night Work," 269; "Messenger Boys Can Work at Night," *The Survey*, January 8, 1910; Lovejoy, "Annual Report of the General Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee. For the Fifth Fiscal Year, Ended September 30, 1909," 198.

¹³¹ "Messenger Boys Can Work at Night."

¹³² "Messenger Boys in Peril," *New York Times*, May 2, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; and "...Will Protect Messenger Boys from Night's Evil," *Atlanta Georgian*, July 14, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS. Also see "Child Labor Law Measure Introduced," *Rochester Times*, March 11, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹³³ "Night Messenger Service Burns Up Boys," *Bridgeport Standard*, May 21, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹³⁴ Scott, "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service," 394; "Blind Alley That Leads to Ruin," *Newport Hoosier State*, July 6, 1910.

¹³⁵ "Child Labor Law Measure Introduced," *Rochester Times*, March 11, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS. For similar claims about the character of the public, see "Men as Messengers," *Schenectady* [], March 30, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; "Subjects That Interest the Massachusetts Federation of Woman's Clubs," *Springfield Republican*, March

17, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; and No title, *Fond Du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth*, May 20, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹³⁶ Conant, "Night Messenger Service," 382; Samuel McCune Lindsey, "Seventh Annual Child Labor Conference," *The Survey*, April 22, 1911, 125; "Favor Child Labor Bill," [] *Tribune*, [] 6, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; "No Contact with Vice," *New Bedford Sunday Standard*, May 29, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹³⁷ *Child Labor in Massachusetts*, 1910, 7.

¹³⁸ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 5.

¹³⁹ Lovejoy, "Age Problems in Industrial Hygiene," 238. Also see "The Messenger Boy Problem," *Christian Advocate, Cincinnati, O.*, June 1, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; "A Commendable Act," *Albany Journal*, May 19, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; Lovejoy, "Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service," 316.

¹⁴⁰ In another instance, the committee reported that NMS legislation "no doubt will have the backing of all the charitable societies in the state as well as the great body of its citizens who have won reputations for their good work." "A Good Bill," *Allentown Democrat*, April 9, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS. Also see Scott, "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service," 437.

¹⁴¹ "[] Will Protect Messenger Boys from Night's Evil," *Atlanta Georgian*, July 14, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; "Child Labor Agent Tells of Augusta Messenger Boys," *Augusta Chronicle*, July 19, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; "How Boys Are Forced into Contact with Vice," *Atlanta Georgian*, July 27, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; No title, *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; "Pastor Makes Plea for Boys," *Cincinnati (O.) Com. Tribune*, May 30, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; Lovejoy, "Child

Labor and the Night Messenger Service,” 311; Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, 186; Scott, “The Evils of the Night Messenger Service,” 395; Brown, “The Night Messenger Service,” 35; Edward N. Clopper, “The Night Messenger Boy,” in *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911* (New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911), 103,

http://books.google.com/books?id=bD_tAAAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false; Davis, “The Night Messenger Boy,” 3.

¹⁴² “Night Messenger Service,” *Reading (Pa.) Telegram*, November 22, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; Lovejoy, “To the Editor: Night Messenger Service,” 504.

¹⁴³ As quoted in “How Boys Are Forced into Contact with Vice,” *Atlanta Georgian*, July 27, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁴⁴ Clopper, “The Night Messenger Boy,” November 1911, 103.

¹⁴⁵ Bryan D. Palmer, *Cultures of Darkness: Night Travels in the Histories of Transgression* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000), 233–36.

¹⁴⁶ Scott, “The Evils of the Night Messenger Service,” 437. Also see Conant, “Night Messenger Service,” 382; “Boys’ Lives Ruined at Night,” *Logansport Reporter*, May 20, 1910; Lovejoy, “Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service,” 315; Edward F. Brown, “The Night Messenger Service -- A Child Labor Problem,” *Editorial Review*, January 1911, 40; and “Night Messenger Service Burns Up Boys,” *Bridgeport Standard*, May 21, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁴⁷ "Ruin for Boys in Night Work. Sensational Report Made by Special Agent," *Atlanta Constitution*, July 18, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; and "Messenger Work Upheld," *Indianapolis Star*, October 13, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁴⁸ For examples, see "Bill Would Prohibit Employing Messengers under 14 Years of Age," *Baltimore News*, March 4, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; "Business Men Boom Charter," *Baltimore Sun*, March 18, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; "No Contact with Vice," *New Bedford Sunday Standard*, May 29, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; No title, *Worcester Telegram*, June 15, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; No Title, *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, --- 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; and Hard, "De Kid Wot Works at Night," 26.

¹⁴⁹ For examples, see "Child Labor Law Measure Introduced," *Rochester Times*, March 11, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; "Use Messenger Boys as Guides in Tenderloin," n.d., box 59, NCLC MSS; and "The Messenger Boy Problem," *Christian Advocate, Cincinnati, O.*, June 1, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁵⁰ Goodnight, "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres: A Note on 21st Century Critical Communication," 259.

¹⁵¹ Scott, "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service," 394.

¹⁵² His immediate audience was relatively narrow, for *The Survey* was a publication geared to reformers in 1910. Yet, as with Scott's article, Lovejoy's message also reached a popular audience as newspapers all over the country carried the text of his article. The following papers carried Lovejoy's message: *The Bridgeport (CT) Standard*, *Elizabeth (NJ) Journal*, *Lewiston (ME) Journal*, *Hastings (NE) Republican*, *Lincoln (NE) Star*, *New London (CT) Telegraph*, *Colorado Springs (CO) Gazette*, *Charleston (WV) Mail*, *Willimatic (CT) Chronicle*, *Hailey (ID) Times*, *Berkeley (CA) Gazette*, *Tradesman*

Chattanooga (TN), Evanston, Ill. The Union Signal, Ft. Dodge (IA) Chronicle, and Albion (MI) Recorder. See National Child Labor Committee Scrapbook, Clippings on Night Messenger Service, 1909-1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁵³ "Night Messenger Bill Gets Favorable Report," *Atlanta Journal*, July 28, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; "How Boys Are Forced into Contact with Vice," *Atlanta Georgian*, July 27, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

Lovejoy noted in his much-circulated article that the full reports were only shared with "interested parties." Lovejoy, "Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service," 316.

¹⁵⁴ "Night Messenger Service Measure Passed in House," n.d., box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁵⁵ Mrs. Stanley S. Reed and Mrs. E.L. Worthington, "The Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs At Mammoth Cave. Report of Meeting Read to Maysville Club by Mrs. Stanley F. Reed and Mrs. Leslie Worthington, Delegates," *Daily Public Ledger*, June 27, 1912, 3.

¹⁵⁶ "[Bo]ys Night Work Death for Boys," *Chicago Tribune*, May 20, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; Untitled article, *The Survey*, May 21, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; "Night Messenger Service Burns Up Boys," *Bridgeport Standard*, May 21, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; and "No Place for a Boy," *Lewiston (Me.) Journal* May 20, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁵⁷ "Night Messenger Boys," *New Bedford Mercury*, May 3, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS. Similarly, Scott couched his account, noting, "It is with great difficulty and great diffidence that I approach the presentation of the following facts, for the facts relate to topics which the American idea of decorum forbids one publicly to discuss." Scott, "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service," 394.

¹⁵⁸ At a hearing before the Massachusetts legislature, Edward Barrows asked for “indulgence” for “speaking very frankly of matters to which it is not considered proper to refer. *Ibid.*, 396; “The Eight-Hour Day and Prohibition of Night Work,” 269.

¹⁵⁹ Reed and Worthington, “The Kentucky Federation of Women’s Clubs at Mammoth Cave.”

Similarly, at a speaking engagement before the West End Women’s Republican Association at the Hotel Astor, Owen Lovejoy noted, “A thorough study of the work of these boys in eight States revealed conditions too terrible to be told *here*.” See “Boy Messengers’ Hard Lot,” *New York Times*, March 25, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁶⁰ “... Will Protect Messenger Boys from Night’s Evil,” *Atlanta Georgian*, July 14, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁶¹ n.t., *Worcester Telegram*, June 15, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁶² “The Eight-Hour Day and Prohibition of Night Work,” 268.

¹⁶³ Campaigners asserted that it would be indecorous to share the full reports from the NMS investigations, but they occasionally also insisted that decorum was a physical necessity. They conveyed that sharing the reports would lead to emotional and bodily pain for the audience. The reformers associated the reports with horror, repugnance, and odiousness. They were “revolting.” Such descriptions projected a visceral response. The details would build dread within the audience; Lovejoy refrained from “inflicting upon the reader the odious details.” The character of the NMS was such that hearing about what the messenger boys heard and knew would take a toll on the public. The campaigners were saving the public from this pain. Clopper, “The Night Messenger

Boy,” 1911, 104; Clopper, “The Night Messenger Service,” 258; *Child Labor in Massachusetts*, 1910, 2; Lovejoy, “Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service,” 312.

¹⁶⁴ “Night Messenger Service Burns Up Boys,” *Bridgeport Standard*, May 21, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁶⁵ “Messenger Boys and Contagious Crime,” *Dayton (Ohio) News*, April 9, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁶⁶ “An Act for the Suppression of Trade In, and Circulation Of, Obscene Literature and Articles of Immoral Use,” Ch. 258 § (1873), <https://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llsl&fileName=017/llsl017.db&recNum=639>.

¹⁶⁷ Andrew S. Taylor, “Legal Knowledge in Factory Inspection,” *Newark News*, October 15, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS. Also see Neill, “Child Labor at the National Capital,” 798; Lovejoy, “Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service,” 313.

On occasion, campaigners took this point further, asserting that the facts were even beyond communication. The investigators found conditions that were “unspeakably bad.” In this view, the report information was so far outside the bounds of decorum that it was impossible to communicate to the public the features and extent of the NMS problem.

¹⁶⁸ “Dens of Infamy. Startling Revelations of a Victim of a Michigan Dance House,” *Burlington Weekly Hawk Eye*, January 27, 1887, 7.

¹⁶⁹ Mark Thomas Connelly, *The Response to Prostitution in the Progressive Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980), 114.

¹⁷⁰ Reginald Wright Kauffman, *The House of Bondage* (New York: Moffat, Yard and Company, 1910); Connelly, *The Response to Prostitution in the Progressive Era*, 119.

¹⁷¹ Connelly, *The Response to Prostitution in the Progressive Era*, 73.

¹⁷² Hard, "De Kid Wot Works at Night," 27–36; Poole, "Waifs of the Street," 47.

¹⁷³ The conservative approach within this context was to attempt to retain traditionally narrower standards of decorum.

¹⁷⁴ Claudia Castañeda, *Figurations: Child, Bodies, Worlds* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002).

¹⁷⁵ Brown, "The Night Messenger Service," 31–35.

¹⁷⁶ Scott, "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service," 394.

¹⁷⁷ "Ruin for Boys in Night Work. Sensational Report Made by Special Agent," *Atlanta Constitution*, July 18, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁷⁸ "Night Messenger Service Burns Up Boys," *Bridgeport Standard*, May 21, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; and "How Boys Are Forced into Contact with Vice," *Atlanta Georgian*, July 27, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁷⁹ "Messenger Boys in Peril," *New York Times*, May 2, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; "Messenger Boys Learn Levee Vice," *Chicago Tribune*, May 22, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; "Night Messengers," *Atlanta Georgian*, July 21, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; and "...Will Protect Messenger Boys from Night's Evil," *Atlanta Georgian*, July 14, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁸⁰ Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 77; Macleod, *The Age of the Child*; Kett, "Curing the Disease of Precocity," 184.

¹⁸¹ Clopper, "The Night Messenger Boy," 1911, 104.

¹⁸² Davidson, *Child Labor Legislation*, 276.

¹⁸³ Also see Andrew S. Taylor, "Legal Knowledge in Factory Inspection," *Newark News*, October 15, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; Lovejoy, "Child Labor and the Night

Messenger Service,” 315–16; Lovejoy, “To the Editor: Night Messenger Service,” 504; Davis, “The Night Messenger Boy”; Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 105; *Child Labor in Massachusetts*, 1910, 7.

¹⁸⁴ Scott, “The Evils of the Night Messenger Service,” 394.

¹⁸⁵ “Bad for the Boys,” *The Citizen*, June 17, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; and “Debauching the Boys,” *Muskogee County Republican*, June 25, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁸⁶ Brown, “The Night Messenger Service,” 40.

¹⁸⁷ Owen Lovejoy charged that the NMS “absorbed [a boy's] years, sapped his energy, blunted his sensibilities, and shattered his ideals.” Lovejoy, “Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service,” 314; Lovejoy, “To the Editor: Night Messenger Service,” 505; Brown, “The Night Messenger Service,” 35; and “Night Messenger Service and Child Labor Question,” *Richmond (Ind.) Palladium*, November 20, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁸⁸ No title, *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, --- 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁸⁹ “Seeks Uplift for Boys,” *Washington, D.C., Post*, May 19, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; “Cincinnatians Would Forbid Boy Messenger at Night Time,” No Paper Listed, March 4, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; “Pastor Makes Plea for Boys,” *Cincinnati (O.) Com. Tribune*, May 30, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; “Night Messenger Boys Sunk in Vice; Lives Are Ruined By Their Faithfulness,” *Fort Wayne, (Ind.) News*, May 21, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; and Clopper, “The Night Messenger Boy,” November 1911, 104.

¹⁹⁰ “Child Labor Committee,” *Springfield Republican*, November 30, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS. Owen Lovejoy argued that the night messenger service was “a hazard to the moral life.” Lovejoy, “Age Problems in Industrial Hygiene,” 238.

¹⁹¹ "Night Messenger Service and Child Labor Question," *Richmond (Ind.) Palladium*, November 20, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; Lovejoy, "To the Editor: Night Messenger Service," 505; Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains through Legislation*, 24.

¹⁹² Scott, "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service," 436.

¹⁹³ Haber, *Efficiency and Uplift*, 2.

¹⁹⁴ U.S. Congress, "Naturalization Act, 1790 (excerpt)," U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, *American History Online*, Facts On File, Inc., accessed May 7, 2015, <http://www.fofweb.com/activelink2.asp?ItemID=WE52&iPin=E14167&SingleRecord=True>. Also see Gardner, *The Qualities of a Citizen*; Pickus, *True Faith and Allegiance*.

¹⁹⁵ "Child Labor Problems," *Philadelphia (Pa.) Record*, January 20, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁹⁶ Brown, "The Night Messenger Service," 38.

¹⁹⁷ No title, *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, --- 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; Owen R. Lovejoy, "Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service," *The Survey*, May 21, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; Owen R. Lovejoy, "To the Editor: Night Messenger Service," *The Survey*, December 24, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; Edward F. Brown, "The Night Messenger Service -- A Child Labor Problem," *Editorial Review*, January 1911, box 59, NCLC MSS; and Owen R. Lovejoy, "Industrial Blind Alleys," *New Boston*, January 1911, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁹⁸ Wiebe, *The Search for Order*.

¹⁹⁹ "Industrial, Adj. and N.," *OED Online* (Oxford University Press, December 2014), <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/94848?redirectedFrom=industrial>.

²⁰⁰ Conant, "Night Messenger Service," 382.

²⁰¹ "Industrial, Adj. and N."

²⁰² Nor were such economic arguments novel, for the NCLC and its partners filtered this reasoning into other contemporary child labor campaigns. The first edition of the *Child Labor Bulletin* warned of the material dangers of child labor, noting that its end product was "the perpetuation of poverty... the increase of crime, the lowering of the wage scale and the swelling of the army of the unemployed." Indeed, the president of the Indiana Child Labor Committee claimed that the purpose of the organization was "to secure the proper safe-guarding of childhood *with reference to industry*." Emphasis added. As quoted in "2,000,000 Children at Work," *Lumberton Robesonian*, June 12, 1913; Clopper, "The Night Messenger Service," 257.

²⁰³ Richard Kitchelt, "The Child Labor Problem," *Rochester (NY) Union & Advertiser*, May 31, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

²⁰⁴ For more on the use of this slogan, see Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism*, 271.

²⁰⁵ "Bad for the Boys," *The Citizen*, June 17, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS. One columnist assumed that these results were apparent: "It is not necessary to evolve any theory as to the consequences that follow when a young boy full of enthusiasm, love of adventure, and with the false ideals that are common to youth and inexperience falls into such association. Actual experience proves enough." "Messenger Boys Should Have Attention," 42, n.d., box 7, folder 1, NYCLC MSS.

²⁰⁶ "A Commendable Act," *Albany Journal*, May 19, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS. Also see Scott, "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service," 436; Lovejoy, "Child Labor and

the Night Messenger Service,” 314; Brown, “The Night Messenger Service,” 35; Davis, “The Night Messenger Boy.”

²⁰⁷ Brown, “The Night Messenger Service,” 35–39; Lovejoy, “Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service,” 314.

²⁰⁸ “Boys as Night Messengers,” *St. Joseph News-Press*, May 20, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS. Also similarly in “Night Messenger Service Burns Up Boys,” *Bridgeport Standard*, May 21, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; “A Commendable Act,” *Albany Journal*, May 19, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; and No title, *The Survey*, May 21, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

Along the same lines, another author claimed that “the night messenger boy has no future.” “The Messenger Boy Problem,” *Christian Advocate, Cincinnati, O.*, June 1, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

²⁰⁹ “The Child Labor Question Applied to the Messenger Service,” *Johnstown (Pa.) Journal*, October 6, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS. Also see Scott, “The Evils of the Night Messenger Service,” 436.

²¹⁰ At the end of his tenure, the messenger boy was, as Brown charged, “again thrown upon the world without any experience which would avail him in a business enterprise.” Brown, “The Night Messenger Service,” 35; Lovejoy, “Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service,” 314; Clopper, “The Night Messenger Service,” 258.

²¹¹ Owen R. Lovejoy, “Industrial Blind Alleys,” *New Boston*, January 1911.

²¹² “Blind Alley, N.,” *OED Online* (Oxford University Press, December 2014), <http://www.oed.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/view/Entry/20227?redirectedFrom=b+lind+alley>.

Also see Lovejoy, "Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service," 314; Lovejoy, "Industrial Blind Alleys," 376.

²¹³ Clopper, "The Night Messenger Service," 257; Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 104.

²¹⁴ Davis, "The Night Messenger Boy."

²¹⁵ "[Bo]ys Night Work Death for Boys," *Chicago Tribune*, May 20, 1910; "Night Messenger Service Defended," *St. Louis Star*, May 20, 1910; "A Commendable Act," *Albany Journal*, May 19, 1910; "Night Messenger Service Burns Up Boys," *Bridgeport Standard*, May 21, 1910; and "Turning Night into Day," *Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel*, May 23, 1910. All these articles come from box 59, NCLC MSS.

²¹⁶ Lovejoy, "Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service," 314.

²¹⁷ Conant, "Night Messenger Service," 382; "Legislation Which Boston-1915 Wants: A Summary of the Bills That the Directors of Boston-1915 Have Voted to Support," *New Boston*, March 1911.

²¹⁸ "Boys Night Work Death for Boys," *Chicago Tribune*, May 20, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

²¹⁹ Brown, "The Night Messenger Service," 40. Also see No title, *The Survey*, May 21, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

²²⁰ Malcolm O. Sillars, "The Rhetoric of the Petition in Boots," in *The Rhetoric of Protest and Reform, 1878-1898*, ed. Paul H. Boase (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1980), 17–35.

²²¹ "Night Messenger Bill Gets Favorable Report," *Atlanta Journal*, July 28, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; "Use Messenger Boys as Guides in Tenderloin," n.d., box 59, NCLC

MSS; Kelley, *Some Ethical Gains through Legislation*, 17; Richard K. Conant, "Street Trades and Reformatories," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 38, no. 3 (July 1911): 107; Mangold, *Child Problems*, 197; Clopper, "The Night Messenger Service," 258; Davis, "The Night Messenger Boy"; Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 166. Also see "Messenger Boys Should Have Attention," 42, NYCLC MSS.

²²² "Night Messenger Bill Gets Favorable Report," *Atlanta Journal*, July 28, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, 187–88; Davis, "The Night Messenger Boy."

²²³ Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 168; Ben B. Lindsey, "Juvenile Delinquency and Employment," *The Survey*, November 4, 1911, 1099.

²²⁴ Scott, "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service," 396; "The Columbus Juvenile Court," 11.

²²⁵ Clopper, "The Night Messenger Service," 258.

²²⁶ Brown, "The Night Messenger Service," 39.

²²⁷ Clopper, "The Night Messenger Service," 259; Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 113.

²²⁸ Richard Kitchelt, "The Child Labor Problem," *Rochester (NY) Union & Advertiser*, May 31, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS.

²²⁹ Brown, "The Night Messenger Service," 32, box 7, folder 1, NYCLC MSS.

²³⁰ "Night Messenger Service and Child Labor Question," *Richmond (Ind.) Palladium*, November 20, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; No title, *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, n.d. 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; and "The Messenger Boy Problem," *Christian Advocate, Cincinnati, O.*, June 1, 1910, box 59, NCLC MSS; Conant, "Night Messenger Service," 382; Kelley,

Some Ethical Gains through Legislation, 26; Lovejoy, "Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service," 316; Lovejoy, "To the Editor: Night Messenger Service," 505.

²³¹ Lovejoy, "Seven Years of Child Labor Reform," 31.

CHAPTER FOUR

RIGHTS AND REFORM IN LEGISLATIVE DEBATE

In 1910, Rep. Hooper Alexander introduced a controversial bill to regulate the night messenger service in the Georgia House of Representatives. Opponents argued that this bill would interfere with a boy's "opportunity to make a living." They reputedly asserted that a boy "*must* have the opportunity to make a living." In response, Rep. Alexander questioned a child's right to work by prodding, "but is it a wholesome thing for the State, is it a wholesome thing for society?"¹ These arguments framed two sides in the conversation over the regulation of the NMS. The legislative debate that followed became a broader contest over the rights of the child. This contest featured a debate among employers, reform school heads, local activists, and national reformers, which positioned professional reform groups at the center of the legislative process.

Each voice in this debate seemingly privileged a fresh articulation of rights. Reformers wanted to extend the child's right to protection and dependence. Opponents of regulation stressed a boy's right to work, an employer's right to set policies, and a father's right to his child's labor. Figures on both sides were renegotiating states' rights, and as legislatures across the United States debated whether to regulate the NMS, reform organizations situated themselves as privileged experts in this contested process. They established themselves as the dominant agents behind this social initiative, and their efforts met with varying degrees of success. In Georgia, reformers achieved a victory when the legislature approved a NMS bill on August 13, 1910, but their victory was limited because the law only protected minors under the age of sixteen and provided no mechanism for enforcement. A few other legislatures came close to enacting the ideal law

sought by the National Child Labor Committee (NCLC). The discourse surrounding the range of this legislation ultimately brings to light several central dimensions of rights rhetoric and reform in the Progressive Era.

These legislative campaigns turned into a complex crusade led by reform organizations to secure children's rights, but they easily could have sought to regulate child labor in the NMS another way. Campaigners, for example, could have pursued nongovernmental strategies.² In 1909, just months before the National Child Labor Committee initiated their NMS campaign, young shirtwaist workers in New York City challenged working conditions by going on strike in what came to be called the Uprising of Twenty Thousand.³ Another potential model was offered by a vice crusader in Chicago who paraded the city's citizens through the red light district to raise awareness and propel reform.⁴ NMS reformers could have worked with the officials of the telegraph and messenger companies, educated messengers about the dangers of night work, and/or commissioned consumers to use their power to reform the night messenger service. The NCLC and its partners, however, rejected these more informal methods in favor of a staid, legislative approach founded on technical reasoning and professionalism. The NMS campaigners fleshed out a discourse of rights that located authority in middle-class reform organizations, extended the states' power to intervene in the lives of children and families, and claimed greater protections for adolescents.

This chapter examines how the NMS campaigns negotiated and reimagined the rights of children, organizations, and the government. To better understand how these relationships were constructed, I tackle two primary questions. First, how did NMS reformers set up their organizations as privileged agents within the community? Second,

how did the NMS campaign define and renegotiate the rights accorded to children and the states?

Child labor organizations assumed the right to define the best interests of night messenger boys based on their growing professional status. Special interest groups had turned legislative campaigning into a highly-organized endeavor, rooted in technical knowledge and guided by legislative expertise. Child labor organizations participated in this trend, for they experienced a burst of growth in the early 1900s that they capitalized on to shift their groups into the center of the legislative process. On this basis, child labor committees and their partners claimed the right to address and make demands of the state, generally positioning themselves as the primary reform agents. With their power, NMS campaigners redefined children's rights by pursuing legislative solutions in the states.

The successful NMS legislation renegotiated children's rights in the community by extending the role of the state as the protector of rising citizen workers. Campaigners realigned the boundaries of childhood dependence and childhood protection. Their arguments recalled traditional structures of authority and responsibility within the family. In the past, families had been responsible for a child's provision, education, labor, and moral upbringing; those responsibilities had shifted though in the 1800s. By the early 1900s, child welfare reformers regularly used maternalistic arguments based on constructions of a mother's love to justify the expansion of state authority to provide for children and their education. The NMS legislation, though, transferred the father's traditional authority over his children to the states by giving states the right and responsibility to oversee an adolescent's labor and moral upbringing sometimes up to the age of twenty-one. As the NMS campaign was bookended by attempts to pass child labor

legislation at the federal level in 1906 and 1916, this campaign fed into efforts to expand the federal government's powers in the life of the nation's children. This power was extended through the organizational structures it established, the legislative strategies that were shared, the expansion of children's rights discourse, and the growth of state authority.

This analysis starts by laying out a framework for examining rights and then reviews how children's rights evolved in U.S. history in relation to the family and the state. This conversation introduces the work of child welfare workers, who spearheaded and justified the expansion of state government in the life of the child. With this background, I examine how these welfare workers organized and positioned themselves as groups in relation to state governments and how they renegotiated the rights of the child in the night messenger service on the basis of these relationships.

RIGHTS RHETORIC

The NMS campaign entered heated debates over both states' rights and children's rights. Campaigners and their opponents made competing claims about the community they were in and the relationships that governed that community. At their base these discussions about rights are inseparable from community, for rights envision and re-envision community. They are about the relationships and interconnections among individuals, groups, and governments, and these relationships are always in flux. Existing groups may assert new rights. Or individuals may attempt to claim a new relationship with the community. In each case, rhetors respond to these expressions, embed conceptions of rights in policy and social practice, and conceive of new ways in which to address the rights exigencies.⁵

Two Aspects of Rights

Rights align relationships within a community by what claims they express and how those claims are to be viewed. As the legal scholar, Martha Minow describes, there are at least two facets of rights. On the one hand, rights refer to the legal rules that “concern relationships among individuals, groups, and the official state.” This understanding of rights dictates what claims an individual can lawfully make against the state.⁶ The U.S. Bill of Rights falls within this understanding, guaranteeing people state-defined civil rights such as freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and due process.⁷ In much the same way, the U.S. Constitution prescribed the legally enforceable rules that were to govern the interactions between individual states and the federal government. It established what rights states had in the new federal system. Yet, rights discourse also involves claims about how a person should be treated. It represents an attempt at persuasion, whether official or unofficial.⁸ Individuals and groups throughout American history have made assertions about their rights. In her 1867 speech to the annual convention of the American Equal Rights Association, Sojourner Truth, for example, stressed, “I want women to have their rights. In the courts women have no right, no voice; nobody speaks for them.”⁹ By pressing for rights, Truth claimed membership within the civic community and made an appeal about the treatment that she and other women deserved in that community.

The child labor movement and the NMS campaign engaged both of these facets of rights. To begin, reformers had to decide where to address their concerns. They wanted governmental intervention, but did the state or federal government have the legal right to regulate child labor in the NMS? The child labor movement was continually responding

to this ongoing conversation about states' rights. Once they had answered this question, they were still left to work out their relationship as an organization with the state. What norms of argument were to moderate this relationship? How should exchanges with states be conducted?

Campaigners, legislators, and telegraph officials relished these questions in legislative debates, but in the NMS hearings, slightly different questions were raised. The debate revolved around *whether* the government had a right to regulate adolescents' labor instead of *which* level of government had the right. Reformers charged that states had the responsibility to protect children. Their opponents privileged the rights of the individual messenger and the family.

The Unique Case of Children's Rights

At root, the NMS campaign claimed to expand children's rights. Taking up the topic of children's rights forces us to broaden our view, though, because generally children do not have the right to vote.¹⁰ There is an expectation that as children mature they are developing capacities and competences for citizenship, but it is assumed that they do not yet possess them. This assumption makes children's rights a unique case.

Children's rights continue to be contested even today. A 2011 forum in the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* deemed childhood to be "the last frontier in the articulation of rights for special groups."¹¹ Today, there is a general consensus that children have rights, but what rights do they have? At the national level, the unsettled status of children's rights is evident in the struggle over whether or not the United States should ratify the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child. Opponents of ratification argue that the treaty violates national sovereignty, guaranteeing protections

for children by compromising the authority of the federal government.¹² Children's rights are placed in competition with the state's rights. This tension is an old debate in which historical developments, such as the child saving campaigns of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, continue to shape the conversation.¹³

In the early 1900s, the idea of children's rights had only recently emerged and was quite controversial. Then as now, as Minow argues, children's rights revolved around the "boundaries and connections" between children and adults in a community.¹⁴ The child labor movement was working out those ties by the questions and challenges it posed in its legislative campaigns. Where was the boundary between childhood and adulthood? And to what extent should children, on the basis of their natural or civil rights, be guaranteed independence from their community or dependence on their community?¹⁵ Children's rights are expressed in the laws, policies, and institutions that govern child life, and even if not explicitly stated, children's rights have been continuously defined by the relationships children have with other members of the community.¹⁶ In passing NMS legislation, each state redefined children's rights and renegotiated the relationship between the government and its citizens in the process.

THE GOVERNMENT'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE FAMILY AND THE CHILD

The relationship between the child and the state had already undergone a gradual evolution over the course of the nineteenth century. At its start, this relationship was governed by a father's common law rights over his child. In time, mothers were granted greater authority in their children's lives on the grounds of their natural rights claim as loving and nurturing guardians. By the start of the twentieth century, though, the community also came to recognize the rights of children.

Along this trajectory, several questions continually animated these relationships between the child, the family, and the state, including: Should the government have any authority in the family household? If so, which level of government and under what circumstances? And was it best to provide for children through public, public-private, or private funding? These evolving relationships between the child, the family, and the state are apparent in child welfare policies and judicial rulings on custody, labor, and education, and these histories form an important backdrop for understanding the evolution of rights in the NMS legislative campaign. The authority of the state in the child's life had been growing, and the NMS legislation extended this authority.

The Child in the American Colonies and Early Republic

In the American colonies and early republic, the father, as the head of the household, was the primary authority in a child's life. The father's rights were paramount while the government's role in the life of the child was minimal. This arrangement was deeply rooted in cultural practices and had been propounded by political theorists for centuries. In his *Two Treatises of Government*, John Locke argued, "The subjection of a Minor places in the Father a temporary Government, which terminates with the minority of the Child."¹⁷ Within this view, a boy was outside of the government's authority. He was "under his Father's Tuition and Authority."¹⁸ For Locke, this familial relationship entailed dues and responsibilities, contractual obligations like those within the broader community. Children owed their fathers respect, and fathers were bound to nourish and educate their children.¹⁹ The distribution of these rights within Locke's model was reflected in family relations in the American colonies and early republic.

In these years, fathers were obligated to supply their sons with adequate food, clothing, and shelter, an education, and religious training. In return, a father had the right to his son's labor in the home and/or the community. He could hire his son out and collect the wages, or he could set his child up as an apprentice. A father or guardian made these arrangements, for boys could not enter into contracts on their own. When a boy reached a certain age (whether twelve or fourteen), though, a father normally had to obtain his son's consent to an apprenticeship contract. The child did not have the right to enter a contract on his own, but his approval was needed.²⁰ Once a father contracted his son out, the master assumed responsibility for providing the boy's training, education, and sustenance and had a right to the boy's labor. This arrangement privileged a father's rights over his child, but it also established a reciprocal relationship, entailing provision from the head of the household and labor from the boy until the boy reached his majority at the age of twenty-one.²¹ Whether under a father or master, these ties were legally enforceable bonds. Local authorities were only given the right to intervene in the affairs of an independent household in a limited set of circumstances.

Orphaned and dependent children became the primary exception to this arrangement, for the state always assumed more control over indigent families. Throughout U.S. history, the state maintained a two-tiered approach to its relationship with children. As reviewed, parents in economically stable households were almost entirely autonomous, raising their children without outside interference. State and local governments played a more active role in the life of the poor.²²

This two-tiered approach was inherited from the English system. The American colonies largely adopted British poor laws, including the Elizabethan Poor Law of 1601.

These laws stressed local control and family responsibility. The system held fathers legally responsible for supporting their children, but when parents were unable to support their children, officials intervened and generally placed poor children in involuntary apprenticeships. In such contracts, dependent children never had to approve these contracts, a right guaranteed to their better-off peers. This setup signaled how a boy's rights within the community depended on his economic status. Involuntary apprenticeships also indicated how the community favored caring for the poor through private means. Once an indigent boy was placed out within a household as an apprentice, the community was freed from having to care for him with public funds.²³

Within this framework, the "family ideal" grew in the early 1800s and further cemented the notion that, whenever possible, children should be cared for within a family. This ideal, as the historian Elizabeth Pleck argues, entailed a set of commitments to family privacy, parental rights, and family preservation. The family was assumed to reside in the private realm, and only when parents failed was public intervention justified.²⁴ In most cases, the father was left as the primary authority. Local courts approved apprenticeship contracts and resolved any conflicts that might arise between fathers and masters, but they had little authority in family life otherwise. In this web of relationships, a boy had no right to due process or to assert his own interests.²⁵ Mothers factored little into this legal reckoning in these years.²⁶

The Child in the 1800s

As the nineteenth century progressed, the state's relationship with the family began to change. Two important shifts marked this new arrangement. Local governments

started to recognize a mother's authority in the life of her child, and they also began to weigh the needs of the child.

Mothers' roles started to shift in the early 1800s as there was more attention to the "mother-child bond" and an understanding that a mother's maternal instincts meant she should assume the responsibility for nurturing her children.²⁷ This cultural awareness played out in court cases, and in 1809, in *Prather v. Prather* a court awarded custody of a five-year-old girl to her mother rather than her father. This ruling seems commonplace from a modern perspective, but it marked a significant shift. Traditionally, courts had always privileged the father's rights in custody disputes. Instead, the judge grounded his decision on an understanding of the mother's crucial role in raising a young child. This reasoning came to be known as the "Tender Years Doctrine" and assumed that young children were best cared for and nurtured by their mothers. This doctrine grew in popularity over the course of the 1800s and so too did the notion that a mother's authority over her child was based in natural rights.²⁸ This mother-child relationship was purportedly inscribed in nature itself.

Alongside this allowance for mothers' rights, a more modern concern for the "best interest of the child" emerged.²⁹ With this principle, the courts recognized that children had interests of their own and identified the child's welfare as the primary concern within custody cases.³⁰ A judge succinctly articulated this principle in an 1881 custody case in Kansas, stating, "Above all things, the paramount consideration is, What will promote the welfare of the child?"³¹ The community was paying more attention to children's special needs, and in response, they ceded more authority to the government to intervene in family life on behalf of a child's welfare.³²

In marking the needs of children, these principles moved toward recognizing children's rights. The "first modern children's rights case," though, according to the legal historian David Tanenhaus, was decided in 1870 by the Illinois State Supreme Court in *The People v. Turner*. In this case, the father of Daniel O'Connell claimed that his son was in a state of involuntary servitude. His son had been committed to a reform school and forced to work without the approval of either of his parents. The father argued that his son's constitutional rights had been violated because the boy had never been charged with a crime. The Illinois Supreme Court agreed with him, freeing his son from the reform school and striking down the system that placed him there. In this decision, the court grounded its decision in the state constitution and ruled that all men, including children, were guaranteed rights, including the right to due process.³³ In these decisions and conversations, the community was defining its relationship with children. Were boys autonomous citizens, the property of their parents, or the responsibility of the State?³⁴ In *The People v. Turner*, the state decreed that children had the right to due process. Yet, in time, children's rights morphed into the right to protection.

The Child in the Late 1800s

In the mid- and late 1800s, the state continued to make inroads into family life, challenging what had largely been unregulated paternal authority over children, their care, education, and labor.³⁵ Several developments illustrate how these relationships were being redefined.

To begin, the state started to assume more responsibility for a child's education, which from the colonial era had been a father's responsibility. When states first moved to provide universal education, families still had a choice of whether or not to send their

child to school, but in 1852, Massachusetts enacted the first compulsory education law. Other states slowly followed, and by 1918, mandatory attendance laws were in place in every state. Enforcement continued to be an issue, but by this move, state governments usurped the head of household by asserting authority and assuming responsibility for the education of the nation's children.³⁶

In these years, the apprentice system was waning, and officials also had to find new ways to provide for the welfare of dependent and delinquent children. Several solutions emerged, including Houses of Refuge, reformatories, and "placing out." As touched on in Chapter One, these provisions were a mix of public, private, and public/private initiatives and illustrate the fluidity of traditional notions of responsibility and authority in the life of the child. The Michigan Plan or state system created a central school for all dependent children, making dependency a public concern. As an alternative, the subsidy system offered a privatized approach that encouraged the formation of private industrial schools, which would then get a per-child subsidy.³⁷ One of the most popular approaches, "placing out," was similar to the earlier involuntary apprenticeship system in which children were placed in homes and promised a room, board, and education in exchange for labor. These schemes kept the care of dependents within the private realm and were frequently the preferred approach.³⁸

Yet, at the same time, members of the community grew more concerned about child welfare and organized to address how children were treated within their families. Anti-cruelty societies formed to protect and advocate for the child who was neglected in the home, which previously had been seen as a sacred private realm cut off from the reach of the state.³⁹ In 1875, the first anti-cruelty society was founded in New York, and

within twenty-five years, over two hundred similar organizations had formed. These organizations became hybrid public-private bodies and under the banner of child welfare assumed the authority to police what once had been the unquestioned domain of the head of the household.⁴⁰ These examples illustrate how children fell increasingly under the authority of the state as they were deemed to have rights and to be autonomous from their parents.

The Child in the Progressive Era

In many ways, the state had superseded the father and the mother as an authority, provider, and nurturer of the child by the Progressive Era. The historian Mary Ann Mason argues that the state became a “superparent” in these years.⁴¹ State governments assumed more authority in their relationship with children by mandating compulsory education, restricting child labor, setting minimums for parental competence, and guarding against child abuse.⁴² The federal government also started to make its first incursions into the life of the child.

The child welfare workers who helped to renegotiate these power balances regularly used maternalist appeals to justify state intervention into family life and female leadership of child welfare initiatives. Maternalism, as Seth Koven and Sonya Michel articulate, encompasses the “ideologies that exalted women's capacity to mother and extended to society as a whole the values of care, nurturance, and morality.” This ideology simultaneously extolls “the private virtues of domesticity” and legitimates “women's public relationships to politics and the state, to community, workplace, and marketplace.”⁴³ On this foundation, women gained an audience in the “masculine” public

realm and lobbied for the expansion of the state's powers over children by claiming nineteenth-century constructions of "mother-love."⁴⁴

Arguments to maternalism helped women to establish, as the historian Robyn Muncy claims, a "monopoly over child welfare policy."⁴⁵ Child welfare reformers used these arguments to justify policy initiatives that gained traction concurrently with the NMS laws. Proponents of mothers' pensions worked to expand the role of state governments in the life of the family and reignited debates about public versus private poor relief.⁴⁶ These reformers countered opposition to governmental solutions with maternalist arguments and passed the first mothers' pension law in 1911.⁴⁷ Speaking about the need for juvenile courts, Hannah Kent Schoff of the National Congress of Mothers stressed, "Unfortunate childhood must suffer unless women recognize that a larger motherhood is required of them than to care only for their own children."⁴⁸ From this perspective, it was the responsibility of women to ensure that all children had the best possible start in life.⁴⁹ The construction of "mother-love" and a mother's special role in nurturing children undergirded these legislative victories that expanded the authority of the state in family life.⁵⁰

Women reformers and maternalism dominated the discourse around child welfare policy in the Progressive Era, but these appeals receded into the background in the NMS campaign.⁵¹ NMS campaigners worked to increase the power of state governments in the lives of children, but they did not base their arguments on maternalism. This deviation raises questions about who assumed leadership of the NMS campaign and how they justified and redistributed rights within the community instead. These questions prod us

to better understand the network of actors that pursued NMS legislation and the organizations they led.

THE ORGANIZATION AND PROFESSIONALIZATION OF CHILD LABOR REFORM

Organizational innovations were at the heart of the development of arguments in the NMS campaign and its rhetoric of rights. American society witnessed a wave of professionalization in the Progressive Era in fields from social work to law.⁵² This wave of professionalization shaped the discourse of reform in these years, including the standards for credibility and evidence in debate as well as the allocation of responsibility within the community. All around, reformers were organizing, establishing professional networks, assigning public and private responsibilities, and developing lobbying expertise.

By the Progressive Era, special interest groups had learned to mimic the tactics of corporations and established lobbies that contributed to the gradual transformation of the legislative process into a more highly-technical domain.⁵³ Today, special interest group lobbies are normalized, but they were not always a part of the American legislative process.⁵⁴

Groups throughout American history signed petitions, lobbied representatives, and organized within political parties, but in the late nineteenth century, groups developed ways of wielding these organizational technologies to lobby on behalf of associated voters.⁵⁵ During the Progressive Era, Clemens claims that there was “the institutionalization of new means by which organized groups might influence the policy process.”⁵⁶ Groups collected voters around common concerns and developed expertise

about the legislative process in order to better advocate before elected officials for their interests. From laborers to child welfare reformers, they came to recognize that, as one farmer insisted, “unorganized power has little chance in the world at the present time” and “unity of action is necessary to make power felt.”⁵⁷ This view privileged the group over the individual citizen (or head of household) and conceptualized the collective as the primary agent within social change. Reformers who wanted to shift how rights were aligned within society needed to organize. As the treasurer of the National American Women’s Suffrage Association urged, “the time has come when we should make a business of organization.”⁵⁸

The NCLC and its state partners participated in this trend toward organization and professionalization and, in so doing, positioned themselves as privileged agents in the legislative process. In the early 1900s, newly-formed child labor committees formalized the relationships between citizens interested in child labor reform, the public, and the state. As they established these channels of interactions, they grounded their legislative appeals in coopted credibility, constructed expertise, and coordinated arguments. While building the authority of reform organizations, these appeals limited the participation of nonmembers by narrowing avenues for engagement and building up the prerequisites for expertise. The new organizational identities of reformers became the foundation on which these groups asserted their right to address legislative actors and the rights of adolescents to protection.

Creating an Organizational Identity

The national and state child labor committees that spearheaded the NMS legislative campaigns were less than a decade old at the height of this reform effort. As

they formed, their organizational commitments reshaped the strategies of the anti-child labor movement.

Before their advent, the anti-child labor movement had been more diffuse. In the late-nineteenth century, voluntary associations like the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the General Federation of Women's Clubs assembled departments or subcommittees to focus on drafting child labor legislation and influencing public opinion. Some of these organizations would then attend legislative sessions to monitor and attempt to direct the agenda.⁵⁹ The executive secretary of the NCLC, Owen R. Lovejoy, concluded that only the Consumers' Leagues stood as a serious force against child labor in these years even though he acknowledged that trade unions, women's clubs, and the Socialist Party opposed child labor as well.⁶⁰

At the turn of the century, the anti-child labor movement adopted the logic of organizing that was circulating prominently, and there was an upswing in independent child labor committees.⁶¹ The first state child labor committee formed in Alabama in 1901, under the leadership of the Episcopal priest Edgar Gardner Murphy, and it was followed by the formation of the storied New York Child Labor Committee (NYCLC) in 1903.⁶² The National Child Labor Committee came together one year later and further formalized its position within the community in 1907 when it was officially incorporated under a charter from the U.S. Congress.⁶³ By 1911, at the height of the NMS campaigns, the NCLC had twenty-seven state and local affiliated committees and boasted 5,000 contributing members.⁶⁴ In this organizing burst, the state and national committees took on many of the same characteristics, turning into largely white, middle-class, and sex-integrated organizations.⁶⁵

As they formed, these committees assembled impressive membership lists and came to leverage their prominent membership as a premise to all of their arguments. They traded on clout and respectability. The Alabama Child Labor Committee boasted a former governor as a member.⁶⁶ The founders of New York's committee included settlement circle elites, and according to Jeremy Felt, these leaders were strategic about their members. They relied on the social prominence of their membership for funding and persuasion from the start.⁶⁷ They secured as founding members of the NYCLC a Columbia professor, a corporation founder, a railroad president, and two investment bankers.⁶⁸ The NCLC followed this lead. From the start, leaders of the NCLC marshalled the ethos of their organization to address legislators and governmental actors. Trattner claims that the membership of the NCLC ensured that they "commanded a respectful hearing throughout the nation."⁶⁹ Members included Grover Cleveland, the former president of the United States; Charles W. Eliot, the president of Harvard University; and Mrs. Sarah S. Platt Decker, the president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.⁷⁰

Child labor committees secured well-known members for their organization, and they then coopted and marshaled their members' credibility as a legislative strategy. They created their letterhead to capture this argument. When state representatives received letters from the NYCLC about the NMS, the twenty-four members of the organization's board of directors and their hometowns were prominently displayed.⁷¹ They represented a new group, but they sought to enact change at the national and state level. It is easier to gain and command an audience with the support of a former president or governor. Their membership, thus, lent them authority, helped them define their position in the community, and helped them rework their relationship to state legislators and children.

Assigning Responsibility for Child Labor Research

These newly-formed committees also established their relationship with the government through the demands they made on the state to collect data about child labor. In the present day, technical evidence is an expected feature of legislative discourse,⁷² but in the Progressive Era, statistics were just becoming the standard within legislative debates. NMS campaigners conducted systematic investigations of the NMS (Chapter Two), but as the campaign developed, committee leaders increasingly charged that the state had the authority and responsibility to provide this data about children to the public and groups like child labor committees.

This stance represented a shift in thought, for at its founding, part of the mission of the NCLC was explicitly defined: “To investigate and report the facts concerning child labor.”⁷³ Up to this point, state governments had been the primary authorities on child labor statistics, collecting information through census data and occasionally labor bureaus. In the early 1900s, private organizations like the NCLC began collecting and supplementing this research. The first executive secretary of the NCLC corresponded with secretaries of state and commissioners of labor to gather materials about local laws and child labor conditions.⁷⁴ Data about child labor remained limited even after these efforts.⁷⁵

Despite the limits of this data, legislative arguments increasingly required statistical evidence. Reformers met with defeat when they relied only on anecdotal evidence or experience in legislative debates and did not lay a technical foundation. Speaking to the NCLC conference in 1910, Secretary Fred S. Hall of the Pennsylvania Child Labor Association (PACLA) warned, “the campaigner who has no statistics is

laying his cause open to discredit in the eyes of an important and increasingly influential part of our communities... We need figures even before we begin our legislative campaign."⁷⁶ Through defeat, Fred Hall found that statistics had become the evidentiary gold standard in legislative debates. Hall proposed that the most successful legislative strategy was to confront opponents with stories *and* charts (which represented the most up-to-date statistical evidence).

Increasingly, committee leaders worked to impress upon the government its responsibility to collect statistics and care for the nation's children by lobbying for a federal children's bureau. The proposed U.S. Children's Bureau marked a significant shift in community relationships and made data and statistics the domain of the federal government. Speaking at the White House Conference on the Care of Dependent Children in 1909, Lovejoy noted,

We believe there is a clear line of demarcation between public responsibility and the responsibility of private citizens... we do not believe it our duty to discover how many children in the United States are working in occupations that may be injurious to them... We believe it is the duty of the National Government to know that and to present those facts to individuals and organizations.⁷⁷

As envisioned by the bureau's proponents, "individuals and organizations" could then draw on this collected data to "create public sentiment" in support of necessary reforms. The NCLC launched investigations of the NMS, but even as they conducted this research, their organization called for the government to assume this responsibility. In 1912, the NCLC successfully helped to establish the U.S. Children's Bureau. This bureau realigned

the relationship between reform organizations and the state as the federal government expanded its authority to monitor child welfare.

THE LEGISLATIVE APPROACH OF NMS REFORMERS

Even though child labor reformers argued for an expansion of the federal government as they lobbied for the U.S. Children's Bureau, NMS campaigners focused instead on states' rights. They pursued a state-by-state legislative strategy when they started their concentrated campaign against the night messenger service in 1910. As local and national committees formed, child labor movement leaders had to determine which level of government was in a position to appropriately intervene in children's lives and how to justify that intervention (especially in the light of historic resistance to government interference in private family life). These decisions made assumptions about states' rights. Indeed, Robert Woods uses the history of the child labor movement to discuss the debate over states' rights.⁷⁸ In these conversations, child labor committees and their partners were also positioning their own groups within the legislative process.

A State-by-State Strategy

The NCLC focused its original mission on state legislative solutions at its founding in 1904. An exploratory committee suggested that any potential national child labor organization needed to be explicitly limited in scope. It was not "to cross the lines of local initiative" or "promote the interests of suggested federal legislation." Rather, the proposed "National Child-Labor Committee" was to aid in creating a public sentiment about child labor that would "become intelligently operative under the local conditions through the specific laws of each of our several States."⁷⁹ Thus, the NCLC recognized

each state's right to determine its relationship with its future citizens in its founding documents.

From the start, the NCLC coordinated with its partners to support state solutions. This perspective on the proper relationship between organizations, government, and citizens ordered the general activities of the committee. At their first official meeting, the Board of Trustees asked the general secretary to draft a "model or standard child labor law" that could be shared with the various states.⁸⁰ The NCLC's focus on local solutions was further evident in the discussion at its first annual conference. Speakers focused on state legislative efforts in addresses on "The Test of Effective Child Labor Legislation," "Child Labor Legislation and the Methods of its Enforcement," "The Operation of the New Child Labor Law in New Jersey," and "Child Labor Legislation – A Requisite for Industrial Efficiency."⁸¹

A Federal Law and Federal Rights

The NCLC reconsidered its state-by-state approach in 1906 when Sen. Albert Beveridge (R-IN) introduced the first piece of federal child labor legislation in Congress. In forwarding this legislation, Beveridge offered an expanded vision of the federal government's role in what had traditionally been classified as matters for the family or the state. He proposed that the U.S. government use its enumerated powers in the interstate commerce clause to regulate child labor. In extended debate on the floor of the Senate, Beveridge outlined how the U.S. Constitution had given the "Federal Government" the "right" to regulate and prohibit interstate commerce.⁸²

His bill proposed to expand the authority of the federal government in its relationship with individual states and to establish a new relationship between the federal

government and the child. He was ridiculed for his advocacy on this measure,⁸³ and opponents of the bill objected to it as unconstitutional. Inside and outside the reform community, this debate revolved around competing constructions of the proper relationship between citizens, the state, and the federal government. Yet these lines of argument were common in the Progressive Era.

The U.S. Constitution, as the historian Michael Benedict posits, was a popular line of argument at the turn of the century, and Beveridge's bill participated in this broader contest over the enumeration of rights within government. The nation was regularly, and often explicitly, negotiating the role of the federal government. Rhetors appealed to the Constitution in party platforms, Congressional debates, and court decisions.⁸⁴ Contemporary legislation had taken a more expansive view of federal powers and increased the purview of the central government. Within recent memory, Congress passed landmark legislation expanding the federal government's powers with the Oleomargarine Act (1886), the Sherman Anti-Trust Act (1890), and the federal lottery act (1895).⁸⁵ In 1906 alone, the federal government made significant interventions into the regulation of food and drugs, railroads, and employers' liability laws.⁸⁶

These measures did not go by without contest, and the Constitution was centered within each debate. Henry Wade Rogers, the Dean of the Law Department at Yale University, mourned what he called the "disposition to extend the power of Congress beyond its constitutional limits and unduly to diminish the proper legislative authority of the States" as exemplified in the Employers' Liability Act.⁸⁷ In an article for *The North American Review*, he observed: "The founders of the Republic established the Constitution upon the fundamental principles of the absolute autonomy of the States,

except in respect to the interests common to the entire country."⁸⁸ Beveridge introduced his federal child labor legislation in the thick of this conversation, and his bill recommended a critical shift in how the powers of the federal government were understood.

Initially, the NCLC supported Beveridge's bill, but this move proved internally divisive. Edgar Gardner Murphy, a central voice in the formation of the National Child Labor Committee, left the organization over the issue.⁸⁹ Others joined him in objecting to federal legislation. The historian Walter Trattner even claims that "most NCLC members" in 1906 thought that a state strategy was "a more effective and legally tenable means of regulation."⁹⁰ Due to this backlash, the NCLC stepped back from federal initiatives and re-committed to seeking legislation at the state level.

State Laws and State Rights

More specifically, the NCLC organized behind uniform state legislation. Uniform state legislation was a common approach and arguably the most important political means of problem-solving in the Progressive Era. This strategy was not new to the Progressive Era, but the historian William Graebner claims that it "was one of the progressives' distinctive contributions to reform."⁹¹ It was a middle ground that answered the demand for local government in the face of national problems.⁹²

Spokesmen from across the political spectrum propounded uniform state legislation as their preferred approach to policy.⁹³ The U.S. Secretary of State, Elihu Root, addressed this issue in a speech before the Pennsylvania Society in 1906 and, according to Graebner, triggered "an intensive, decade-long debate on the federal system."⁹⁴ In his speech, Root listed the ties that increasingly bound the states together,

ranging from a growing “National sentiment” to innovations in travel. He concluded, “It is plainly to be seen that the people of the country are coming to the conclusion that in certain important respects the local laws of the separate States... are inadequate for the due and just control of the business and activities which extend throughout all the States.”⁹⁵ He proposed that the only way for a state to preserve its power was to enact legislation in keeping with its own affairs and “with reference to the effect upon all its sister States.”⁹⁶ According to Root, states must develop their legislation with their neighbors in mind; he anticipated the strategy of uniform state legislation.⁹⁷

Amid a debate over states’ rights, the strategy of uniform state legislation was attractive to organizations like the NCLC for many reasons. To begin, this approach to policy met calls for union *and* autonomy, and it addressed the shortcomings of legislative alternatives. On the one hand, early child labor reformers had found that pursuing isolated pieces of state legislation was inadequate. Opponents of reform regularly charged that states which instituted protective legislation were at a comparative disadvantage. Affected businesses could simply pack up shop and move across the border to another state to escape restrictions.⁹⁸

At the same time, reformers faced strong resistance when they proposed federal legislation (e.g., Beveridge’s child labor bill). Federal legislation would even the playing field across states, but it was seen to be unconstitutional and a violation of states’ rights. Additionally, there was no assurance that federal legislation would be upheld in the courts. The Employers’ Liability Act (that Henry Wade Rogers specifically objected to) was ruled unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1908. Uniform state legislation thus became an argumentatively defensible arrangement of governmental powers and

approach to policy. By lobbying for the same legislation to be passed in each state, uniform state legislation avoided infringing on states' rights while also working to negate concerns about a comparative disadvantage.

There were many uniform state legislative campaigns in the early 1900s, especially in the realm of social welfare.⁹⁹ Mothers' pensions were perhaps the most successful example. In 1911, the first mothers' pension legislation passed in Illinois, and in the following decade forty other states adopted similar measures.¹⁰⁰ Uniform state legislation became the preferred legislative strategy of the child labor movement. The NCLC circulated model laws through its national conference and state partners, and it even titled the proceedings of one of its annual conferences "Uniform Child Labor Laws."¹⁰¹ In 1911, the Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in partnership with the National Child Labor Committee drafted a uniform child labor.¹⁰² The Conference's recommendations practically became the universal standard in the following years, and child labor reformers were able to achieve some major inroads with this state-by-state approach.¹⁰³ When the NCLC took up the NMS in 1910, these campaigners decided to present their claims to the states and to seek uniform state legislation.

CAMPAIGNING FOR NIGHT MESSENGER SERVICE LEGISLATION IN THE STATES

The NCLC and its partners sought uniform laws, but they didn't necessarily get them. Some states passed the model law. Some passed a scaled back measure. Others didn't even discuss it at all. In the five years between 1910 and 1914, at least twenty-nine states and two cities put restrictions on child labor in the night messenger service.

Moving forward, this analysis focuses primarily on the campaigns in New York, Georgia, Massachusetts, and Maryland.¹⁰⁴ The NCLC was involved at least tangentially in each of these efforts, but there were key differences in how these state campaigns were conducted and what arguments were issued. In their similarities and differences, these campaigns illustrate how committees continued to situate themselves in relation to other groups and the state. By looking across states, these campaigns flesh out how children's rights were debated and codified in both successful and seemingly failed discourse.

Appealing for the Rights of Messengers in New York

One of the earliest and greatest victories of the NCLC's NMS campaign was the Murray Night Messenger Boy law in New York, which the NYCLC put on the agenda and guided through the state legislature. The legislative campaign for this bill was exemplary in many ways. It shows the degree of organization achieved within the anti-child labor movement and how the committee used that organization to persuasive ends. The New York Child Labor Committee was only seven years old in 1910. In its arguments in the NMS campaign, it showed how as a group it assigned responsibility for child welfare to the state and further defined its relationship with the state and individual citizens. The NYCLC asserted the right to make claims of the state on the basis of its membership and on the basis of its organizational status. And through its campaign, the group met and reinforced technical standards within legislative argument through its organization and expressions of expertise. The NYCLC claimed to work on the behalf of children to secure their rights. In the process, the organization strengthened its own position in society. Its rights claims were developing in tandem.

Assemblyman Andrew F. Murray introduced the night messenger bill in the state assembly, but he was not the primary driver behind the bill. In New York, the state child labor committee led the charge – documenting, tracking, prodding, persuading – lobbying for the passage of the Murray Night Messenger Bill. Nor was this a light task. The state legislative process was involved. A parallel case illustrates this point well. In 1913, a mothers’ pension bill in Wisconsin had to pass through thirty-one decision points before it became a law. These steps included multiple readings in the Assembly and Senate, committee hearings, votes, and executive signatures.¹⁰⁵ State legislatures were a more local level of government, but they were not simple or accessible. By the Progressive Era, the legislative process was complex. Elaborate parliamentary procedures made moving and tracking legislation difficult.¹⁰⁶

In order to secure the passage of the Murray bill, the NYCLC closely watched the bill’s progression and coordinated the support of reformers, professionals, state officials, and the public. Within the NYCLC, this responsibility largely fell to George A. Hall, the executive secretary of the organization. Hall was a professional child labor reformer, and as an employee of the NYCLC, he “chiefly centered” his time on “legislative activity” over the course of the campaign.¹⁰⁷ For Hall, legislative activity entailed an array of responsibilities. He collected expert testimony, organized support, and shepherded the bill through the legislative process.

From the start, the NYCLC collected and shared expert testimony in support of the bill. Hall looked to his network for other models of state legislation. He reached out to the NCLC’s secretary for New England, Everett Lord, and to the leaders who helped to get a NMS bill passed in Ohio in order to secure copies of their bills.¹⁰⁸ He also looked to

this network of reform organizations for support. When the Murray bill came under attack, members of the Charity Organization Society wrote an editorial response to an attack on the bill in the *Telegraph and Telephone Age*.¹⁰⁹ The NYCLC also met with New York's Labor Commissioner, John Williams, and received permission to share publicly that the Department of Labor would "heartily" support the restrictions.¹¹⁰

Secretary Hall further built the organization's legislative argument by cobbling together expertise from other professional networks. He wrote to New York doctors requesting their support. Noting the position of the NYCLC and that "a number of medical men" already supported the bill, he requested: "To aid in the passage of this measure we are endeavoring to secure letters of endorsement for public use from prominent medical men... we would be very glad to receive a letter from you favoring the enactment of the bill."¹¹¹ Later in the letter, Hall even prescribed the range of responses that doctors might provide, from a simple letter of support to personal reports that might corroborate the investigators' findings. Doctors responded with a range of support, and Hall used these letters as expert testimony.

By our standards, he conducted an informal survey to collect this evidence, but he cited it with authority. Later in the campaign, he noted how the NYCLC had in their files "letter after letter from physicians who have treated night messengers" and "agree absolutely" that the work ruined boys bodies and morals.¹¹² Testifying before the Committee on Labor and Industries, Hall cited how "social workers and particularly medical authorities" agreed as to the dangers of the NMS.¹¹³ The extended testimony and impressive sounding title of one of these doctors repeatedly emerged in the committee's argument. Hall read in a hearing the written testimony of "Dr. G.A. DeSantos Saxe of

New York City, instructor in Genito-Urinary surgery, N.Y. Post Graduate Medical School, Assistant Surgeon Bellevue Hospital Dispensary, and Editor of American Journal of Urology [sic].”¹¹⁴

Hall marshalled all of this support, and in part because of it, he claimed the right of the NYCLC to address and set the agenda of the New York legislature. Testifying in a hearing for the bill before the Committee on Labor and Industries, Hall began, ““This measure was introduced at the request of the New York Child Labor committee. It is based on the findings of a careful investigation covering over a year, conducted by the National Child Labor Committee.””¹¹⁵ His first argument involved his group identity. Both organizations were professional bodies with prominent members. As a group, these reformers could collectively make claims upon the state. Three individuals were noted as speakers in newspaper accounts about the hearings for the Night Messenger Boy bill – George Hall, the secretary of the NYCLC; Edward Barrows, a special investigator for the NCLC; and G.A. DeSantos Saxe, a titled medical professional.¹¹⁶ Within these legislative conversations, professional credentials were central.

George Hall made the NYCLC central to the entire progression of the NMS bill through the New York legislature. His involvement in the legislative process was exhaustive. He sent out a summary of the NCLC’s investigative reports to the assemblymen. He communicated with representatives to encourage them to commit their support. He arranged a hearing on the Murray Night Messenger Boy Bill, corresponding with state senators to set a time and then requesting that the bill’s sponsor attend.¹¹⁷ He spoke at the hearings.¹¹⁸ He wrote to committee members to encourage and gauge their

support for the bill.¹¹⁹ And he wrote thank you notes to representatives who aided in advancing it through the legislature.¹²⁰

In contrast, the responsibilities relegated to the public in this legislative process were minimal. As a group, the NYCLC informed the public of the problem and orchestrated displays of support from its members. Although the leaders of the NYCLC rooted their authority and representativeness in the prominence and broad base of their membership, Hall guided the bill through the legislative process. NYCLC members and supporters simply needed to write to their representatives when prompted by Hall and the committee.

Throughout the campaign, the NYCLC took charge and became the acknowledged leader. The organization wrote and released news bulletins to the local papers to carry the details and progression of the bill to the public.¹²¹ The NYCLC also called on members of their network to write to their representatives. At one meeting, they collected the names of people who would write their representatives in support of the Murray bill when needed. The signers noted, “I promise to write my assemblyman or senator in the State Legislature, or to telegraph him if that action is necessary, whenever I am informed that this act on my part will aid the passage of the above bill.”¹²² The reform organization assumed responsibility for directing the engagement of ordinary citizens with their state representatives. It was as if the public were “on call” throughout the legislative process. They were dormant until activated by the committee. One citizen of New York, C.F. Stowe, wrote the following to Hall, “I must in honor plead guilty to not complying directly to your recent request in the matter of Messenger boys.” Stowe followed this confession by quickly assuring Hall that he had written his local

representatives to urge them to support the child labor reforms in the past.¹²³ These notes and the organizational structure behind them sketch out the relationship envisioned between the state, reform groups, and citizens. The NYCLC as a professional organization served as the engine of these reforms efforts.

Acknowledging the leadership of Hall, supporters reached out to him directly to volunteer. The Superintendent of the Syracuse Boys' Club offered, "In case it is desirable to bring pressure to bear on the senate, I can use seventy five [sic] copies of the bill to good advantage."¹²⁴ Hall could let him know if and when it was necessary to bring pressure, and the NYCLC, with their information and resources, was the assumed base for that support. Even in suggesting independent action, this Superintendent recognized the funneling of reform through the NYCLC. The committee prompted (perhaps even goaded) their members to voice their support at critical junctures.

Child labor reformers in New York mounted an involved, technical campaign for reform. The NYCLC amassed the support of a broad professional network, showed expertise in shepherding the bill through the legislative process, held their members at bay until the critical moment for their support, and located their organization at the center of this campaign for children's rights. They were well-organized in their outreach to representatives, professionals, and the public, and they saw their ideal become law. On May 21, 1910, the Murray Night Messenger Bill was signed by Governor Hughes. The law stipulated:

In cities of the first or second class no person under the age of twenty-one years shall be employed or permitted to work as a messenger for any telegraph or messenger company in the distribution, transmission or delivery of goods or

messages before five o'clock in the morning or after ten o'clock in the evening of any day.¹²⁵

This law became a point of reference and comparison as other child labor organizations worked out the definition and distribution of children's rights.

Appealing for the Rights of Messengers Across the United States

The news of the successful Murray Night Messenger bill was shared among reform circles across the country. The conduct of the New York campaign and the victory that they achieved fed how reformers approached legislative debate and conceived of children's rights. Other child labor committees frequently adopted and tried to pass legislation that mirrored the New York law. Their communities and how those communities recognized the bounds between childhood and adulthood and the relationship between state authorities and reform groups inevitably shaped the reception these claims received. The Pennsylvania Child Labor Association drafted a bill that followed the New York law "almost exactly," but they had trouble even getting a sponsor for the bill, which eventually died in committee.¹²⁶ After a hearing, a NMS bill in Massachusetts also died in committee.¹²⁷

The annual conference of the National Child Labor Committee became the forum where local reformers shared these victories and defeats. Different reform organizations reported what children's rights were recognized in their states and how they had interacted with legislators and other state actors to secure those understandings. This process affected the groups' understanding of the claims they could make in the legislative debates *and* the claims they could make therein about childhood.

The state committees held out their experience as examples, and in so doing, these groups continued to build their technical understanding of the arguments they should issue in the legislative process. Corporations had lobbied legislators for decades, but special interest group lobbies, like the child labor reform community, were still relatively young.¹²⁸ At their meetings and in their publications, this community circulated legislative strategies. They projected who should spearhead reform and how they should do so. Special interest groups were swapping strategies across the country. In 1913, the president of the Washington State Federation of Labor shared a color-coded legislative review of representatives on key votes, and convention attendees responded enthusiastically to this new tool that they could use to educate the public. In the same year, a California labor lobbyist published the legislative records of individual representatives. Although this persuasive strategy is commonplace today, the public considered this technique, as Clemens argues, “*extremely* questionable.”¹²⁹ Corporations had learned to maneuver the legislative process to support their own ends, and groups of child labor reformers were working to pick up the same lessons.

At the NCLC conferences, state committees shared strategies about how to turn public support into legislative action. In these recommendations, they prescribed how the public could best interact with the state. Similar to the New York campaign, reformers pictured a latent public being activated by the reform community at the national level. In 1913, Lovejoy explained to the local committees:

You must get a number of leading citizens from different sections of the state, men and women who will have influence with their own legislators, so that when the bill comes up and some man proceeds to oppose the bill you will be able to

telegraph to that man's chief constituent, and ask him to stimulate his representative a little and get him on the right side.¹³⁰

This strategy had already been used successfully by groups like the NYCLC and the Massachusetts Child Labor Committee (MACLC).¹³¹

As with their early membership, the organization's strategy was to rely on the credibility of their members to undergird and support their persuasive claims. Members of the MACLC told of how they stymied the messenger companies' attempts to weaken their bill. The legislative committee had initially favored a weakening amendment, but as the MACLC's secretary described, "Their opinion was changed, however, through the efforts of a special auxiliary committee and through the efforts of 275 organizations and clubs throughout the state which had endorsed the bill."¹³² By mobilizing their supporters, the Massachusetts Child Labor Committee asserted and saw the enactment of a new child labor law that prohibited boys under the age of twenty-one from working in the night messenger service.

In their accounts, reformers described how to navigate a bill through the legislature. They developed together a procedural mastery of the legislative process. They shared lessons about timing and the need for vigilance in working with the state legislatures. In 1910, Alexander McKelway recounted how in Georgia a NMS bill *just* passed. He described the case, noting, "The opponents of the bill thought they had killed it in the Senate by a filibuster, but the filibuster talked just about a half minute too short a time. The bill passed on the fifty-ninth second of the last hour of the session... It was a pretty close race against time." This lesson was learned through victory and defeat. With the help of the NCLC's Alexander McKelway, the Georgia bill passed. A model child

labor bill in Minnesota failed, though, with the legislative session ending just minutes before the bill would have passed.¹³³ This lesson was reiterated in subsequent years. Speaking from his experiences in the Kentucky campaign, Herschel Jones (one of the NMS investigators) instructed, “This shows that in order to get a bill through a legislature you have to watch it right up to the last minute.”¹³⁴ The lesson was vigilance.

In such interactions about strategy, these groups focused on collective approaches to legislative reform. In 1914, Herschel Jones linked the success of a recent Kentucky bill to the support they received from organizations and professionals. He noted, “The bill never could have been put through without the cooperation of all the forces throughout the state. The women's clubs, the State Federation of Labor, and a number of women who had been active in social work, worked together on the thing. We had letters coming from all over the state to members of the legislature.”¹³⁵ Committees activated their membership when they needed to put pressure on legislators and show that as organizations they represented powerful members of the community, specifically voting citizens. They positioned their organizations as experts and the prime movers of reform, propelling the child labor movement forward and securing legislative changes. This weighting of relationships within the community was central to their narrative, privileging organization and professionalization.¹³⁶

These organizational dynamics were even clearer in conflict. The inwardly contentious Maryland NMS campaign shows how the relationships between groups, the state, and citizens were being worked out. The course of the first NMS law in Maryland offered a sharp contrast to the Murray campaign and the NYCLC’s coordination and expertise. A “citizen of Baltimore who did not even know of the existence of the

Maryland Child Labor Committee” (MDCLC) drafted the bill. Once McKelway learned of the bill, he lent the professional and technical expertise of the NCLC to the cause by arranging an investigation of local conditions. As he had done in other states, he then began to shepherd the bill by scheduling a committee hearing. At that point, he learned that the Maryland Child Labor Committee opposed the bill, citing that they would not support any measure that did not adequately provide for enforcement. Due to these objections, he handed the investigative report off to the bill’s sponsor in the House and otherwise stopped his involvement. The bill still passed.¹³⁷ Owen Lovejoy claimed that McKelway was of “material help” in passing the Maryland NMS law, but McKelway’s own memorandum about the case grudgingly focused on how he had been forced to withdraw his support.¹³⁸ He was annoyed.

This conflict suggests two points. First, groups were still working out their standards for state child labor legislation. The MDCLC was concerned with what minimum age was set *and* how the community was to enforce this regulation. Second, groups were still working out their relationship within the community. The campaigning of an isolated individual was at odds with the Maryland committee’s agenda. As a concerned citizen, he could have become a supporter of the MDCLC, but outside the group’s ranks, his actions led to conflict. Within the NMS campaigns, state committees were building networks within the child labor reform community and laying out expectations for the roles they might play and the interactions they might have. All these efforts were deployed on behalf of the “best interest of the child.”

THE CODIFICATION OF CHILDREN’S RIGHTS

States renegotiated children's rights as they debated NMS legislation. Reformers demanded public intervention on behalf of the child; they called for states to recognize adolescents' rights to moral protection. They made these claims by petitioning state governments to prohibit children under the age of twenty-one from working in the messenger service during the night in urban centers. The Murray bill was their ideal. Alexander McKelway stressed, "we hope that we soon shall have a twenty-one year age limit for the night messenger service in every state of the Union, as we now have in New York."¹³⁹ In contrast, opponents of NMS legislation centered their objections on the historically-rooted family ideal or a dismissal of modern conceptions of adolescence. In the end, each state marked off its own definition of children's rights as it enacted NMS legislation with specific age limits, temporal and spatial restrictions, and mechanisms for administration. These differences show the fluidity of rights, but this debate also exemplifies how children's rights came to be constructed according to the markers of age, time, and place.

The Opposition's Conception of Children's Rights

Reformers made light of the opposition to their efforts, but opponents invoked familiar rights-based arguments as they mounted their case against proposed NMS regulations. In some states, there was very little resistance to the new NMS laws. Campaigners in New York touted: "Practically no opposition to this restriction was incurred."¹⁴⁰ Telegraph companies in New York wanted to set the age limit at eighteen rather than twenty-one, but they did not mount a public campaign against the measure.¹⁴¹ Western Union and American District Telegraph, though, publicly and vehemently opposed the bills in several states, including Ohio, Kentucky, Georgia, Massachusetts,

and Oregon.¹⁴² In their arguments, opponents extended two economically-rooted perspectives on messenger's rights.

In the first perspective, opponents of the NMS declared that a child's rights were set by the family economic unit. These arguments recalled how children's rights were conceived in relation to the family ideal, which stressed that a child and his family should be provided for through private means without governmental intervention. For example, a representative of a messenger company in Kentucky claimed that messengers were not working in the NMS for "pastime." Rather, they did it "because they or their people need the money."¹⁴³ Officials in the U.S. House of Representatives used this same line of argument to oppose a child labor law for the District of Columbia in 1906. Invoking a traditional view of family responsibilities and privileges, Rep. Weldon Heyburn (R-ID) cautioned, "we should be very careful not to take away from the parent the right to those services at the hands of the child that are natural and proper because the child is a part of the household." As Locke before him, Rep. Heyburn offered a contractual understanding of a child's rights. The child was "sustained and clothed and fed and housed by the parents," and those parents had a "right" to that child's labor.¹⁴⁴ In the same debate, Rep. Henry Cabot Lodge (R-MA) articulated the traditional family ideal more explicitly, stating: "I do not myself believe that we have the right to invade the family and interfere with the power of the father and the mother, even in an extreme case."¹⁴⁵ These figures privileged the household as an independent economic unit, and household authorities were then to determine when and where a child should or could work. For them, the parent (whether father or mother) determined what was right for their own child.¹⁴⁶

From another angle, legislators and messenger companies countered the NMS bills by rejecting modern constructions of childhood and adolescence. They referred to messengers as boys, yet they denied that this state required any special protections. They focused on the right of the individual to work. Speaking at the Georgia hearing, Western Union's representative, Col. Albert Howell, Jr., charged that it was a wrong to "take away from these boys the right to deliver messages."¹⁴⁷ The editor of the *Telegraph and Telephone Age* made a similar claim, asserting, "it would be a great injustice to American youths to deprive them of the opportunity of earning their living as messengers between the ages of 16 and 21."¹⁴⁸ Both of these accounts defined the rights of children in relation to their freedom from governmental interference.

Opponents of regulation rooted their arguments in rights, but they defined rights in terms of economic independence, whether of the household or of the individual. This approach reflected traditional and new economic hierarchies in society. Industrialization broke down household and craft structures. Apprenticeships had become antiquated and disputed. In 1911, Ohio's Children's Code even eliminated the right of a child's guardian to contract with a journeyman to set their child up in an apprenticeship.¹⁴⁹ Wage labor became the norm. While children might be expected to turn their pay envelopes over to their parents, child laborers frequently used their money as they saw fit (as was brought out in the NMS investigations). In this wage system, these young men had a degree of financial freedom, and opponents of the NMS reforms pressed that their right to economic independence should be privileged over any perceived needs for protection. They charged that adolescents did not need special protections; these adolescent

messengers should be guaranteed the right to pursue economic opportunity that seemingly set them up for a financially-independent life in adulthood.

The Campaigns' Realignment of Children's Rights

While opponents asserted families' rights and adolescents' economic independence, child labor committee's and their partners proposed a seismic shift in the relationship between child laborers and the state. They established adolescence as a conditional state and demanded that the state assume responsibility for an adolescent's moral development. From their perspective, states needed to intervene to protect adolescents from moral dangers. The NMS legislation sought to protect children by extending child labor regulations to older children, prohibiting these youths from working in morally precarious times and places, and assigning responsibility for the violation of these new regulations.

To begin, the proposed NMS legislation carried forward the decades-long effort of reformers to renegotiate children's rights by extending the legal period of childhood. State governments had been passing child labor laws and hence asserting the authority to monitor and control a child's labor for over half a century. In 1848, Pennsylvania passed the first restriction prohibiting children under the age of twelve from working in certain industries.¹⁵⁰ By the start of the NMS campaign, almost every state had passed minimum age legislation. They had legally marked off a period of childhood that was protected by the government. These state laws overrode the claims that a father and mother had to their child's labor. In this reconstruction, children under twelve generally had a legal right to claim the state's protection from premature labor. The NCLC and its partners continually worked to raise this minimum age and to expand these provisions to more

industries. By 1911, most committees favored legislation that recognized that by fourteen a youth was capable enough to work in most industries.¹⁵¹ Fourteen persisted as the upper boundary of childhood in many occupations. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 established fourteen as a minimum standard, and in many states, this boundary remains.¹⁵²

The ideal NMS legislation extended the rights of childhood up to the age of twenty-one. This proposal marked a significant extension of childhood. The uniform child labor law stipulated a general prohibition of child labor under the age of fourteen, *but* it prescribed as the standard that “no minor under twenty-one [may work] in saloons, bar-rooms, or in the night messenger service.”¹⁵³ By proposing a minimum of twenty-one, reformers claimed that the state had the right and responsibility to regulate a twenty-year-old’s labor.¹⁵⁴ Several states passed this ideal. Others still extended childhood even if they struck a compromise at a sixteen- or eighteen-year minimum. Many states incrementally redefined the rights of childhood, gradually raising the minimum age at which boys could work in the messenger service. This progression occurred in Maryland. A sixteen-year minimum was established in 1910, but in 1912, a stronger law was passed that raised the minimum to eighteen.¹⁵⁵

The NMS legislation also discussed and made important distinctions about the rights of adolescents by the terms they used to legally identify messengers. In the public campaign, messengers were regularly referred to as boys or youths. In the NMS legislation, a sixteen-, eighteen-, or twenty-one-year-old was variously labeled as a boy, minor, person, or man. Participants considered these language choices. A draft of a form letter to be sent jointly by the secretary and chairman of the NYCLC crossed out “young”

as a modifier of “boys” when asking for help in enacting the bill.¹⁵⁶ In the end, state legislators settled on different terms. The legislation that passed in New York referred to a “person” under twenty-one.¹⁵⁷ In Ohio, though, the original bill proposed that no “boy under the age of twenty-one” should be permitted to work in the NMS.¹⁵⁸ When Pennsylvania finally regulated the NMS in 1915, it stipulated that “no minor” should work as a night messenger, explicitly stating that the “term ‘minor’” “shall mean any person under twenty-one years of age.”¹⁵⁹ By describing messengers as boys or minors, the state identified them as incomplete or at an impermanent status. The logic of these assumptions is that a boy becomes a man, and a minor comes into his majority. As Claudia Castañeda notes, such notions offer “a conceptualization of the child as a potentiality rather than an actuality, a becoming rather than a being.”¹⁶⁰ States, however, extended their authority over the lives of workers by boldly describing a messenger as a person or a man.

The NMS laws constructed adolescence as a conditional state. A sixteen-year-old was to be treated as an adult in one setting, but to be protected in another setting. The Maryland law captures how these dynamics were laid out. Their law prohibited “persons” under fourteen from working in the day messenger service, but it prohibited “boys” under sixteen from working in the night messenger service.¹⁶¹ Therefore, a fourteen-year-old was legally defined as a *person* with the right to contract out his labor while a fifteen-year-old was still a *boy* whose labor was regulated by the state government under certain conditions. In passing NMS legislation, the state of Maryland extended the period in which it had authority over moral development. It codified that an individual’s moral childhood extended beyond his economic childhood. In this way, the NMS legislation

separated out dependence from protection. A fourteen-year-old had a right to economic independence but was still subject to stricter moral supervision by the government. With such moves, states significantly extended their authority in the lives of workers based on a reconceptualization of adolescence.

In these definitions, the time of day became one marker that separated adolescence from adulthood. The New York law restricted labor between 10 p.m. and 5 a.m.,¹⁶² and Indiana prohibited children under sixteen from working after 6 p.m. or before 7 a.m.¹⁶³ Other states set in place arguably random variations of these limits. The exact times that messengers' work was restricted are less telling than how these restrictions conceived of the night. Bryan Palmer claims that nights were seen as the "underworld of crime commingling with poverty, bestial passions, and sensual gratifications."¹⁶⁴ These states legally established the night as the antithesis of childhood, and they claimed the right to monitor when adolescents worked.

Some of the NMS laws also codified the state's right to limit the spaces that adolescent laborers could occupy. Whereas previous legislation made it illegal for children to work in places like mines or glass houses, these laws forbade children from working in certain communities. The Murray Messenger Boy law prohibited night work in "cities of the first or second class."¹⁶⁵ The 1911 New Jersey law made different allowances for labor in "cities of the first class" versus "other municipalities."¹⁶⁶ A general child labor law passed in Wisconsin in 1911 provided a more expansive reach: "In cities of the first, second or third class no person under the age of twenty-one years shall be employed or permitted to work as a messenger."¹⁶⁷ These stipulations factored the size of a city into the relationship between a citizen and the state; they acknowledged

the current view that urban environments constituted a threat to the population. By these laws, states significantly extended their right to regulate where and when adolescents worked.

State legislators inferred moral judgments in their regulation of messengers' ages, hours, and spaces, yet weaker NMS laws often explicitly noted the moral considerations that prompted legislation. A Virginia act forbade "the sending of children, boys or girls, under seventeen years of age, to disreputable resorts."¹⁶⁸ McKelway optimistically noted, "It at least indicated that the state was looking at the moral side of the employment of children."¹⁶⁹ These laws justified an expansion of the state's powers in the lives of young workers on the basis that it shielded them from disreputable influences.

Leaders in the child labor committees reasoned that the NMS problem demanded state intervention beyond the minimum protections that had already been set. They claimed that it was the state's legal right, and it was how these children ought to be treated. Many leaders set these extensions within grounded legal conceptions of rights. Rep. Hooper Alexander concluded the Georgia hearing on the NMS bill by noting, "Mr. McKelway is absolutely right in principle when he says the boys of this country are the wards of the State; he is sound in law; it is the declaration upon which the chancery jurisdiction is founded, that the boys and the minors are the wards of the state, and the country that does not take care of its young will suffer for it."¹⁷⁰ His remarks invoked the legal relationship between the child and the state. He framed the legislation as Georgia's obligation, and as many before him, he warned his audience of the consequences of neglecting this responsibility. By such claims, campaigners laid out children's legal rights in relationship to the state and hinted at the dangers of ignoring these rights.

Some of the NMS reformers' remarks set out the state's responsibilities like a formal treatise on government. Owen Lovejoy spoke pointedly. He asserted that the government must intervene on behalf of its legal wards, "those under twenty-one years of age."¹⁷¹ At a later date, reflecting on the legislative progress of the NCLC, he claimed, "The state is the natural guardian and protector of all minor children."¹⁷² This claim contradicted the nation's tradition of familial and household autonomy. For Lovejoy and his colleagues, the father was not the child's government. Rather the father's rights were subordinated to the government's. Nature gave the government, not the mother, the right to protect its wards. In such statements, these campaigners significantly pressed the recent shifts in views of children. They argued that the government naturally served as the protector of *all* children, not just dependent or indigent children, and the government's role extended well into a child's life.

The NMS laws expanded the reach of government in a child's life and marked off the boundaries of this relationship, and these laws also fleshed out how the relationships between children and the state were to be managed. To begin, states named who was responsible for enforcing the NMS law. These provisions hinged on local institutions and bureaucratic arrangements within the states. At times, as in Massachusetts, the "district police" were commissioned to enforce the NMS law.¹⁷³ A general child labor law in New Hampshire that regulated the NMS relegated this responsibility to the "truant officer of each school district" and "three state inspectors," who were to be appointed by the superintendent of public instruction.¹⁷⁴ In New Jersey, this responsibility fell to "the Commissioner of Labor and his authorized deputies."¹⁷⁵ In Oregon, a "Board of Inspectors of Child Labor," who served in a voluntary capacity except for the secretary,

were tasked with enforcing the child labor laws.¹⁷⁶ These stipulations guided the state's relationships. Was the NMS a matter to be dealt with by law enforcement? Was it proper for the NMS to be monitored by an education- or labor-specific inspector? Should these responsibilities be undertaken by public officials or volunteers? Through the NMS legislation, states claimed children's extended rights (or the state's expanded rights over children) and arranged how the privileges and duties of this relationship were to be administered and/or monitored.

Most if not all of the NMS legislation also identified who could be held liable for violations of these new laws. The campaigners spoke of children's rights, but the states outlined legal responsibilities. Messengers were not held responsible. In regulating this form of child labor, legislators deemed the boys incapable of evaluating the situation and making an independent choice as to whether or not to work in the industry. Instead, many states held employers liable when they were found to have underage workers. The Maryland law stated that any "company or representative thereof" who violated the law would be "subject to a fine of not less than one hundred dollars nor more than five hundred dollars, or sixty days in jail or both, at the discretion of the court, for each and every offense."¹⁷⁷ The Ohio law held that whoever had "charge or management" of a messenger office was to be liable, but their penalty was milder. The guilty parties, the law stipulated, "shall be fined not less than twenty-five dollars nor more than fifty dollars."¹⁷⁸ In New Jersey, corporations and firms were also liable.¹⁷⁹

Parents and guardians were also legally responsible when their adolescents violated the NMS regulations in multiple states, including New Hampshire, Wisconsin, and Oregon.¹⁸⁰ These provisions overturned historical arrangements of rights within the

community. In the colonial era, economically-independent fathers had practically complete authority over their children. They had to provide for their children, but they also had a right to their children's labor. In the mid-1800s, states came to recognize a mother's role and authority over her child, and child welfare reformers in the Progressive Era justified state interventions into family life on maternalistic appeals. By holding parents culpable if their sons worked while underage in the night messenger service, the NMS legislation redistributed rights. These laws extended the state's right to regulate a child's labor on the basis of a broadened understanding of the adolescents' needs for protection from immoral influences.

THE RHETORIC OF RIGHTS IN THE NIGHT MESSENGER SERVICE CAMPAIGN

Child welfare reform in the Progressive Era was dominated by women, who used maternalistic arguments to justify their engagement in public and the state's intervention in family life. Yet, this reasoning did not carry into the state NMS campaigns. If maternalism wasn't used to justify this expansion of government in the life of the child, what arguments were used? After examining the legislative discourse in multiple states, this chapter shows that the state NMS campaigns became a contest over rights, and this chapter addresses how these conversations about rights were conducted and how rights came to be defined and apportioned in these debates.

This analysis offers several implications about rights discourse. First, this analysis demonstrates how the group identity of child labor reformers came to dominate argument. As newly formed organizations in the early 1900s, child labor committees were claiming their membership and defining their role within the community. They did so with arguments based on credibility and alignments of public/private responsibilities.

As these groups became more organized, the responsibilities of their individual supporters diminished, and in the NMS campaigns the efforts of these supporters were funneled through the organization's structure and reform strategy. Rhetorical scholars have debated whether a liberal democratic public is a myth or still plays some role in policy-making.¹⁸¹ The newly-formed child labor interest groups in the Progressive Era wielded their public support in order to shoehorn the NMS legislation past resistance and procedural obstacles. Child labor committees were learning how to negotiate their interactions with the state and how to benefit from these constructions of their credibility and public support.

Second, this analysis establishes how state governments more fully claimed a paternalistic role in the NMS legislation. Having already assumed responsibility over a child's care and education, states expanded their right over a child's labor. The NMS laws represented a seismic shift in the relationship between children and the state, for these laws extended the bounds of childhood up to twenty-one in some cases and marked it off by time and place. They justified these expansions on moral grounds. Under the new laws, a child had the right to economic independence at fourteen even as the state protected him from labor that it perceived to be morally degenerating further into adolescence. The NMS reform debate resulted in the state usurping the father's common law rights over the child.

Third, this analysis signals shifts in conceptions of children's rights in relation to states' rights. The NMS campaign was pursued in state legislatures; the National Child Labor Committee worked to implement uniform state legislation on this issue. As the flurry of NMS campaigns in the states subsided, the national organization recommitted

itself to seeking a federal child labor law. The organizational networks, legislative strategies, and technical expertise developed within the NMS campaigns fed into this renewed effort to give the federal government rights over the child.¹⁸² Competing conceptions of rights that circulated in the NMS legislative debates reappeared in federal discussions about child labor. And although the first federal child labor legislation, the Keating-Owens Act, passed in 1916 and gave the federal government the right to regulate child labor, the law was struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court two years later. Taking a traditional stance, the court privileged the father's common law right to his child's labor. The NMS campaigns successfully expanded the rights of state governments over children, but in the debate between state and federal powers, "children's rights" remained contested.

End Notes: Chapter Four

¹ ARGUMENTS. Before the Committee on Labor and Labor Statistics of the Georgia House of Representatives, on the "Night Messenger Bill," in the Hall of the House of Representatives, State Capitol, Atlanta, Georgia, 5 o'clock P.M., Wednesday, July 27, 1910, box 59, National Child Labor Committee Archives, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. This manuscript collection will be identified in all future references as NCLC MSS.

² In 1902, Mary Harris "Mother" Jones unorthodoxly marched child laborers across the country to draw attention to the need for better protections of childhood. Mari Boor Tonn, "Radical Labor in a Feminine Voice: The Rhetoric of Mary Harris 'Mother' Jones and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn," in *The Rhetoric of Nineteenth-Century Reform*, ed. Martha S. Watson and Thomas R. Burkholder, vol. 5 (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2008), 233–34.

Messenger boys themselves offered another approach to social change. They regularly launched their own campaigns to alter working conditions. They mimicked the strategies of the broader labor movement and went out on countless strikes in the first decade of the 1900s to demand fairer treatment and higher wages. They went out on strike so often that one newspaper headline resignedly noted how the messenger boys caught the "strike fever." "Messenger Boys Catch Strike Fever," *The Washington Post*, August 1, 1899.

³ Annelise Orleck, *Common Sense and a Little Fire: Women and Working-Class Politics in the United States, 1900-1965* (University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

⁴ Eric Anderson, "Prostitution and Social Justice: Chicago, 1910-15," *Social Service Review* 48, no. 2 (1974): 208–9.

Close contemporaries of the NMS campaigners in the National Women's Party took up their posts as "silent sentinels" to advocate for the recognition of women's rights. Belinda A. Stillion Southard, "Militancy, Power, and Identity: The Silent Sentinels as Women Fighting for Political Voice," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10, no. 3 (Fall 2007): 399–417.

⁵ Minow, "Interpreting Rights," 1876.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 1866.

⁷ "Bill of Rights" (1791),

<http://ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&doc=13&page=transcript>; Pickus, *True Faith and Allegiance*, 24.

⁸ Minow, "Interpreting Rights," 1867.

⁹ Sojourner Truth, "Speech to the Anniversary Convention of the American Equal Rights Association," in *American Rhetorical Discourse*, ed. Ronald F. Reid and James F. Klumpp, 3rd ed. (Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 2005), 635.

¹⁰ Lyndon B. Johnson in his Special Message to Congress on March 15, 1965, privileged voting rights, noting "The most basic right of all was the right to choose your own leaders...Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote. There is no reason which can excuse the denial of that right." Garth E. Pauley, *LBJ's American Promise: The 1965 Voting Rights Address* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), 3.

¹¹ Felton Earls, "Introduction: Children: From Rights to Citizenship," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 633 (January 2011): 8.

¹² Karen Attiah, “Why Won’t the U.S. Ratify the U.N.’s Child Rights Treaty?,” *The Washington Post*, November 21, 2014, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-partisan/wp/2014/11/21/why-wont-the-u-s-ratify-the-u-n-s-child-rights-treaty/>.

¹³ Karen Wells, “Child Saving or Child Rights: Depictions of Children in International NGO Campaigns on Conflict,” *Journal of Children and Media* 2, no. 3 (2008): 248, doi:10.1080/17482790802327475.

¹⁴ Minow, “Interpreting Rights,” 1877. Also see Allison James, “To Be (Come) or Not to Be (Come): Understanding Children’s Citizenship,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 633 (January 2011): 171.

¹⁵ Minow, “Interpreting Rights,” 1868.

¹⁶ James, “To Be (Come) or Not to Be (Come),” 169.

¹⁷ John Locke, *Locke: Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett, Student Edition (Cambridge University Press, 1988), 312.

¹⁸ As Smith lays out, Locke did not believe that anyone had birthright citizenship. Men were born free and then had to choose to become members of a specific civil society after they came of age. *Ibid.*, 347; Smith, *Civic Ideals*, 79.

¹⁹ Locke, *Locke*, 312. Girls were also under the authority of their fathers and could be apprenticed out, but most states did not require fathers or masters to educate girls.

²⁰ David S. Tanenhaus, “Between Dependency and Liberty: The Conundrum of Children’s Rights in the Gilded Age,” *Law and History Review* 23, no. 2 (2005): 363.

²¹ Slave children did not even have a right to these provisions. They were not guaranteed an education or vocational training. Mary Ann Mason, *From Father’s*

Property to Children's Rights: The History of Child Custody in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 5.

²² Tanenhaus, "Between Dependency and Liberty," 352.

²³ Michael Grossberg, "Changing Conceptions of Child Welfare in the United States, 1820-1935," in *A Century of Juvenile Justice*, ed. Margaret K. Rosenheim et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 6–10; Mason, *From Father's Property to Children's Rights*, 38–76; Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest?*, 90.

²⁴ Elizabeth Hafkin Pleck, *Domestic Tyranny: The Making of American Social Policy against Family Violence from Colonial Times to the Present* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987), 7–8; Grossberg, "Changing Conceptions of Child Welfare," 9.

²⁵ Mason, *From Father's Property to Children's Rights*, 2.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 1–46; Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest?*, 142; Ladd-Taylor, *Mother-Work*, 141.

²⁷ Grossberg, "Changing Conceptions of Child Welfare," 7; Ladd-Taylor, *Mother-Work*, 141; Smith, *Civic Ideals*, 234.

²⁸ Mason, *From Father's Property to Children's Rights*, 60–61; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 162; Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest?*, 143.

²⁹ Mason, *From Father's Property to Children's Rights*, 60; Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest?*, 19.

³⁰ Grossberg, "Changing Conceptions of Child Welfare," 8; Mason, *From Father's Property to Children's Rights*, 50; Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 162.

³¹ Abbott, *The Child and the State*, 1:67.

³² Relatedly, the judicial concept of *parens patriae* grew more prevalent. Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 162; Elizabeth S. Scott, "The Legal Construction of Childhood," in *A*

Century of Juvenile Justice, ed. Margaret K. Rosenheim et al. (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 116.

³³ Tanenhaus, “Between Dependency and Liberty,” 354–68.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 352.

³⁵ Grossberg, “Changing Conceptions of Child Welfare,” 37.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 13–29; Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest?*, 145.

³⁷ Tanenhaus, “Between Dependency and Liberty,” 370–71.

³⁸ Grossberg, “Changing Conceptions of Child Welfare,” 15–26; Mason, *From Father’s Property to Children’s Rights*, 78.

³⁹ Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest?*, 40.

⁴⁰ Grossberg, “Changing Conceptions of Child Welfare,” 25.

⁴¹ Mason, *From Father’s Property to Children’s Rights*, 87.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 101–18.

⁴³ Seth Koven and Sonya Michel, “Womanly Duties: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of Welfare States in France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, 1880-1920,” *The American Historical Review* 95, no. 4 (1990): 1079.

⁴⁴ Ladd-Taylor, *Mother-Work*.

⁴⁵ Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion*. Also see Kathryn Kish Sklar, “Two Political Cultures in the Progressive Era: The National Consumers’ League and the American Association for Labor Legislation,” in *U.S. History as Women’s History: New Feminist Essays*, ed. Linda K. Kerber, Alice Kessler-Harris, and Kathryn Kish Sklar (Chapel Hill: Univ of North Carolina Press, 1995), 62; Anne Firor Scott, *Natural Allies: Women’s Associations in American History* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 176.

Women's participation and these maternalist arguments became central to the formation of what has been called America's "distinctively 'maternalist' welfare state." Elisabeth S. Clemens, "Organizational Repertoires and Institutional Change: Women's Groups and the Transformation of American Politics, 1890-1920," in *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*, ed. Theda Skocpol and Morris P. Fiorina (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1999), 87; Elizabeth J. Clapp, "Welfare and the Role of Women: The Juvenile Court Movement," *Journal of American Studies* 28, no. 3 (1994): 367.

⁴⁶ Grossberg, "Changing Conceptions of Child Welfare," 33; Theda Skocpol et al., "Women's Associations and the Enactment of Mothers' Pensions in the United States," *The American Political Science Review* 87, no. 3 (1993): 686, doi:10.2307/2938744.

⁴⁷ Jessica Toft and Laura S. Abrams, "Progressive Maternalists and the Citizenship Status of Low-Income Single Mothers," *Social Service Review* 78, no. 3 (2004): 447, doi:10.1086/421921; Ladd-Taylor, *Mother-Work*; Elisabeth S. Clemens, *The People's Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890-1925* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 66.

⁴⁸ Hannah Kent Schoff, "A Campaign for Childhood," in *Children's Courts in the United States: Their Origin, Development, and Results*, ed. Samuel J. Barrows (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904), 136. Also see Platt, *The Child Savers*, 75; Clapp, "Welfare and the Role of Women," 370–82.

⁴⁹ These appeals to maternalism were also prominent in the formation of the U.S. Children's Bureau, which became the federal government's first foray into child welfare policy. Formed in 1912, the Children's Bureau helped to set up child welfare policy as

the forte of women. Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion*, 48; Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest?*, 237.

⁵⁰ Women's participation in reform was praised. A child labor reformer specifically thanked "the good women of Richmond" for preventing the repeal of a law limiting the hours of work for women and children to ten hours per day. Toft and Abrams, "Progressive Maternalists and the Citizenship Status of Low-Income Single Mothers," 450; Clapp, "Welfare and the Role of Women," 367; Ladd-Taylor, *Mother-Work*; Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion*, 36.

⁵¹ Women were not absent from this campaign, but their participation and trademark appeals to maternalism were less prominent. Women's organizations addressed the NMS issue at their meetings and national conferences. Some women were prominently involved. Francis Ingram, a settlement house worker and active member of the Kentucky Child Labor Association, had access to the confidential investigative reports of the NMS. Florence Kelley wrote about her participation in this campaign. Alice Higgins testified on behalf of night messenger service legislation in Massachusetts. See Reed and Worthington, "The Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs at Mammoth Cave."

⁵² Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion*; Austin, "The Flexner Myth and the History of Social Work"; Leiby, *A History of Social Welfare*; Gregory Clark and S. Michael Halloran, "Introduction: Transformations of Public Discourse in Nineteenth-Century America," in *Oratorical Culture in Nineteenth-Century America: Transformations in the Theory and Practice of Rhetoric*, ed. Gregory Clark and S. Michael Halloran (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993), 1–26; John H. Ehrenreich, *The*

Altruistic Imagination: A History of Social Work and Social Policy in the United States (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985); Recchiuti, *Civic Engagement*.

⁵³ For instance, the California State Federation of Labor finally approved a permanent headquarters for their labor lobby in 1910. Clemens, *The People's Lobby*, 123.

⁵⁴ J. Michael Hogan, *The Nuclear Freeze Campaign: Rhetoric and Foreign Policy in the Telepolitical Age* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1994), 120.

⁵⁵ Clemens, *The People's Lobby*, 85.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁵⁷ James Andrew Everitt, *The Third Power: Farmers to the Front*, 4th ed. (Indianapolis, IN: J. A. Everitt, Publisher, 1907), 83.

⁵⁸ Harriet Taylor Upton, ed., *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Convention of the National-American Woman Suffrage Association, Held in Washington, D.C., February 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, 1894* (Warren, OH: Chronicle Print, 1894), 102; Clemens, *The People's Lobby*, 88.

⁵⁹ Clemens, *The People's Lobby*, 3–83.

⁶⁰ It is difficult to tell how much his analysis was affected by his middle-class prejudices and the fact that the leader of the National Consumers' League was likely sitting in his audience. Lovejoy, "Seven Years of Child Labor Reform," 31.

⁶¹ This burst of organizing and growth in membership was mirrored in the membership of other voluntary associations like the Farmers' Alliance and the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Clemens, *The People's Lobby*, 37.

⁶² Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 54; Felt, *Hostages of Fortune*, 38.

⁶³ Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 58; “Chap. 1180. An Act to Incorporate the National Child Labor Committee,” in *The Statutes at Large of the United States of America from December, 1905, to March, 1907*, vol. 34 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1907), 914–15.

In 1906, the Secretary of the NCLC could boast in his annual report that three state committees (Maine, Kentucky, and Nebraska) and four local committees had been formed in the preceding year and six additional state committees were being formed (Louisiana, Virginia, California, West Virginia, South Carolina, and Mississippi). Minute Book, National Child Labor Committee, October 24, 1906 to April 29, 1908, box 6, NCLC MSS.

⁶⁴ Lovejoy, “Seven Years of Child Labor Reform,” 32.

⁶⁵ Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion*, 41.

⁶⁶ Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 54.

⁶⁷ The settlement circle elites included Florence Kelley, Lillian Wald, Mary K. Simkhovitch, Pauline Goldmark, and Wiles Robert Hunter. Felt, *Hostages of Fortune*, 44–45.

⁶⁸ Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 57.

⁶⁹ The NCLC’s early members were distinguished and included settlement house residents, social workers, professors, businessmen, bankers, and ministers. Walter I. Trattner, “The First Federal Child Labor Law (1916),” *Social Science Quarterly* 50, no. 3 (1969): 511.

⁷⁰ Minute Book of the National Child Labor Committee First to the Tenth Meeting, April 1904–April 1916, box 6, NCLC MSS; Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 60–65.

⁷¹ Letter to Contributors, June 1910, Legislative Form Letters Book 2, box 28, NYCLC MSS.

⁷² Schiappa, "Defining Marriage in California"; Edward Schiappa, "The Rhetoric of Nukespeak," *Communication Monographs* 56, no. 3 (1989): 253–72; Asen et al., "The Research Says."

⁷³ Minute Book National Child Labor Committee First to the Tenth Meeting April 1904-April 1906, box 6, NCLC MSS.

⁷⁴ Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 61.

⁷⁵ In 1908, Florence Kelley mourned the inadequacy of existing data about children and labor. Kelley, "The Responsibility of the Consumer," 111.

⁷⁶ Fred S. Hall, "Child Labor Statistics," in *Child Employing Industries: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference, Boston, Massachusetts, January 13-16, 1910* (New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1910), 114.

⁷⁷ *Proceedings of the Conference on the Care of Dependent Children*, 178.

⁷⁸ Stephen B. Wood, *Constitutional Politics in the Progressive Era: Child Labor and the Law* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968).

⁷⁹ Minute Book of the National Child Labor Committee, First to Tenth Meeting, April 1904-April 1906, box 6, NCLC MSS.

⁸⁰ Minute Book of the National Child Labor Committee, First to Tenth Meeting, April 1904-April 1906, box 6, NCLC MSS.

⁸¹ "Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the National Child Labor Committee," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 25, no. 3 (1905).

⁸² Senator Beveridge, speaking on H.R. 17838, on January 29, 1907, 59th Cong., 2nd sess., *Congressional Record* 1867-1883, pt. 4.

⁸³ Wood, *Constitutional Politics in the Progressive Era*, 38.

⁸⁴ Michael Les Benedict, "Constitutional Politics in the Gilded Age," *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 9, no. 1 (2010): 7–35.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*; Wood, *Constitutional Politics in the Progressive Era*, 14.

⁸⁶ William Graebner, "Federalism in the Progressive Era: A Structural Interpretation of Reform," *The Journal of American History* 64, no. 2 (1977): 347, doi:10.2307/1901828; Crunden, *Ministers of Reform*.

⁸⁷ Henry Wade Rogers, "The Constitution and the New Federalism," *The North American Review* 188, no. 634 (September 1908): 327.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 322–23.

⁸⁹ Minute Book, National Child Labor Committee, October 24, 1906 to April 29, 1908, box 6, NCLC MSS.

⁹⁰ Trattner, "The First Federal Child Labor Law (1916)," 512.

⁹¹ Graebner, "Federalism in the Progressive Era," 332–33.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 345.

⁹³ As early as 1905, the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor authorized their board to organize a conference of state federations so that uniform labor legislation might be considered. Clemens, *The People's Lobby*, 140.

⁹⁴ Elihu Root, *How to Preserve the Local Self-Government of the States: A Brief Study of National Tendencies* (New York: Brentano's, 1907), 3,

<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/njp.32101073360958>.; Graebner, “Federalism in the Progressive Era,” 347.

⁹⁵ Root, *How to Preserve the Local Self-Government of the States*, 10–11.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Graebner, “Federalism in the Progressive Era,” 349.

⁹⁸ Florence Kelley, “What Should We Sacrifice to Uniformity?,” in *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference* (New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911), 29; Charles L. Chute, “The Glass Industry and Child Labor Legislation,” in *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference* (New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911), 126; Clemens, *The People’s Lobby*, 72.

⁹⁹ Well-known organizations pursued this strategy, including the American Association for Labor Legislation and the National Civic Federation. Jane Addams lobbied for uniform compulsory education laws in 1905. The National American Woman Suffrage Association continued to support a state-by-state approach to woman’s suffrage in the early 1910s. Graebner, “Federalism in the Progressive Era,” 349–50.

¹⁰⁰ Mark H. Leff, “Consensus for Reform: The Mothers’-Pension Movement in the Progressive Era,” *Social Service Review* 47, no. 3 (1973): 397; Ladd-Taylor, *Mother-Work*; Linda Gordon, “Putting Children First: Women, Maternalism, and Welfare in the Early Twentieth Century,” in *U. S. History as Women’s History: New Feminist Essays*, ed. Linda K. Kerber, Alice Kessler-Harris, and Kathryn Kish Sklar (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 63–86; Susan Sterett, “Serving the State: Constitutionalism and Social Spending, 1860s-1920s,” *Law & Social Inquiry* 22, no. 2

(1997): 311–56; Toft and Abrams, “Progressive Maternalists and the Citizenship Status of Low-Income Single Mothers.”

¹⁰¹ Adler, “Child Labor a Menace to Civilization.”

¹⁰² Several governors appointed a Conference of Commissioners to meet, consider, and recommend to the state legislatures measures to “bring about uniformity of laws on certain subjects.” A. T. Stovall, “Standards Proposed by United States Commission on Uniform Laws,” in *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama* (New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911), 17.

¹⁰³ Graebner, “Federalism in the Progressive Era,” 344.

¹⁰⁴ One singular virtue of each of these campaigns from 1910 is that I have been able to find records about them. Yet, that is not their lone virtue.

¹⁰⁵ Clemens, *The People’s Lobby*, 18–19.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 42.

¹⁰⁷ Minutes of the New York Child Labor Committee Meetings from June 1908 to October 26, 1910, box 11, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁰⁸ Letter from George A. Hall to Everett W. Lord, March 14, 1910, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁰⁹ Press Clippings, box 28, book 1, NYCLC MSS.

¹¹⁰ Press Bulletin Service, March 1910, box 28, book 1, NYCLC MSS.

¹¹¹ Letter from George A. Hall to Dr. Abraham Jacobi, April 8, 1910, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹¹² “Night Messenger Service. Its Dangers Pointed Out by Child Labor Committee,” *Evening Post*, October 5, 1910, box 28, book 1, NYCLC MSS.

¹¹³ “Night Messenger Service. Its Dangers Pointed Out by Child Labor Committee,” *Evening Post*, October 5, 1910, box 28, book 1, NYCLC MSS.

¹¹⁴ “Gross Evils Beset Work of These Boys,” *Po’keepsie News*, April 6, 1910, box 28, book 1, NYCLC MSS.

¹¹⁵ “Gross Evils Beset Work of These Boys,” *Po’keepsie News*, April 6, 1910, box 28, book 1, NYCLC MSS.

¹¹⁶ “Gross Evils Beset Work of These Boys,” *Po’keepsie News*, April 6, 1910, box 28, book 1, NYCLC MSS; “Favor Child Labor Bill,” *New York Tribune*, April 6, 1910.

¹¹⁷ State Senator George A. Davis telegraphed George Hall to let him know that he could be heard on the Murray bill the following Wednesday. Telegram from Geo. A. Davis to Geo. A. Hall, April 21, 1910, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS. Murray responded to the request, noting, “Your favor of the 20th received. I shall be highly pleased to appear before the Senate Judiciary Committee next Wednesday and help the messenger boy bill through. Senator Davis is a warm personal friend of mine and doubtless the rest of the Committee will be friendly to the proposition.” Letter from Andrew F. Murray to George A. Hall, April 22, 1910, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹¹⁸ “Favor Child Labor Bill.”

¹¹⁹ Letter to G. A. Hall from Harvey D. Ginman, Chairman, Committee on Affairs of Cities, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹²⁰ George Hall wrote a thank you note to the Hon. Thomas F. Grady in the New York Senate for “the valuable help you rendered the case we represented by your urging the

advancement of the Murray Night Messenger Boy Bill when it came up last Friday on the General Orders Calendar.” Letter to Hon. Thomas F. Grady, Senate Chamber, Capitol, Albany, N.Y. from the NYCLC Secretary (Hall) dated May 11, 1910, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹²¹ Memorandum regarding cooperation of newspapers with Child Labor Committee, box 7, folder 7, NYCLC MSS.

¹²² Assembly Bill No. 1193, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹²³ Letter from C. F. Stowe to George A. Hall, May 25, 1910, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹²⁴ Letter from John W. Platt to G. A. Hall, April 14, 1910, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹²⁵ AN ACT To amend the labor law relative to hours of labor of minors, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹²⁶ “Pennsylvania Three-Ply Child Labor Campaign,” *The Survey*, March 18, 1911, 994.

¹²⁷ Owen R. Lovejoy, “Annual Report of the General Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee for the Sixth Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1910,” in *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference Birmingham, Alabama March 9-12, 1911* (New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911), 187.

¹²⁸ Clemens, *The People’s Lobby*.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 124–32.

¹³⁰ “Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Conference on Child Labor under the Auspices of the National Child Labor Committee. Jacksonville, Fla., March 13-17, 1913,” *The Child Labor Bulletin* 2, no. 1 (May 1913): 169.

¹³¹ The Massachusetts Child Labor Committee secured the endorsement of 60 state organizations, including women’s clubs, charity organizations, and citizens’ associations for their 1910 legislative agenda (which had a bill focused on night work). *Child Labor in Massachusetts*, 1910, 3.

¹³² *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911* (New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911), 169.

¹³³ A NMS bill in Minnesota, after moving from the House to the Senate and back to the House in 1911, never passed. Unlike Georgia, representatives of the Minnesota Child Labor Committee ran out of time. Reporting for the committee, F. E. Hoffman bemoaned, “Another fifteen minutes and Minnesota would have had the best child labor law of any state in the Union.” A. J. McKelway, “New Territory,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 38 (July 1911): 141; *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911*, 172.

¹³⁴ “Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Conference on Child Labor under the Auspices of the National Child Labor Committee. New Orleans, La., March 15-18, 1914,” *The Child Labor Bulletin* 3, no. 1 (1914): 193.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*

¹³⁶ They emphasized the organization even in how they recalled how the NMS campaign started. They cited that one of their employees, a professional from within their community, had incited the call to examine the night messenger service (not the muckraking expose of William Hard a year earlier).

¹³⁷ Presumably, this citizen was a white male, but in recounting the history of this bill, Alexander McKelway never mentioned that this citizen had any professional credentials or special expertise. Alexander J. McKelway, Memorandum for Maryland Child Labor Committee, May 3, 1910, box 3, Alexander J. McKelway Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. This manuscript collection will be referred to as McKelway Papers from here on out.

¹³⁸ Lovejoy, "Annual Report of the General Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee for the Sixth Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1910," 192.

¹³⁹ McKelway, "New Territory," 140.

¹⁴⁰ The telegraph and messenger companies expressed their belief that an eighteen-year minimum age limit was sufficient, but they did not vocally mount their opposition to the NMS bill. *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911*, 175.

¹⁴¹ Newspaper clipping, May 2, 1910, box 28, book 1, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁴² Lovejoy, "Annual Report of the General Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee for the Sixth Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1910," 187; *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911*, 179; Owen R. Lovejoy, "The Year's Progress in Child Labor Legislation," *The Survey*, July 2, 1910, 571.

¹⁴³ “The Messenger Co’s Side,” box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS. This point was mirrored in the argument voiced by Rep. Piles (R-WA), who defended, “if a young boy wishes to take care temporarily of a widowed mother or of a disabled father or provide for himself, he should have the right to do so.” “Employment of Child Labor” (U.S. Senate, 1908), 5795, [http://congressional.proquest.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/congressional/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/\\$2fa pp-bin\\$2fgis-congrecord\\$2f6\\$2fc\\$2fc\\$2f4\\$2fcr-1908-0506_from_1_to_71.pdf/entitlementkeys=1234#page=13](http://congressional.proquest.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/congressional/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/$2fa pp-bin$2fgis-congrecord$2f6$2fc$2fc$2f4$2fcr-1908-0506_from_1_to_71.pdf/entitlementkeys=1234#page=13).

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 5790.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 5796.

¹⁴⁶ Opponents of NMS laws focused on the family ideal even when they acknowledged modern theories of adolescence. In Kentucky, one opponent of NMS legislation presented the modern perspective on children’s rights, but he challenged reformers on how to best respond to the special needs of childhood. He concluded, “wherein is the ‘protection’ that withdraws from the boy the means of honest labor and leaves him exposed to idleness and the reading of cheap literature which are well known to be in themselves devil’s workshop [sic]?” He didn’t object to a boy’s right to protection, but by his reasoning, he did return to the family ideal. He claimed that the boy was best served by working for his family, not by special protections from the state of Kentucky. The family represents the best interests of the child. “The Messenger Co’s Side,” box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁴⁷ Instead, Howell offered that messenger companies had the “right” to set and enforce rules to correct any abuses they might uncover in their business. ARGUMENTS.

Before the Committee on Labor and Labor Statistics of the Georgia House of Representatives, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁴⁸ Newspaper clipping, box 28, book 1, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁴⁹ Owen R. Lovejoy, *The Federal Government and Child Labor: A Brief for the Palmer-Owen Child Labor Bill* (New York: Clarence S. Nathan, 1914), 18.

¹⁵⁰ Trattner, *Crusade for the Children*, 30.

¹⁵¹ Most of the time, children's rights are adults' judgment of the competence and capacities of children. James, "To Be (Come) or Not to Be (Come)," 172.

¹⁵² "Wage & Hour Divisions (WHD) - Employment/Age Certificate," *U.S. Department of Labor*, January 1, 2016, <https://www.dol.gov/whd/state/certification.htm#Maryland>.

¹⁵³ In the case of the NMS, Samuel McCune Lindsay said that the State should regulate labor "until the child has attained its legal majority" at twenty-one. "A Model Uniform Child Labor Law," *The Outlook*, October 21, 1911.

¹⁵⁴ In the case of the NMS, Samuel McCune Lindsay said that the State should regulate labor "until the child has attained its legal majority" at twenty-one. Lindsay, "Seventh Annual Child Labor Conference," 125.

¹⁵⁵ "Lauds Child Labor Law: Mr. McKelway Says It Puts Maryland in Front Rank," *The Sun*, April 13, 1912.

¹⁵⁶ Letter to Endorsers, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁵⁷ AN ACT To amend the labor law relative to hours of labor of minors, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁵⁸ Note, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁵⁹ An Act to Provide for the Health, Safety, and Welfare of Minors (May 13, 1915), *Laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, ch. 177 (1915), 286-89.

¹⁶⁰ Castañeda, *Figurations*, 1.

¹⁶¹ An Act to Prohibit the Employment of Telegraph, Telephone, or Messenger Companies as Messengers of Any Persons under Fourteen Years of Age (April 8, 1910), *Laws of Maryland*, ch. 587 (1910).

¹⁶² “Bill Signed by Gov. Hughes,” *New York Times*, May 22, 1910.

¹⁶³ The Ohio NMS bill restricted those under eighteen from working in the messenger service between the hours of 9 p.m. and 6 a.m. *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911*, 162.

¹⁶⁴ Palmer, *Cultures of Darkness*, 236.

¹⁶⁵ AN ACT To amend the labor law relative to hours of labor of minors, box 36, folder 22, NYCLC MSS.

¹⁶⁶ An Act Regulating the Employment of Persons as Messengers for the Distribution, Transmission or Delivery of Goods, Messages or the Performance of Other Service (1911), *Constitution of State of New Jersey, as Amended*, ch. 363 (1924).

¹⁶⁷ An Act to Amend Subsections... (June 30, 1911), *Wisconsin Session Laws*, ch. 851 (1911), 567-576.

¹⁶⁸ McKelway, “New Territory,” 140.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ ARGUMENTS. Before the Committee on Labor and Labor Statistics of the Georgia House of Representatives, box 59, NCLC MSS.

¹⁷¹ Lovejoy, “To the Editor: Night Messenger Service,” 504.

¹⁷² Lovejoy, “Seven Years of Child Labor Reform,” 33.

¹⁷³ An Act Relative to Employment in the Night Messenger Service (June 28, 1911), *Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, ch. 629 (1911), 713, <http://archives.lib.state.ma.us/actsResolves/1911/1911acts0629.pdf>.

¹⁷⁴ An Act Relating to Child Labor (1911), *Laws of the State of New Hampshire*, ch. 162 (Concord, NH: Secretary of State of the State of New Hampshire, 1911), <https://archive.org/stream/lawsstateofnew1911newh#page/176/mode/2up>.

¹⁷⁵ An Act Regulating the Employment of Persons as Messengers for the Distribution.

¹⁷⁶ An Act to Amend an Act Entitled “An Act Regulating the Employment of Child Labor,...” (February 21, 1911), *General Laws of the State of Oregon*, ch. 138 (1913).

¹⁷⁷ An Act to Prohibit the Employment of Telegraph, Telephone, or Messenger Companies.

¹⁷⁸ An Act to Supplement Section 12996 of the General Code Relating to Restricting the Employment of Boys in Messenger Service at Night (May 10, 1910), *Ohio Revised Statutes* (1910).

¹⁷⁹ An Act Regulating the Employment of Persons as Messengers for the Distribution.

¹⁸⁰ An Act Relating to Child Labor; An Act to Amend Subsections; An Act to Amend an Act Entitled “An Act Regulating the Employment of Child Labor.”

¹⁸¹ Hogan, *The Nuclear Freeze Campaign: Rhetoric and Foreign Policy in the Telepolitical Age*; Gerard A. Hauser and Carole Blair, “Rhetorical Antecedents to the Public,” *Pre Text* 3, no. 2 (1982): 139–67.

¹⁸² An Act Relating to Child Labor; An Act to Amend Subsections; An Act to Amend an Act Entitled “An Act Regulating the Employment of Child Labor.”

AFTERWORD

In 1999, the International Labor Organization adopted Convention 182, known as the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention. This convention applies to “all persons under the age of 18,” and it restricts the labor of children in “illicit activities, in particular for the production and trafficking of drugs.” The measure also restricts children in “work, which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children.”¹ Mirroring the NMS laws, this convention defines childhood as an extended period of life that should be protected from harmful influences. In 1999 as in 1910, the community determined that it was responsible for protecting the health, safety, and morals of children. This perspective was not always assumed.

During the Progressive Era, child welfare reformers helped to reshape adolescence into its modern form and shifted how the process of reform was conducted. The NMS campaigners defined this boy problem with social scientific arguments, turned the public into the *phronimos* with limited political power, and redistributed family and state’s rights over adolescent boys. With the NMS laws, state governments more fully asserted their paternalistic authority to limit and define adolescence. This project demonstrates that in this progression NMS campaigners renegotiated adolescence and professionalized reform.

RENEGOTIATING ADOLESCENCE

NMS campaigners challenged reigning conceptions of adolescence in the Progressive Era and ultimately refined what it meant to be a child of character in America in five ways. First, NMS laws extended the age range of adolescence as a period of life that should be protected. Before the NMS campaigns, fourteen-year-olds were generally

free to work whenever they wanted and for as long as they wanted. Some states prohibited child labor under the age of twelve or thirteen. State child labor laws included a number of exemptions and were notoriously hard to enforce in the early 1900s, but they established childhood as a period of life that needed to be protected. Reformers lobbied to extend these protections up to eighteen- or even twenty-year-olds in the night messenger service. The NMS laws asserted that states had the right to extend their protections of childhood to adolescents in their late-teens and early twenties.

Second, this campaign established adolescence as a balance between protection and independence. Reformers only sought to raise the minimum age to twenty-one in the night messenger service. They did not aim to raise the minimum working age to eighteen or twenty-one across all industries. For most work, reformers lobbied for a fourteen-year age minimum. Child labor reformers acknowledged a fourteen-year-old's right to be economically independent. The new NMS laws, though, asserted states' rights to protect adolescents by regulating the type of work they performed.

Third, the NMS reformers established that acceptable work for adolescents was based on whether or not it led to industrial efficiency. The campaigners' primary critique of the NMS was that these messengers did not learn skills that would advance them in business; they would leave the service unskilled, accustomed to irregular schedules, steeped in dishonesty and vice, and generally unfit for productive labor. Campaigners conflated the economic and moral futures of night messengers. In this framework, reformers focused on how adolescents should be socialized. The ideal adolescent was being prepared to be a productive worker. Reformers spoke little about preparing these young men to be citizens. Rather, they focused their attention on their economic futures.

Fourth, this campaign circumscribed adolescence as a period of moral vulnerability and dependence. In the public campaign, NMS reformers drew on adolescent psychology to argue that messengers threatened the entire community. Campaigners described adolescence as a formative time of life in which young men were particularly susceptible to degrading influences, and they warned that messengers would carry the bad habits they picked up in the messenger service into adulthood. In contrast to this denigrating life, the NMS laws identified the ideal boundaries of adolescence by age markers, time of day, and location. The ideal adolescent was removed from the immorality of urban night environments, particularly its activities and habitants. In this framework, adolescents, along with children, needed to be protected from immoral, adult influences in the cities.

Fifth, this campaign positioned adolescent labor under the authority of state governments, significantly extending the power of states over the lives of its citizens. The labor of eighteen-year-olds (certainly twenty-one-year-olds) had previously been unregulated by state governments. Traditionally, fathers controlled the education and labor of their children. In the late 1800s, adolescents had gained independence as the apprentice system weakened and wage labor increased. This freedom was apparent in the NMS investigations. In the investigative reports, the night messengers spoke of themselves as independent actors. In the Progressive Era, though, child welfare reformers justified state intervention into family and work life based on the demands of childhood. NMS campaigners extended these arguments and codified adolescents' right to moral protection from the state. In the public campaigns and legislative debates, reformers framed maturing messengers as a looming threat to society, and on the basis of this

threat, they successfully lobbied for the state to intervene in the lives of adolescents. In this new framing, reformers cast twenty-year-old messengers as dependents of the state.

PROFESSIONALIZING REFORM

As they challenged reigning conceptions of adolescence, the NMS campaign also shows that reformers adopted and privileged technical lines of argument in discussions about child welfare reform. The NMS campaign signaled the growing dominance of experts in arguments for reform and the diminished role prescribed for the general public in an era known for advancing democratic engagement.

This campaign demonstrates the growing demand for technical expertise within arguments for child welfare reform in the Progressive Era. The National Child Labor Committee (NCLC) and its partners adopted the rhetoric of social science and privileged credibility and scientific claims from their initial investigations through to the enactment of state legislation. The committee launched the NMS campaign by sending out full-time field agents to conduct systematic investigations of child labor in the NMS. These agents presented their investigations in line with social science's demands for objective, methodical research rooted in the experiential knowledge of trained first-hand observers. In these investigative reports and their successive public appeals, campaigners claimed authority based on their "extensive research" and interpreted their findings in light of psychology's recently-developed theories about adolescence. Having used technical arguments to define the child labor problem in the NMS, campaigners established the grounds for professional organizations to also lead efforts to resolve this problem. Newly-formed child labor organizations thrust this issue onto the legislative agenda, shepherded bills through the legislatures, and situated themselves at the center of the

legislative debates. They learned and shared legislative strategies with the communication network established by their professionalization. From investigation to legislation, the NMS campaign situated child welfare reform as the domain of experts.

This campaign also illustrates the argumentative logic of professionalization that made (and makes) reform the primary responsibility of experts rather than individual community members. NMS campaigners identified the American people as the *phronimos*, a homogenous, moral body. According to reformers, the general public was not familiar with the immorality of urban nights; these environments were described as “foreign” to the average business leader. The campaign reported that trained investigators had to conduct extensive research in order to reveal the true extent of the NMS evil. Experts had uncovered this problem, but the details they revealed were viewed as too inappropriate to share with the moral American public. Campaigners assumed that sharing just a partial account of NMS reports would be sufficient. These reformers urged the public to be educated (partially) and vigilant, but they prescribed a largely inactive role for the people. In the Progressive Era, the American people were to be a great democratic force. Yet, in framing the NMS campaign through technical arguments and reformers’ expertise, these leaders turned the American people into a latent public. Concerned members of the community were to remain inactive until prompted by campaigners to write their representatives.

These expectations about adolescence and reform reverberate through contemporary efforts to define the problem of child labor, to engage the American public, and to propel the community to recognize the rights of children. Current accounts of child laborers continue to privilege progressive constructions of adolescents’ dependence. It is

still unusual to hear adolescents' narratives of their own work.² Instead, popular headlines are more likely to track the systematic investigations of nonprofits into child labor. The public looks to professionals to identify child labor abuses and to lead efforts for reform. On August 7, 2012, for instance, the non-profit China Labor Watch released a report after three undercover investigations over the span of two months charging that "child labor" was "a common practice" in Samsung's supplier HEG Electronics. Following the Chinese government's definitions of childhood, the report defined child laborers as workers under the age of sixteen.³ Samsung responded promptly to this negative coverage and reaffirmed their zero-tolerance policy on child labor.⁴ Global supply chains complicate the process of reform, but the trajectory of professional investigations, public exposure, and fierce criticisms of child labor violations has become the norm among multinational companies in industries from technology to cosmetics to chocolate and hazelnuts.⁵ Whether China Labor Watch or Human Rights Watch, professional reformers conduct systematic investigations of working conditions grounded in assumptions about adolescents' right to dependence that provide the data that shapes the trajectory of reform.

End Notes: Afterword

¹ “C182 - Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182),” *International Labor Organization*, 2016,
http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:C182.

² Sarah Grossman, “Street Teens in India Launch Their Own Newspaper,” *The Huffington Post*, April 27, 2016, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/balaknama-street-children-newspaper-india_us_571f8bf2e4b0b49df6a90bb5.

³ “Samsung Factory Exploiting Child Labor ---- Investigative Report on HEG Electronics (Huizhou) Co., Ltd. Samsung Supplier,” *China Labor Watch*, August 7, 2012, <https://chinalaborwatch.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/samsung8-271.pdf>.

⁴ “Samsung: No Child Labor at China Supplier,” *Market Watch: The Wall Street Journal*, September 3, 2012, <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/samsung-no-child-labor-at-china-supplier-2012-09-03>; “Samsung to Review 250 Chinese Suppliers for Labor Violations,” *Chicago Tribune*, September 3, 2012, <http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/sns-rt-us-samsung-chinabre8820bw-20120903,0,2799652.story>.

⁵ “Nestlé Advances Child Labor Battle Plan,” *The CNN Freedom Project: Ending Modern-Day Slavery*, June 29, 2012, <http://thecnnfreedomproject.blogs.cnn.com/2012/06/29/nestle-advances-child-labor-battle-plan/>; Mark Lee and Jun Yang, “Samsung China Assembler Employs Child Workers, Group Says,” *Bloomberg*, August 8, 2012, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-08-07/samsung-china-assembler-employs-child->

workers-labor-group-says.html; “Mr. Daisey and the Apple Factory,” *This American Life*, January 6, 2012, <http://www.thisamericanlife.org/radio-archives/episode/454/mr-daisey-and-the-apple-factory>; Jennifer Booton, “Rights Group Finds Child Labor Rampant in Nestle’s Ivory Coast Supply Chain,” *Fox Business*, June 29, 2012, <http://www.foxbusiness.com/markets/2012/06/29/rights-group-finds-child-labor-rampant-in-nestle-ivory-coast-supply-chain/>; Richard Marosi, “In Mexico’s Fields, Children Toil to Harvest Crops That Make It to American Tables,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 14, 2014, <http://graphics.latimes.com/product-of-mexico-children/>; Nina Smith, “Ending Child Labor: The Dirty Business of Cleaning Up Supply Chains,” *The Huffington Post*, June 10, 2016, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/skoll-foundation/ending-child-labor-the-di_b_10407714.html; Dominique Soguel, “How Turkey Is Tackling Child Labor in Hazelnut Harvesting,” *Christian Science Monitor*, September 7, 2015, <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2015/0907/How-Turkey-is-tackling-child-labor-in-hazelnut-harvesting>; Peter Bengtsen and Laura Paddison, “Beauty Companies and the Struggle to Source Child Labour-Free Mica,” *The Guardian*, July 28, 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/2016/jul/28/cosmetics-companies-mica-child-labour-beauty-industry-india->

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Special Collections:

Chute, Charles L., Papers. Columbia University Library, New York, New York.

Ingram, Frances M., Papers. Filson Historical Society, Louisville, Kentucky.

Juvenile Protective Association. Papers. University of Illinois Library, Chicago.

Kentucky Child Labor Association. Papers. University of Louisville Library, Kentucky.

McKelway, Alexander J., Papers. Library of Congress, Washington, District of
Columbia.

National Child Labor Committee. Papers. Library of Congress, Washington, District of
Columbia.

New York Child Labor Committee. Papers. New York State Public Library, Albany, New
York.

Pennsylvania Education and Child Labor Association. Papers. Temple University,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

General Sources:

“2,000,000 Children at Work.” *Lumberton Robesonian*. June 12, 1913.

“A Model Uniform Child Labor Law.” *The Outlook*, October 21, 1911.

“A Sociological Retreat at Sagamore.” *The Survey*, June 10, 1909.

Abbott, Edith. “A Study of the Early History of Child Labor in America.” *American
Journal of Sociology* 14, no. 1 (1908): 15–37.

Abbott, Grace, ed. “The Beveridge-Parsons Bill of 1906.” In *The Child and the State*,
1:472. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

- , ed. *The Child and the State; Select Documents, with Introductory Notes*. Vol. 1. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1938.
- Adams, Myron E. “Children in American Street Trades.” In *Child Labor*, 25–46. New York City: National Child Labor Committee, 1905.
- Addams, Jane. “Child Labor Legislation - A Requisite for Industrial Efficiency.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 25 (May 1905): 128–36.
- . *Democracy and Social Ethics*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1902.
- . “Evils of Child Labor.” In *Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History*, edited by Robert Bremner, 2:649. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- . “Introduction.” In *Hull House Papers and Maps: A Presentation of Nationalities and Wages in a Congested District of Chicago, Together with Comments and Essays on Problems Growing Out of the Social Conditions*. New York: T.Y. Crowell & Co., 1895.
- . “The Subjective Necessity for Social Settlements.” In *Philanthropy and Social Progress: Seven Essays*, 1–26. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Company, 1893.
- . “Trades Unions and Public Duty.” *American Journal of Sociology* 4, no. 4 (1899): 448–62.
- Adler, Felix. “Child Labor a Menace to Civilization.” In *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911*, 1–7. New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911.

“Advertisement: The Omaha Messenger and Express Co.” *Omaha (NE) Daily Bee*,
October 4, 1903, 15.

Alderson, Bernard. *Andrew Carnegie: The Man and His Work*. New York: Doubleday,
Page & Co., 1905.

[http://books.google.com/books?id=bXNEAAAIAAJ&pg=PA156&dq=Andrew
+Carnegie+%22messenger%22+work&hl=en&sa=X&ei=xAOsUOCvKqm60QG
74oCQBA&ved=0CDkQ6AEwAw#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?id=bXNEAAAIAAJ&pg=PA156&dq=Andrew+Carnegie+%22messenger%22+work&hl=en&sa=X&ei=xAOsUOCvKqm60QG74oCQBA&ved=0CDkQ6AEwAw#v=onepage&q&f=false).

Alger, George W. “The Literature of Exposure.” *The Atlantic Monthly*, August 1905.

Alger, Horatio, Jr. *Adventures of a Telegraph Boy or “Number 91.”* Philadelphia, PA:
David McKay, 1900.

———. *The Telegraph Boy*. Philadelphia, PA: The John C. Winston Co., 1879.

<http://ufdc.ufl.edu/?c=juv&b=UF00047771>.

Amigh, Ophelia L. *Proceedings of the Illinois Conference of Charities at Lincoln,
October 23-24, 1901*. Springfield, IL: Phillips Bros. State Printers, 1902.

An Act for the Suppression of Trade in, and Circulation of, Obscene Literature and
Articles of Immoral Use, Ch. 258 § (1873). [https://memory.loc.gov/cgi-
bin/ampage?collId=lsl&fileName=017/lsl017.db&recNum=639](https://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=lsl&fileName=017/lsl017.db&recNum=639).

“An Honest Messenger.” *Journal of the Telegraph* 9, no. 10 (May 15, 1876): 147.

Anderson, Eric. “Prostitution and Social Justice: Chicago, 1910-15.” *Social Service
Review* 48, no. 2 (1974): 203–28.

“Annual Report of the General Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee. For the
Sixth Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1910.” *Annals of the American Academy
of Political and Social Science* 38 (July 1911): 186–201.

- Applegarth, Risa. *Rhetoric in American Anthropology: Gender, Genre, and Science*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2014.
- Applegate, Edd. *Muckrakers: A Biographical Dictionary of Writers and Editors*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2008.
<http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip083/2007043761.html>.
- Ariès, Philippe. *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- Aristotle. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Translated by George Alexander Kennedy. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Armitage, Kevin C. “‘The Child Is Born a Naturalist’: Nature Study, Woodcraft Indians, and the Theory of Recapitulation.” *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 6, no. 1 (2007): 43–70.
- Armstrong-Fumero, Fernando. “‘Even the Most Careless Observer’: Race and Visual Discernment in Physical Anthropology from Samuel Morton to Kennewick Man.” *American Studies* 53, no. 2 (2014): 5–29. doi:10.1353/ams.2014.0100.
- Asen, Robert, Deb Gurke, Ryan Solomon, Pamela Conners, and Elsa Gumm. “‘The Research Says’: Definitions and Uses of a Key Policy Term in Federal Law and Local School Board Deliberations.” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 47 (Spring 2011): 195–213.
- Attiah, Karen. “Why Won’t the U.S. Ratify the U.N.’s Child Rights Treaty?” *The Washington Post*, November 21, 2014.
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-partisan/wp/2014/11/21/why-wont-the-u-s-ratify-the-u-n-s-child-rights-treaty/>.

- Austin, David M. "The Flexner Myth and the History of Social Work." *The Social Service Review* 57, no. 3 (1983): 357.
- Avon Whidden, Rachel. "Maternal Expertise, Vaccination Recommendations, and the Complexity of Argument Spheres." *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48, no. 4 (2012): 243–57.
- Bailey, Hugh C. *Edgar Gardner Murphy: Gentle Progressive*. Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press, 1968.
- . *Liberalism in the New South: Southern Social Reformers and the Progressive Movement*. Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press, 1969.
- Baker, Newton D. "Forward to The Story of an Epoch-Making Movement." In *The Story of an Epoch-Making Movement*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1986.
- Bannister, Robert C. *Sociology and Scientism: The American Quest for Objectivity, 1880-1940*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.
- Baron, Ava. "Gender and Labor History: Learning from the Past, Looking to the Future." In *Work Engendered: Toward a New History of American Labor*, 1–46. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- . "Masculinity, the Embodied Male Worker, and the Historian's Gaze." *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 69 (Spring 2006): 143–60. doi:10.2307/27673026.
- . "Questions of Gender: Deskillling and Demasculinization in the U.S. Printing Industry, 1830-1915." *Gender and History* 1, no. 2 (Summer 1989): 178–99.
- Bellasis, Edward. *Notes for Boys and Their Fathers on Morals, Mind, and Manners*. Chicago, IL: A. C. McClurg and Company, 1888.

- Benedict, Michael Les. "Constitutional Politics in the Gilded Age." *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 9, no. 1 (2010): 7–35.
- Bengtson, Peter, and Laura Paddison. "Beauty Companies and the Struggle to Source Child Labour-Free Mica." *The Guardian*, July 28, 2016.
<https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/2016/jul/28/cosmetics-companies-mica-child-labour-beauty-industry-india->.
- Bentley, Matthew. "Playing White Men: American Football and Manhood at the Carlisle Indian School, 1893–1904." *The Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth* 3, no. 2 (2010): 187–209. doi:10.1353/hcy.0.0092.
- Beveridge, Albert J. "Child Labor and the Nation." In *Child Labor and the Republic: Proceedings of the Third Annual Meeting of the National Child Labor Committee, Cincinnati, December 13-15, 1906*. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1907.
- Bill of Rights (1791).
<http://ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&doc=13&page=transcript>.
- "Bill Signed by Gov. Hughes." *New York Times*, May 22, 1910.
- Birkhead, Douglas. "The Progressive Reform of Journalism: The Rise of Professionalism in the Press." In *Rhetoric and Reform in the Progressive Era*, edited by J. Michael Hogan, 113–44. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2003.
- Bishop, Ronald. *When Play Was Play: Why Pick-up Games Matter*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009.

- “Blind Alley, N.” *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, December 2014.
<http://www.oed.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/view/Entry/20227?redirectedFrom=b+lind+alley>.
- “Blind Alley That Leads to Ruin.” *Newport Hoosier State*, July 6, 1910.
- Bly, Nellie. *Ten Days in a Mad-House*. New York: Ian L. Munro, Publisher, 1887.
<http://digital.library.upenn.edu/women/bly/madhouse/madhouse.html>.
- Boase, Paul H. “Christian Socialism and the Social Gospel.” In *The Rhetoric of Protest and Reform, 1878-1898*, edited by Paul H. Boase, 235–64. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1980.
- Bodnar, John E. “Socialization and Adaptation: Immigrant Families in Scranton, 1880-1890.” In *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, edited by Harvey J. Graff, 385–96. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987.
- Boorstin, Daniel J. *The Americans: The Democratic Experience*. 1st ed. New York: Random House, 1973.
- Booton, Jennifer. “Rights Group Finds Child Labor Rampant in Nestle’s Ivory Coast Supply Chain.” *Fox Business*, June 29, 2012.
<http://www.foxbusiness.com/markets/2012/06/29/rights-group-finds-child-labor-rampant-in-nestle-ivory-coast-supply-chain/>.
- Boyd, Josh. “Public and Technical Interdependence: Regulatory Controversy, Out-Law Discourse, and the Messy Case of Olestra.” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 39 (Fall 2002): 91–109.
- Boyer, Paul S. “In His Steps: A Reappraisal.” *American Quarterly* 23, no. 1 (Spring 1971): 60–78.

- “Boys’ Lives Ruined at Night.” *Logansport Reporter*. May 20, 1910.
- Brace, Charles Loring. *The Dangerous Classes of New York and Twenty Years’ Work Among Them*. New York: Wynkoop & Hallenbeck, Publishers, 1872.
- Braeman, John. “Albert J. Beveridge and the First National Child Labor Bill.” *Indiana Magazine of History* 60, no. 1 (March 1964): 1–36.
- Brenzel, Barbara. “Domestication as Reform: A Study of the Socialization of Wayward Girls, 1856-1905.” In *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, edited by Harvey J. Graff, 352–68. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987.
- Brown, Edward F. “The Night Messenger Service -- A Child Labor Problem.” *Editorial Review*, January 1911.
- Brown, Emma E. *The Child Toilers of Boston Streets*. Boston, MA: D. Lothrop & Co., 1878.
- Bruno, Frank J. *Trends in Social Work, 1874-1956: A History Based on the Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.
- Bushnell, Horace. *Christian Nurture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1916.
- “C182 - Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182).” *International Labor Organization*, 2016.
http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:C182.
- Camic, Charles, and Yu Xie. “The Statistical Turn in American Social Science: Columbia University, 1890 to 1915.” *American Sociological Review* 59, no. 5 (1994): 773–805.

- Candela, Joseph L., Jr. "The Struggle to Limit the Hours and Raise the Wages of Working Women in Illinois, 1893-1917." *Social Service Review* 53, no. 1 (March 1979): 15–34.
- Carlson, A. Cheree. "Creative Casuistry and Feminist Consciousness: The Rhetoric of Moral Reform." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 78, no. 1 (February 1992): 16–32.
- Carmack, Heather J. "Social and Tertiary Health Identities as Argument in the DSM-V Asperger's/Autism Debate." *Western Journal of Communication* 78, no. 4 (July 2014): 462–79. doi:10.1080/10570314.2013.845792.
- Carnegie, Andrew. *Autobiography of Andrew Carnegie*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920.
- Carson, Mina. "American Settlement Houses: The First Half of the Century." In *Settlements, Social Change, and Community Action*, edited by Ruth Gilchrist and Tony Jeffs, 34. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2001.
- Castañeda, Claudia. *Figurations: Child, Bodies, Worlds*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Cavallo, Dominick. *Muscles and Morals: Organized Playgrounds and Urban Reform, 1880-1920*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.
- Chambers, Clarke A. *Seedtime of Reform: American Social Service and Social Action, 1918-1933*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963.
- Chandler, Daniel Ross. "Charles M. Sheldon and the 'Social Gospel' Novel Movement." *Religious Communication Today*, September 1986, 20.

- “Chap. 1180. An Act to Incorporate the National Child Labor Committee.” In *The Statutes at Large of the United States of America from December, 1905, to March, 1907*, 34:914–15. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1907.
- Child Labor in Massachusetts: Annual Report of the Massachusetts Child Labor Committee*. Massachusetts State Child Labor Committee, 1912.
- Child Labor in Massachusetts: Report of the Massachusetts State Child Labor Committee on the Legislative Campaign, 1910*. Boston: Massachusetts State Child Labor Committee, 1910.
- “Child Labor: The Cosmopolitan’s Readers Agree That This Disgrace Must Go.” *The Cosmopolitan; a Monthly Illustrated Magazine (1886-1907)*, November 1906.
- Chinn, Sarah E. *Inventing Modern Adolescence*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2009.
- Chriss, James J. “Giddings and the Social Mind.” *Journal of Classical Sociology* 6, no. 1 (2006): 123–44. doi:10.1177/1468795X06061289.
- Chura, Patrick. *Vital Contact: Downclassing Journeys in American Literature from Herman Melville to Richard Wright*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Chura, Patrick J. “‘Vital Contact’: Eugene O’Neill and the Working Class.” *Twentieth Century Literature* 49, no. 4 (2003): 520–46.
- Churchill, Winston. *The Inside of the Cup*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1913.
- Chute, Charles L. “The Glass Industry and Child Labor Legislation.” In *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference*, 123–32. New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911.

Clapp, Elizabeth J. "Welfare and the Role of Women: The Juvenile Court Movement."

Journal of American Studies 28, no. 3 (1994): 359–83.

Clark, Gregory, and S. Michael Halloran. "Introduction: Transformations of Public

Discourse in Nineteenth-Century America." In *Oratorical Culture in Nineteenth-*

Century America: Transformations in the Theory and Practice of Rhetoric, edited

by Gregory Clark and S. Michael Halloran, 1–26. Carbondale: Southern Illinois

University Press, 1993.

Clemens, Elisabeth S. "Organizational Repertoires and Institutional Change: Women's

Groups and the Transformation of American Politics, 1890-1920." In *Civic*

Engagement in American Democracy, edited by Theda Skocpol and Morris P.

Fiorina. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1999.

———. *The People's Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group*

Politics in the United States, 1890-1925. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago

Press, 1997.

Clopper, Edward N. "Child Labor and Public Health." *Journal of the American Public*

Health Association 1, no. 5 (May 1911): 322–28.

———. "The Night Messenger Boy." In *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the*

Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911, 103–4.

New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911.

http://books.google.com/books?id=bD_tAAAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false.

———. "The Night Messenger Boy." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and*

Social Science 38, no. 3 (November 1911): 103–4.

- . “The Night Messenger Service.” In *Public Welfare in Indiana, Issues 84-87*, 257–60, 1911.
- Clopper, Edward Nicholas. *Child Labor in City Streets*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1912.
- Cohen, Ronald D. “Child-Saving and Progressivism, 1885-1915.” In *American Childhood: A Research Guide and Historical Handbook*, edited by Joseph M. Hawes and N. Ray Hiner, 273–309. Greenwood Press, 1985.
- Compton, Stephen C. “Edgar Gardner Murphy and the Child Labor Movement.” *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 52, no. 2 (June 1983): 181–94.
- Conant, Richard K. “Street Trades and Reformatories.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 38, no. 3 (July 1911): 105–7.
- Conant, R.K. “Night Messenger Service.” *New Boston*, January 1911.
- Connelly, Mark Thomas. *The Response to Prostitution in the Progressive Era*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- Crane, Lydia Hale. “The Messenger Boy.” *Child Labor Bulletin* 3, no. 2 (1914): 23–26.
- Crane, Stephen. “An Experiment in Misery.” In *Stephen Crane: Stories and Tales*, edited by Robert Wooster Stallman, 27–38. New York: Vintage Books, 1955.
- Crunden, Robert Morse. *Ministers of Reform: The Progressives’ Achievement in American Civilization, 1889-1920*. New York: Basic Books, 1982.
- Davidson, Elizabeth. *Child Labor Legislation in the Southern Textile States*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939.

- Davis, Allen Freeman. *Spearheads for Reform: The Social Settlements and the Progressive Movement, 1890-1914*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Davis, Philip. *Street-Land: It's Little People and Big Problems*. Boston: Small, Maynard & Company, 1915.
- . "The Night Messenger Boy. Why the Legislature Should Limit His Years." *Boston Evening Transcript*, March 11, 1911.
- Dawley, Alan. *Class and Community: The Industrial Revolution in Lynn*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Dawley, Thomas Robinson. *The Child That Toileth Not: The Story of a Government Investigation That Was Suppressed [Sic]*. 2nd ed. New York: Gracia Publishing, 1912.
- DeGraw, Julie. "Untangling the 'Snare of Preparation': The Chicago Social Settlement Movement and Its Relationship with the University of Michigan in the 1880s." *Educational History Journal* 33, no. 2 (2006): 127–36.
- "Dens of Infamy. Startling Revelations of a Victim of a Michigan Dance House." *Burlington Weekly Hawk Eye*. January 27, 1887.
- Department of Commerce and Labor Bureau of the Census, United States Bureau of the. *Bulletin 69: Child Labor in the United States*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1907.
- Dickinson, Edward B., ed. *Official Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Ill., June 21st, 22nd and 23rd 1892*. Chicago, IL: Cameron, Amberg & Co., 1892.

- Dillon, Michael. "Anatomy of a Crusade: The Buffalo News' Campaign for Immigrants." In *The Muckrakers: Evangelical Crusaders*, edited by Robert Miraldi, 25–52. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000.
- "District Telegraph Boys: Features of the Messenger Service Peculiar and Varied Errands on Which Boys Are Sent--Acting as Escorts to Ladies and Bringing Home Tipsy Husbands--Statistics of the Work Done in the Holiday Season." *New York Tribune*. February 17, 1879.
- Donovan, Frances R. *The Woman Who Waits*. Boston: Richard G. Badger, 1920.
- Dorn, Jacob Henry. *Washington Gladden: Prophet of the Social Gospel*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1967.
- Dorsey, Leroy G. "Preaching Morality in Modern America: Theodore Roosevelt's Rhetorical Progressivism." In *Rhetoric and Reform in the Progressive Era*, edited by J. Michael Hogan, 49–83. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2003.
- Dow, Bonnie J. "Feminism and Public Address Research: Television News and the Construction of Women's Liberation." In *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, edited by Shawn J. Parry-Giles and J. Michael Hogan, 343–72. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Downey, Gregory J. "Running Somewhere Between Men and Women: Gender in the Construction of the Telegraph Messenger Boy." In *Research in Science and Technology Studies: Gender and Work*, edited by Shirley Gorenstein. Stamford, CT: JAI Press, 2000.

- . *Telegraph Messenger Boys: Labor, Technology, and Geography, 1850-1950*.
New York: Routledge, 2002.
- “Dr. Lindsay to Head Child Labor Project.” *New York Times*, July 21, 1904.
- Earls, Felton. “Introduction: Children: From Rights to Citizenship.” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 633 (January 2011): 6–16.
- “Economic Discussion.” *Harper’s Weekly*, June 20, 1891.
- Ehrenreich, John H. *The Altruistic Imagination: A History of Social Work and Social Policy in the United States*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. “Archetypal Patterns of Youth.” In *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, edited by Harvey J. Graff, 48–60. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987.
- Elder, Glen H., Jr. “Adolescence in Historical Perspective.” In *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, edited by Harvey J. Graff, 5–47. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987.
- Ellis, Leonora Beck. “A Study of Southern Cotton-Mill Communities, Child Labor, The Operatives in General.” *American Journal of Sociology* 8, no. 5 (1903): 623–30.
- Ellwood, Charles A. “Philanthropy and Sociology.” *The Survey*, June 4, 1910.
- . “Prolegomena to Social Psychology. IV. The Concept of the Social Mind.” *American Journal of Sociology* 5, no. 2 (September 1899): 220–27.
- “Employment of Child Labor.” U.S. Senate, 1908.
- <http://congressional.proquest.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/congressional/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdfli>

nk/\$2fapp-bin\$2fgis-congrecord\$2f6\$2fc\$2fc\$2f4\$2fcr-1908-
0506_from_1_to_71.pdf/entitlementkeys=1234#page=13.

Endres, Fred F. "The Pit-Muckraking Days of McClure's Magazine, 1893-1901."

Journalism Quarterly 55, no. 1 (Spring 1978): 154–57.

Endres, Kathleen L. "Women and the 'Larger Household.'" *American Journalism* 14, no.

3–4 (1997): 262–82. doi:10.1080/08821127.1997.10731923.

Evans, Michael S. "Defining the Public, Defining Sociology: Hybrid Science—Public

Relations and Boundary-Work in Early American Sociology." *Public*

Understanding of Science 18, no. 1 (2009): 5–22.

doi:10.1177/0963662506071283.

Everitt, James Andrew. *The Third Power: Farmers to the Front*. 4th ed. Indianapolis, IN:

J. A. Everitt, Publisher, 1907.

Fabj, Valeria, and Matthew J. Sobnosky. "AIDS Activism and the Rejuvenation of the

Public Sphere." *Argumentation & Advocacy* 31 (Spring 1995): 163–84.

"Favor Child Labor Bill." *New York Tribune*, April 6, 1910.

Fee, Frank E., Jr. "Reconnecting with the Body Politic: Toward Disconnecting

Muckrakers and Public Journalists." *American Journalism* 22, no. 3 (Summer

2005): 77–102.

Felt, Jeremy P. *Hostages of Fortune: Child Labor Reform in New York State*. Syracuse,

NY: Syracuse University Press, 1965.

"Fields of Peril: Child Labor in US Agriculture." Human Rights Watch, 2010.

http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/crd0510webwcover_1.pdf.

- Filler, Louis. *Crusaders for American Liberalism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1939.
- Fishburn, Janet Forsythe. *The Fatherhood of God and the Victorian Family: The Social Gospel in America*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- Flannery, James L. *The Glass House Boys of Pittsburgh: Law, Technology, and Child Labor*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009.
- Forbush, William Byron. *The Boy Problem: A Study in Social Pedagogy*. 2nd ed. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1901.
- Ford, Henry Jones. "The Pretensions of Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 15, no. 1 (1909): 96–104.
- Franklin, Donna L. "Mary Richmond and Jane Addams: From Moral Certainty to Rational Inquiry in Social Work Practice." *The Social Service Review* 60, no. 4 (1986): 504.
- Freiberg, Albert H. "Some of the Ultimate Physical Effects of Premature Toil." In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the National Child Labor Committee, 1905, 1906*, edited by Robert H. Bremner, 19–25. New York: Arno Press, 1974.
- Friedman, Lawrence M. *Guarding Life's Dark Secretes: Legal and Social Controls over Reputation, Propriety, and Privacy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- Gaines, Robert N. "Phronesis." In *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, edited by Thomas O. Sloane, 601–3. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Gardner, Martha. *The Qualities of a Citizen: Women, Immigration, and Citizenship, 1870-1965*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005.

- Giddings, Franklin H. "A Theory of Social Causation." In *Publications of the American Economic Association: Papers and Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting, Part II*, 383–418. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1904.
- Giddings, Franklin H. *The Theory of Sociology*. Philadelphia, PA: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1894.
- Gieryn, Thomas F. "City as Truth-Spot: Laboratories and Field-Sites in Urban Studies." *Social Studies of Science* 36, no. 1 (2006): 5–38.
- Gilchrist, Ruth, and Tony Jeffs. "Introduction." In *Settlements, Social Change, and Community Action*, edited by Ruth Gilchrist and Tony Jeffs, 10. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2001.
- Gladden, Washington. *The Church and the Kingdom*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1894.
- Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. *Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Goldman, Eric Frederick. *Rendezvous with Destiny: A History of Modern American Reform*. New York: Knopf, 1952.
- Goldmark, Josephine C. "The Necessary Sequel of Child-Labor Laws." *American Journal of Sociology* 11, no. 3 (1905): 136–38.
- Goodman, Matthew. *Eighty Days: Nellie Bly and Elizabeth Bisland's History-Making Race Around the World*. New York: Ballantine Books, 2013.
- Goodnight, G. Thomas. "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres: A Note on 21st Century Critical Communication." *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48 (Spring 2012): 258–67.

- . “The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument.” In *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, edited by Thomas O. Sloane, 629–31. Oxford University Press, 2001.
- . “The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument: A Speculative Inquiry into the Art of Public Deliberation.” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48 (Spring 2012): 198–210.
- Gordon, Linda. “Putting Children First: Women, Maternalism, and Welfare in the Early Twentieth Century.” In *U. S. History as Women’s History: New Feminist Essays*, edited by Linda K. Kerber, Alice Kessler-Harris, and Kathryn Kish Sklar, 63–86. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- Gordon, Lynn. “Women and the Anti-Child Labor Movement in Illinois, 1890-1920.” *The Social Service Review* 51, no. 2 (1977): 228–48.
- Gorrell, Donald K. *The Age of Social Responsibility: The Social Gospel in the Progressive Era 1900-1920*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988.
- Gottlieb, Agnes Hooper. “Women and Exposé: Reform and Housekeeping.” In *The Muckrakers: Evangelical Crusaders*, 71–91. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000.
- Graebner, William. “Federalism in the Progressive Era: A Structural Interpretation of Reform.” *The Journal of American History* 64, no. 2 (1977): 331–57.
doi:10.2307/1901828.
- Graff, Harvey J. “Introduction.” In *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, edited by Harvey J. Graff, xi–xix. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987.

- Granger, Mrs. A. O. "The Work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs against Child Labor." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 25 (May 1905): 102–7.
- Greek, Cecil E. *The Religious Roots of American Sociology*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1992.
- Grenier, Judson A. "Muckraking and the Muckrakers: An Historical Definition." *Journalism Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (September 1960): 552–58.
- Gronbeck, Bruce E. "Rhetorical History and Rhetorical Criticism: A Distinction." *Speech Teacher* 24, no. 4 (November 1975): 309–20.
- Gross, Matthias. "Human Geography and Ecological Sociology: The Unfolding of a Human Ecology, 1890 to 1930 -- and Beyond." *Social Science History* 28, no. 4 (2005): 575–605.
- Grossberg, Michael. "Changing Conceptions of Child Welfare in the United States, 1820-1935." In *A Century of Juvenile Justice*, edited by Margaret K. Rosenheim, Franklin E. Zimring, David S. Tanenhaus, and Bernardine Dohrn, 3–41. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Grossman, Sarah. "Street Teens in India Launch Their Own Newspaper." *The Huffington Post*, April 27, 2016. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/balaknama-street-children-newspaper-india_us_571f8bf2e4b0b49df6a90bb5.
- Guernsey, Alice Margaret. *Citizens of Tomorrow: A Study of Childhood and Youth from the Standpoint of Home Mission Work*. New York: F. H. Revell, 1907.
- Gusfield, Joseph R. *The Culture of Public Problems: Drinking-Driving and the Symbolic Order*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

- Haber, Samuel. *Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890-1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Hall, Fred S. "Child Labor Statistics." In *Child Employing Industries: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference, Boston, Massachusetts, January 13-16, 1910*, 114–26. New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1910.
- Hall, G. Stanley. *Adolescence: Its Psychology and Its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion and Education*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1905.
- . *Youth: Its Education, Regimen, and Hygiene*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1908.
- <http://books.google.com/books?id=w9kKAQAIAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=Hall+Youth:+Its+Education&hl=en&sa=X&ei=O119UpOaKYnc4APbu4HgBA&ved=0CEgQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- Hall, George A. "The Newsboy." In *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911*, 100–102. New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911.
- Halverson, Cathryn. "The Fascination of the Working Girl: Dorothy Richardson's The Long Day." *American Studies* 40, no. 1 (Spring 1999): 95–115.
- Hamilton, Alexander. *Report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States on the Subject of Manufactures*. Online ed. Childs and Swaine, 1791.
- http://books.google.com/books?id=FphDAAAACAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false

- Handy, Robert T., ed. "Richard T. Ely." In *The Social Gospel in America*, 186. New York: Oxford Press, 1966.
- . *The Social Gospel in America, 1870-1920*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Haney-López, Ian. *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race*. Rev. ed. New York: New York University Press, 2006.
- Hantover, Jeffrey P. "The Boy Scouts and the Validation of Masculinity." *Journal of Social Issues* 34, no. 1 (1978): 184–95.
- Hard, William. "De Kid Wot Works at Night." *Everybody's Magazine*, January 1908.
- Hard, William, and Rheta Childe Dorr. "The Woman's Invasion." *Everybody's Magazine*, November 1908.
- Hart, Hastings H. "The Care of the Dependent Child in the Family." In *Care of Dependent Children in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*, edited by Robert H. Bremner, 464–72. *Children and Youth: Social Problems and Social Policy*. New York: Arno Press, 1974.
- Hartelius, E. Johanna. *The Rhetoric of Expertise*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2011.
- Hauser, Gerard A. "Aristotle on Epideictic: The Formation of Public Morality." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 29, no. 1 (1999): 5–23.
- . "Features of the Public Sphere." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 4, no. 4 (1987): 437–41.
- . "On Publics and Public Spheres: A Response to Phillips." *Communication Monographs* 64, no. 3 (1997): 275–79.

- Hauser, Gerard A., and Carole Blair. "Rhetorical Antecedents to the Public." *Pre Text* 3, no. 2 (1982): 139–67.
- Higbie, Toby. "Crossing Class Boundaries: Tramp Ethnographers and Narratives of Class in Progressive Era America." *Social Science History* 21, no. 4 (Winter 1997): 559–92.
- Hindman, Hugh D. *Child Labor: An American History*. Armonk, N.Y: M.E. Sharpe, 2002.
- Hirsch, Emil G. "The Home Versus the Institution." In *Proceedings of the Conference on the Care of Dependent Children Held at Washington, D.C., January 25, 26, 1909*, 85–94. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1909.
- Hoben, Allan. "Child Labor in City Streets, by Edward N. Clopper." *American Journal of Sociology* 18, no. 4 (1913): 579.
- . "The Minister and the Boy: II. An Approach to Boyhood." *The Biblical World* 38, no. 5 (November 1911): 306–14.
- Hoffman, Nicholas J. "Miniature Demons: The Young Helpers of Milwaukee's Glass Industry, 1880-1922." *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 91, no. 1 (Autumn 2007): 2–13.
- Hofstadter, Richard. *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972.
- . *The Progressive Movement, 1900-1915*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

- Hogan, J. Michael, ed. "Conclusion: Memories and Legacies of the Progressive Era." In *Rhetoric and Reform in the Progressive Era*, 472. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2003.
- . "Introduction." In *Rhetoric and Reform in the Progressive Era*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2003.
- . *The Nuclear Freeze Campaign: Rhetoric and Foreign Policy in the Telepolitical Age*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1994.
- . *Woodrow Wilson's Western Tour: Rhetoric, Public Opinion, and the League of Nations*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2006.
- Houde, Mary Jean. *Reaching Out: A Story of the General Federation of Women's Clubs*. Chicago, IL: Mobium Press, 1989.
- Howerth, I. W. "A Programme for Social Study." *American Journal of Sociology* 2, no. 6 (May 1897): 852–72.
- Howerth, Ira W. "Present Conditions of Sociology in the United States." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 5 (1894): 112–21.
- Hull-House Maps and Papers: A Presentation of Nationalities and Wages in a Congested District of Chicago, Together with Comments and Essays on Problems Growing out of the Social Conditions*. New York: T.Y. Crowell & Co., 1895.
- Hunter, Robert. *Poverty*. New York: MacMillan & Co., 1912.
- "Industrial, Adj. and N." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, December 2014.
<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/94848?redirectedFrom=industrial>.
- Ireland, Tom. *Child Labor as a Relic of the Dark Ages*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1937.

- James, Allison. "To Be (Come) or Not to Be (Come): Understanding Children's Citizenship." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 633 (January 2011): 167–79.
- Jensen, Robin E. *Dirty Words: The Rhetoric of Public Sex Education, 1870-1924*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2010.
- . "Using Science to Argue for Sexual Education in U.S. Public Schools: Dr. Ella Flagg Young and the 1913 'Chicago Experiment.'" *Science Communication* 29, no. 2 (2007): 217–41. doi:10.1177/1075547007309101.
- Johnson, Elizabeth Sands. "Child Labor Legislation." In *History of Labor in the United States, 1896-1932*, edited by John R. Commons, Vol. 3. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935.
- Johnson, W. L. A. *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Kansas Bureau of Labor and Industrial Statistics*. Topeka, KS: W.Y. Morgan, State Printer, 1899.
- "Kansas City's School of Social Science." *The Survey*, September 11, 1909.
- Katz, Michael B. "Child-Saving." *History of Education Quarterly* 26, no. 3 (1986): 413–24.
- Katz, Michael B., and Ian E. Davey. "Youth and Early Industrialization in a Canadian City." In *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, edited by Harvey J. Graff, 268–300. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987.
- Kauffman, Reginald Wright. *The House of Bondage*. New York: Moffat, Yard and Company, 1910.
- Kelley, Florence. *Some Ethical Gains through Legislation*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905.

- . “The Federal Government and the Working Children.” In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the National Child Labor Committee, 1905, 1906*, edited by Robert H. Bremner, 289–92. New York: Arno Press, 1974.
- . “The Illinois Child-Labor Law.” *American Journal of Sociology* 3, no. 4 (1898): 490–501.
- . “The Responsibility of the Consumer.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 32 (July 1908): 108–12.
- . “The Street Trader Under Illinois Law.” In *The Child in the City: A Series of Papers Presented at the Conferences Held During the Chicago Child Welfare Exhibit*, edited by S.P. Breckinridge, 293. Chicago: Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, Department of Social Investigation, 1912.
- . “What Should We Sacrifice to Uniformity?” In *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference*, 24–30. New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911.
- Kellor, Frances A. *Experimental Sociology: Descriptive and Analytical*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1901.
- Keniston, Kenneth. “Psychological Development and Historical Change.” In *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, edited by Harvey J. Graff, 61–72. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987.
- Keränen, Lisa. “Mapping Misconduct: Demarcating Legitimate Science from ‘Fraud’ in the B-06 Lumpectomy Controversy.” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 42, no. 2 (2005): 94–113.

- Kett, Joseph F. "Adolescence and Youth." In *The Family in History: Interdisciplinary Essays*, edited by Theodore K. Rabb and Robert I. Rotberg, 95–110. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- . "Curing the Disease of Precocity." *American Journal of Sociology* 84 (1978): S183–211. doi:10.2307/3083227.
- . "Growing Up in Rural New England, 1800-1840." In *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, edited by Harvey J. Graff, 175–84. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987.
- . *Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the Present*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.
- Kipling, Rudyard. "*Captains Courageous*": *A Story of the Grand Banks*. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1897.
- Klumpp, James F., Patricia Riley, and Thomas A. Hollihan. "Beyond Dialogue: Linking the Public and Political Spheres." *Conference Proceedings -- National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation)*, January 1999, 361–68.
- Koven, Seth, and Sonya Michel. "Womanly Duties: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of Welfare States in France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, 1880-1920." *The American Historical Review* 95, no. 4 (1990): 1076–1108.
- Kraig, Robert Alexander. "The Second Oratorical Renaissance." In *Rhetoric and Reform in the Progressive Era*, edited by J. Michael Hogan, 1–48. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2003.

- Kurtz, Lester R. *Evaluating Chicago Sociology: A Guide to the Literature, with an Annotated Bibliography*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Ladd-Taylor, Molly. *Mother-Work: Women, Child Welfare, and the State, 1890-1930*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994.
- Lahne, Herbert J. *The Cotton Mill Worker*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc, 1944.
- Landers, James. "Hearst's Magazine, 1912-1914." *Journalism History* 38, no. 4 (Winter 2013): 221–212.
- Lannoy, Pierre. "When Robert E. Park Was (Re) Writing 'The City': Biography, the Social Survey, and the Science of Sociology." *American Sociologist* 35, no. 1 (March 2004): 34–62.
- Lasch, Christopher. *Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.
- Latta, Maurice C. "The Background for the Social Gospel in American Protestantism." *Church History*, 1936.
- "Lauds Child Labor Law: Mr. McKelway Says It Puts Maryland in Front Rank." *The Sun*. April 13, 1912.
- Lee, Mark, and Jun Yang. "Samsung China Assembler Employs Child Workers, Group Says." *Bloomberg*, August 8, 2012. <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-08-07/samsung-china-assembler-employs-child-workers-labor-group-says.html>.
- Leff, Mark H. "Consensus for Reform: The Mothers'-Pension Movement in the Progressive Era." *Social Service Review* 47, no. 3 (1973): 397–417.
- "Legislation Which Boston-1915 Wants: A Summary of the Bills That the Directors of Boston-1915 Have Voted to Support." *New Boston*, March 1911.

Leiby, James. *A History of Social Welfare and Social Work in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.

Lengermann, Patricia Madoo, and Jill Niebrugge-Brantley. "Back to the Future: Settlement Sociology, 1885-1930." *The American Sociologist* 33, no. 3 (September 2002): 5–20. doi:10.1007/s12108-002-1009-z.

Leonard, Mrs. Clara T. "Family Homes for Pauper and Dependent Children." In *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference of Charities, Held at Chicago, June 10-12, 1879*, 170–78, 1879. http://books.google.com/books?id=24JAAAAIAAJ&pg=RA1-PA170&dq=Clara+T.+Leonard,+%22Family+Homes+for+Pauper+and+Dependent+Children,%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=kM3xUY_vJdGs4APTt4HQCw&ved=0CDUQ6AEwAQ#v=onepage&q&f=true.

Letchworth, Hon. William P. "Children of the State." In *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, at the Thirteenth Annual Session Held in St. Paul, Minn., July 15-22, 1886*, edited by Isabel C. Barrows, 138–57. Boston: Press of Geo. H. Ellis, 1886.

Lewis, Denslow. "The Need of Publicity in Venereal Prophylaxis." *Medical Record: A Weekly Journal of Medicine and Surgery* 69, no. 22 (June 2, 1906): 863–65.

Lewis, Sinclair. *Elmer Gantry*. Project Gutenberg of Australia., 1927. <http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks03/0300851h.html>.

Lincoln, Steffens. *The Shame of the Cities*. New York: McClure, Phillips & Co., 1904. http://openlibrary.org/books/OL7222729M/The_shame_of_the_cities.

- Linder, Marc. "From Street Urchins to Little Merchants: The Juridical Transvaluation of Child Newspaper Carriers." *Temple Law Review* 63 (1990): 829–64.
- Lindsay, Samuel McCune. "New York as a Sociological Laboratory." In *Proceedings of the National Conference on Universities and Public Service*, edited by Edward A. Fitzpatrick, 133–38. Madison, WI: Cantwell Printing Company, 1914.
- . "Seventh Annual Child Labor Conference." *The Survey*, April 22, 1911.
- . "The Study and Teaching of Sociology: The Annual Meeting of 1898." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 12 (July 1898): 1-.
- Lindsey, Ben B. "Juvenile Delinquency and Employment." *The Survey*, November 4, 1911.
- Lippmann, Walter. *Drift and Mastery: An Attempt to Diagnose the Current Unrest*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1914.
- Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. T. Tegg and Son, 1836.
- . *Locke: Two Treatises of Government*. Edited by Peter Laslett. Student Edition. Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- London, Jack. *The Apostate*. Girard, KS: The Appeal to Reason, 1906.
- . *The People of the Abyss*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1904.
- Lovejoy, Owen R. "Age Problems in Industrial Hygiene." *American Journal of Public Hygiene* 20, no. 2 (1910): 233–38.
- . "Annual Report of the General Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee." In *Child Employing Industries: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference, Boston, Massachusetts, January 13-16, 1910*, 205. New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1910.

<https://books.google.com/books?id=HvsbAAAAMAAJ&pg=PA207&dq=Child+Employing+Industries&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjD2YmQprPPAhULGR4KHe7gD6gQ6AEIzAB#v=onepage&q=Child%20Employing%20Industries&f=false>.

- . “Annual Report of the General Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee. For the Fifth Fiscal Year, Ended September 30, 1909.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 35 (March 1910): 195–206.
- . “Annual Report of the General Secretary of the National Child Labor Committee for the Sixth Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1910.” In *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference Birmingham, Alabama March 9-12, 1911*, 186–201. New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911.
- . “Child Labor and the Night Messenger Service.” *The Survey*, May 21, 1910.
- . “In the Shadow of the Coal Breaker.” New York: National Child Labor Committee, 1907.
- http://darrow.law.umn.edu/documents/Lovejoy_Shadow%20of%20Coal%20Breaker.pdf.
- . “Industrial Blind Alleys.” *New Boston*, January 1911.
- . “School-House or Coal-Breaker.” *Outlook*, August 26, 1905.
- . “Seven Years of Child Labor Reform.” In *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911*, 31–38. New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911.

https://books.google.com/books?id=D1w_AQAAMAAJ&pg=PA31&dq=%22seven+years+of+child+labor+reform%22+lovejoy&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi5h-uK3rHLAhVGkh4KHQvTDOMQ6AEIOjAE#v=onepage&q&f=false.

———. *The Federal Government and Child Labor: A Brief for the Palmer-Owen Child Labor Bill*. New York: Clarence S. Nathan, 1914.

———. “The Year in Child Labor Reform.” *The Survey*, May 29, 1909.

———. “The Year’s Progress in Child Labor Legislation.” *The Survey*, July 2, 1910.

———. “To the Editor: Night Messenger Service.” *The Survey*, December 24, 1910.

Lubove, Roy. *The Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career, 1880-1930*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Lucas, Stephen E. “The Renaissance of American Public Address: Text and Context in Rhetorical Criticism.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 74 (May 1988): 241–60.

———. “The Schism in Rhetorical Scholarship.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 67, no. 1 (February 1981): 1–20.

Lynd, Robert S., and Helen Merrell Lynd. *Middletown: A Study in Modern American Culture*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1956.

MacLean, Annie Marion. “The Sweat-Shop in Summer.” *American Journal of Sociology* 9, no. 3 (November 1903): 289–309.

———. “Two Weeks in Department Stores.” *American Journal of Sociology* 4, no. 6 (May 1899): 721–41.

———. “With Oregon Hop Pickers.” *American Journal of Sociology* 15, no. 1 (July 1909): 83–95.

- Macleod, David I. "Act Your Age: Boyhood, Adolescence, and the Rise of the Boy Scouts in America." In *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, edited by Harvey J. Graff, 397–413. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987.
- . *The Age of the Child: Children in America, 1890-1920*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1998.
- Mangold, George B. *Child Problems*. Edited by Richard T. Ely. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910.
- Markham, Edwin. "Edwin Markham's Eyrie." *Success Magazine*, November 1908.
- . "The Hoe-Man in the Making." *The Cosmopolitan; a Monthly Illustrated Magazine*, October 1906.
- Marmarelli, Ron. "William Hard as Progressive Journalist." *American Journalism* 3, no. 3 (1986): 142–53.
- Marosi, Richard. "In Mexico's Fields, Children Toil to Harvest Crops That Make It to American Tables." *Los Angeles Times*, December 14, 2014.
<http://graphics.latimes.com/product-of-mexico-children/>.
- Martin, Edward Winslow. *The Secrets of the Great City: A Work Descriptive of the Virtues and the Vices, the Mysteries, Miseries and Crimes of New York City*. Philadelphia, PA: National Publishing Company, 1868.
- Marty, Martin E. *Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America*. New York: Dial Press, 1970.
- Marzolf, Marion. "Ida Tarbell: Portrait of a Muckraker." *Journalism History* 12, no. 2 (Summer 1985): 71–72.

- Mason, Mary Ann. *From Father's Property to Children's Rights: The History of Child Custody in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- May, Henry F. *Protestant Churches and Industrial America*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949.
- McClure, S. S. "Concerning Three Articles in This Number of McClure's, and a Coincidence That May Set Us Thinking." *McClure's Magazine*, January 1903.
- . "The Tammanyizing of a Civilization." *McClure's Magazine*, November 1909.
- McGee, Michael Calvin. "The 'Ideograph': A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66, no. 1 (1980): 1–16.
- McGerr, Michael E. *A Fierce Discontent: The Rise and Fall of the Progressive Movement in America, 1870-1920*. New York: Free Press, 2003.
- McIntosh, Robert. *Boys in the Pits: Child Labour in Coal Mining*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000.
- McKelway, A. J. "New Territory." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 38 (July 1911): 139–43.
- Medhurst, Martin J. "Afterword: The Ways of Rhetoric." In *Beyond the Rhetorical Presidency*, 218–26. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1996.
- . "The History of Public Address as an Academic Study." In *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, edited by Shawn J. Parry-Giles and J. Michael Hogan, 17–66. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Mero, Everett B., ed. *American Playgrounds: Their Construction, Equipment, Maintenance and Utility*. Boston, MA: American Gymnasia Co., 1908.
- Merwin, Samuel. "The Magazine Crusade." *Success Magazine*, June 1906.

- “Messenger Boys Can Work at Night.” *The Survey*, January 8, 1910.
- “Messenger Boys Catch Strike Fever.” *The Washington Post*. August 1, 1899.
- Miller, Marion Mills, ed. *Great Debates in American History: From the Debates in the British Parliament on the Colonial Stamp Act (1764) to the Debates in Congress at the Close of the Taft Administration (1912-1913)*. Vol. 11. New York: Current Literature Publishing Company, 1913.
- Mills, C. Wright. “Mass Society and Liberal Education.” In *Power, Politics and People: The Collected Writings of C. Wright Mills*, edited by Irving Louis Horowitz, 353–73. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Minow, Martha. “Interpreting Rights: An Essay for Robert Cover.” *Yale Law Journal* 96 (July 1987): 1860–1915.
- Mintz, Steven. *Huck’s Raft: A History of American Childhood*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Miraldi, Robert. “Fictional Techniques in the Journalism of David Graham Phillips.” *American Journalism* 4, no. 4 (1987): 181–90.
- . “Introduction: Why the Muckrakers Are Still with Us.” In *The Muckrakers: Evangelical Crusaders*, xi–xix. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000.
- . “Muckraking the World’s Richest Church.” In *The Muckrakers: Evangelical Crusaders*, edited by Robert Miraldi, 53–70. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000.
- . “Scaring Off the Muckrakers with the Threat of Libel.” *Journalism Quarterly* 65, no. 3 (Fall 1988): 609–14.
- . “The Journalism of David Graham Phillips.” *Journalism Quarterly* 63, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 83–88.

- “Misery of ‘Breaker’ Boys in Pennsylvania Mines.” *Washington Post*, December 11, 1905.
- Modell, John, Frank F. Furstenberg Jr., and Theodore Hershberg. “Social Change and Transitions to Adulthood in Historical Perspective.” *Journal of Family History* 1, no. 1 (1976): 7–32.
- Morgan, Edmund S. *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1975.
- Morgan, J. Graham. “The Development of Sociology and the Social Gospel in America.” *Sociological Analysis* 30, no. 1 (1969): 43.
- Morrison, Ken. “The Disavowal of the Social in the American Reception of Durkheim.” *Journal of Classical Sociology* 1, no. 1 (2001): 95–125.
- “Mr. Daisey and the Apple Factory.” *This American Life*, January 6, 2012.
<http://www.thisamericanlife.org/radio-archives/episode/454/mr-daisey-and-the-apple-factory>.
- Mullins, Nicholas C., and Carolyn J. Mullins. *Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Muncy, Robyn. *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform, 1890-1935*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Murphy, Edgar Gardner. “Child Labor as a National Problem.” In *Proceedings of the Conference of Charities and Correction at the Thirteenth Annual Session Held in the City of Atlanta, May 6-12, 1903*, edited by Isabel C. Barrows, 121–34. Press of Fred J. Heer, 1903.
- N. W. “The Swift and the Slow.” *Puck*, April 1893.

- Nasaw, David. *Children of the City: At Work and at Play*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1985.
- Nathan, Maud. *The Story of an Epoch-Making Movement. Women & Children First*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1986.
- Neill, Charles P. "Child Labor at the National Capital." *Charities and The Commons*, March 3, 1906.
- "Nestlé Advances Child Labor Battle Plan." *The CNN Freedom Project: Ending Modern-Day Slavery*, June 29, 2012.
<http://thecnnfreedomproject.blogs.cnn.com/2012/06/29/nestle-advances-child-labor-battle-plan/>.
- New York University Catalogue and Announcements for 1898-1899*. New York: The Burr Printing House, 1899.
- Nichols, Francis H. "Children of the Coal Shadows." *McClure's Magazine*, February 1903.
- Nixon, Justin Wroe. "The Status and Prospects of the Social Gospel." *Journal of Religion* 22, no. 4 (1942): 348.
- "'Old Boy' Messengers: Western Union Telegraph Company Gives Up The 'Kids.'" *The Sun*. November 9, 1912.
- Olson, Kathryn M., and G. Thomas Goodnight. "Epochal Rhetoric in 19th-Century America: On the Discursive Instantiation of the Technical Sphere." In *Spheres of Argument: Proceedings of the Sixth SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation*, edited by Bruce E. Gronbeck, 57–65. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1989.

- Orleck, Annelise. *Common Sense and a Little Fire: Women and Working-Class Politics in the United States, 1900-1965*. University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- “Our Saloon Investigation for the Committee of Fifty.” *The Commons: A Monthly Record Devoted to Aspects of Life and Labor from the Social Settlement Point of View*, November 1900.
- Owens, B. Robert. “‘Laboratory Talk’ in U.S. Sociology, 1890-1930: The Performance of Scientific Legitimacy.” *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 50, no. 3 (2014): 302–20. doi:10.1002/jhbs.21667.
- Painter, Nell Irvin. *Standing at Armageddon: The United States, 1877-1919*. 1st ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 1987.
- Paliewicz, Nicholas S. “Global Warming and the Interaction between the Public and Technical Spheres of Argument: When Standards for Expertise Really Matter.” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48, no. 4 (2012): 231–42.
- Palmer, Bryan D. *Cultures of Darkness: Night Travels in the Histories of Transgression*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000.
- Park, Robert E. “The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the City Environment.” *American Journal of Sociology* 20, no. 5 (March 1915): 577–612.
- Parry-Giles, Shawn J., and J. Michael Hogan. “Introduction: The Study of Rhetoric and Public Address.” In *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, edited by Shawn J. Parry-Giles and J. Michael Hogan, 1–15. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

- Parry-Giles, Trevor. "For the Soul of the Supreme Court: Progressivism, Ethics, and 'Social Justice' in the 1916 'Trial' of Louis D. Brandeis." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 2, no. 1 (1999): 83–106. doi:10.1353/rap.2010.0039.
- Pauley, Garth E. *LBJ's American Promise: The 1965 Voting Rights Address*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007.
- Peabody, Francis Greenwood. *Jesus Christ and the Social Question: An Examination of the Teaching of Jesus in Its Relation to Some of the Problems of Modern Social Life*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1900.
- "Pennsylvania Three-Ply Child Labor Campaign." *The Survey*, March 18, 1911.
- Phillips, David Graham. "The Treason of the Senate." *The Cosmopolitan; a Monthly Illustrated Magazine*, March 1906.
- Pickus, Noah M. *True Faith and Allegiance: Immigration and American Civic Nationalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Pittenger, Mark. "A World of Difference: Constructing the 'Underclass' in Progressive America." *American Quarterly* 49, no. 1 (March 1997): 26–65.
- . *Class Unknown: Undercover Investigations of American Work and Poverty from the Progressive Era to the Present*. New York: New York University Press, 2012.
- Platt, Anthony M. "The Child Savers Reconsidered." In *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2009.
- . *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency*. Expanded 40th Anniversary Edition. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2009.
- Platt, Harold L. "Jane Addams and the Ward Boss Revisited: Class, Politics, and Public Health in Chicago, 1890-1930." *Environmental History* 5, no. 2 (2000).

- Pleck, Elizabeth Hafkin. *Domestic Tyranny: The Making of American Social Policy against Family Violence from Colonial Times to the Present*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987.
- Poole, Ernest. *The Harbor*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap Publishers, 1915.
- . “Waifs of the Street.” *McClure’s Magazine*, May 1903.
- Porter, Eleanor H. *Just David*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916.
- . *The Turn of the Tide: The Story of How Margaret Solved Her Problem*. A. L. Burt Company, 1908.
- Porter, Eleanor Hodgman. *Cross Currents: The Story of Margaret*. New York: A.L. Burt Company, 1907.
- . *Pollyanna*. Boston: The Page Co., 1913.
- . *The Story of Marco*. New York: A.L. Burt Company, 1911.
- Prelli, Lawrence J. “The Rhetorical Construction of Scientific Ethos.” In *Rhetoric in the Human Sciences*, edited by Herbert W. Simons, 48–68. London: Sage Publications, 1989.
- “Problems of City Life.” *The Independent*, October 25, 1915.
- Proceedings of the Conference on the Care of Dependent Children Held at Washington, D.C., January 25, 26, 1909*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1909.
- “Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the National Child Labor Committee.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 25, no. 3 (1905).
- “Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Conference on Child Labor under the Auspices of the National Child Labor Committee. Jacksonville, Fla., March 13-17, 1913.” *The Child Labor Bulletin* 2, no. 1 (May 1913): 145–74.

- “Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Conference on Child Labor under the Auspices of the National Child Labor Committee. New Orleans, La., March 15-18, 1914.” *The Child Labor Bulletin* 3, no. 1 (1914): 167–95.
- Puffer, J. Adams. *The Boy and His Gang*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1912.
- Putney, Clifford. *Muscular Christianity: Manhood and Sports in Protestant America, 1880-1920*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Rauschenbusch, Walter. “The Kingdom of God.” In *The Social Gospel in America 1870-1920*, edited by Robert T. Handy, 267. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Recchiuti, John Louis. *Civic Engagement: Social Science and Progressive-Era Reform in New York City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Reed, Mrs. Stanley S., and Mrs. E. L. Worthington. “The Kentucky Federation of Women’s Clubs at Mammoth Cave. Report of Meeting Read to Maysville Club by Mrs. Stanley F. Reed and Mrs. Leslie Worthington, Delegates.” *Daily Public Ledger*. June 27, 1912.
- Reilly, F. W. *Biennial Report of the Department of Health of the City of Chicago Being for the Years 1895 and 1896*. Chicago, IL: Cameron, Amberg & Co., 1897.
- Reisch, Michael. “The Sociopolitical Context and Social Work Method, 1890-1950.” *The Social Service Review* 72, no. 2 (1998): 161.
- “Reports from State and Local Child Labor Committees.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 38 (July 1911): 156–85.
- Riis, Jacob A. *How the Other Half Lives: Studies among the Tenements of New York*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1890.

- Riis, Jacob August. *Neighbors: Life Stories of the Other Half*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1919.
- Rodgers, Daniel T. "In Search of Progressivism." *Reviews in American History* 10, no. 4 (December 1982): 113–32.
- Rogers, Harry L. "Adding Efficiency to Messengers." *Nation's Business*, November 1928.
- Rogers, Henry Wade. "The Constitution and the New Federalism." *The North American Review* 188, no. 634 (September 1908): 321–35.
- Roosevelt, Theodore. "The Conservation of Childhood." In *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911*, 8–16. New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911.
- . "The Manly Virtues and Practical Politics." In *American Ideals and Other Essays, Social and Political*, 38–50. Philadelphia: Gebbie and Company, 1903.
- . *The Strenuous Life*. Homeward Bound Ed. New York: Review of Reviews Company, 1901.
- Root, Elihu. *How to Preserve the Local Self-Government of the States: A Brief Study of National Tendencies*. New York: Brentano's, 1907.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/njp.32101073360958>.
- Rose, Michael. "The Secular Faith of the Social Settlements: 'If Christ Came to Chicago.'" In *Settlements, Social Change, and Community Action*, 21. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2001.

- Rosenberg, Rosalind. *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism*.
New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Ross, Dorothy. "The Development of the Social Sciences." In *The Organization of
Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920*, edited by Alexandra Oleson and John
Voss, 107–38. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.
- Routzahn, E.G. "Survey of Civic Betterment." *The Chautauquan; A Weekly
Newsmagazine*, February 1906.
- Rowland, Robert C. "Spheres of Argument: 30 Years of Influence." *Argumentation &
Advocacy* 48, no. 4 (Spring 2012): 195–97.
- . "The Relationship between the Public and the Technical Spheres of Argument:
A Case Study of the Challenger Seven Disaster." *Central States Speech Journal*
37, no. 3 (1986): 136–46.
- Ruskin, John. *"Unto This Last": Four Essays on the First Principles of Political
Economy*. New York: J. Wiley & Sons, 1872.
- Ruthven, Noel. "Our Monster Telegraph System." *Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly*,
March 1881.
- Sallee, Shelley. *The Whiteness of Child Labor Reform in the New South*. Athens:
University of Georgia Press, 2004.
- "Samsung Factory Exploiting Child Labor ---- Investigative Report on HEG Electronics
(Huizhou) Co., Ltd. Samsung Supplier." *China Labor Watch*, August 7, 2012.
<https://chinalaborwatch.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/samsung8-271.pdf>.

- “Samsung: No Child Labor at China Supplier.” *Market Watch: The Wall Street Journal*, September 3, 2012. <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/samsung-no-child-labor-at-china-supplier-2012-09-03>.
- “Samsung to Review 250 Chinese Suppliers for Labor Violations.” *Chicago Tribune*, September 3, 2012. <http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/sns-rt-us-samsung-chinabre8820bw-20120903,0,2799652.story>.
- Sanborn, Alvan F. “A Study of Beggars and Their Lodgings.” *Forum*, April 1895.
- Schiappa, Edward. “Defining Marriage in California: An Analysis of Public and Technical Argument.” *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48, no. 4 (Spring 2012): 216–30.
- . “The Rhetoric of Nukespeak.” *Communication Monographs* 56, no. 3 (1989): 253–72.
- Schlossman, Steven L. “G. Stanley Hall and the Boys’ Club: Conservative Applications of Recapitulation Theory.” *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 9, no. 2 (1973): 140–47.
- Schmidt, James D. *Industrial Violence and the Legal Origins of Child Labor*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- . “‘Restless Movements Characteristic of Childhood’: The Legal Construction of Child Labor in Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts.” *Law and History Review* 23, no. 2 (2005): 315–50.
- Schneirov, Richard. *Labor and Urban Politics: Class Conflicts and the Origins of Modern Liberalism in Chicago, 1864-1897*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998.

- Schocket, Eric. "Undercover Explorations of the 'Other Half,' or the Writer as Class Transvestite." *Representations* 64 (Autumn 1998): 109–33.
- Schoff, Hannah Kent. "A Campaign for Childhood." In *Children's Courts in the United States: Their Origin, Development, and Results*, edited by Samuel J. Barrows, 133–43. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904.
- Schroeder, Theodore. "Prostitution as a Social Problem." *The Arena*, February 1909.
- Schudson, Michael. *The Good Citizen: A History of American Civic Life*. New York: The Free Press, 1998.
- Schwarze, Steve. "Performing Phronesis: The Case of Isocrates' Helen." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 32, no. 1 (1999): 78–95.
- Scott, Anne Firor. *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991.
- Scott, Elizabeth S. "The Legal Construction of Childhood." In *A Century of Juvenile Justice*, edited by Margaret K. Rosenheim, Franklin E. Zimring, David S. Tanenhaus, and Bernadine Dohrn, 113–41. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Scott, Leroy. "The Evils of the Night Messenger Service." *Success Magazine*, June 1910.
- Self, Lois S. "Rhetoric and Phronesis: The Aristotelian Ideal." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 12, no. 2 (1979): 130–45.
- Sergeant, Elizabeth Shepley. "Toilers of the Tenements: Where the Beautiful Things of the Great Shops Are Made." *McClure's Magazine*, July 1910.

- Seton, Ernest Thompson. *Boy Scouts of America: A Handbook of Woodcarving, Scouting, and Life-Craft*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1910.
<http://archive.org/details/boyscoutsofameri00seto>.
- Shaver, Lisa. “‘Serpents,’ ‘Fiends,’ and ‘Libertines’: Inscribing an Evangelical Rhetoric of Rage in the ‘Advocate of Moral Reform.’” *Rhetoric Review* 30, no. 1 (2011): 1–18. doi:10.1080/07350198.2011.530099.
- Sheldon, Charles M. *In His Steps: “What Would Jesus Do?”* Revised Edition. Chicago: Advance Publishing Company, 1899.
- Sillars, Malcolm O. “The Rhetoric of the Petition in Boots.” In *The Rhetoric of Protest and Reform, 1878-1898*, edited by Paul H. Boase, 17–35. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1980.
- Sklar, Katherine Kish. “The Consumers’ White Label Campaign of the National Consumers’ League, 1898-1918.” In *Getting and Spending: European and American Consumer Societies in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Susan Strasser, Charles McGovern, and Mattias Judd, 17–35. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Sklar, Kathryn Kish. “Two Political Cultures in the Progressive Era: The National Consumers’ League and the American Association for Labor Legislation.” In *U.S. History as Women’s History: New Feminist Essays*, edited by Linda K. Kerber, Alice Kessler-Harris, and Kathryn Kish Sklar, 36–62. Chapel Hill: Univ of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- Skocpol, Theda, Marjorie Abend-Wein, Christopher Howard, and Susan Goodrich Lehmann. “Women’s Associations and the Enactment of Mothers’ Pensions in the

- United States.” *The American Political Science Review* 87, no. 3 (1993): 686–701. doi:10.2307/2938744.
- Small, A. W. “The Era of Sociology.” *American Journal of Sociology* 1, no. 1 (July 1895): 1–15.
- Small, Albion W., and George E. Vincent. *An Introduction to the Study of Society*. New York: American Book Company, 1894.
- Smelser, Neil J. “Sociology: Spanning Two Centuries.” *The American Sociologist* 34, no. 3 (2003): 5–19.
- Smith, Christian. “Secularizing American Higher Education: The Case of Early American Sociology.” In *The Secular Revolution: Power, Interests, and Conflict in the Secularization of American Public Life*, 97–159. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Smith, Gary Scott. “When Stead Came to Chicago: The ‘Social Gospel Novel’ and the Chicago Civic Federation.” *American Presbyterian* 68, no. 3 (1990): 193–205.
- Smith, Munroe. “Introduction: The Domain of Political Science.” *Political Science Quarterly* 1, no. 1 (March 1886): 1–8. doi:10.2307/2139299.
- Smith, Nina. “Ending Child Labor: The Dirty Business of Cleaning Up Supply Chains.” *The Huffington Post*, June 10, 2016. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/skoll-foundation/ending-child-labor-the-di_b_10407714.html.
- Smith, Rogers M. *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.
- “Sociological Notes.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 6 (July 1895): 181–96.

- Soderlund, Gretchen. *Sex Trafficking, Scandal, and the Transformation of Journalism, 1885-1917*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013.
- Soguel, Dominique. "How Turkey Is Tackling Child Labor in Hazelnut Harvesting." *Christian Science Monitor*, September 7, 2015.
<http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2015/0907/How-Turkey-is-tackling-child-labor-in-hazelnut-harvesting>.
- Sommerville, Joseph A. "Experts in Moral Argument." In *Spheres of Argument: Proceedings of the Sixth SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation*, 81–85. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1989.
- Sovacool, Benjamin K. "Spheres of Argument Concerning Oil Exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge: A Crisis of Environmental Rhetoric?" *Environmental Communication* 2, no. 3 (2008): 340–61. doi:10.1080/17524030802396745.
- Spargo, John. *The Bitter Cry of the Children*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1909.
- Speakman, Joseph M. "The Inspector and His Critics: Child Labor Reform in Pennsylvania." *Pennsylvania History* 69, no. 2 (Spring 2002): 266–86.
- Standage, Tom. *The Victorian Internet: The Remarkable Story of the Telegraph and the Nineteenth Century's On-Line Pioneers*. New York: Walker and Company, 1998.
- Stansell, Christine. "Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets: Class and Gender Conflict in New York City, 1850-1860." In *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, edited by Harvey J. Graff, 301–19. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987.
- Stanton, Elizabeth Cady. *Eighty Years and More (1815-1897): Reminiscences of Elizabeth Cady Stanton*. New York: European Publishing Company, 1897.

- State of New York Preliminary Report of the Factory Investigating Commission*. Vol. 1. Albany, NY: The Argus Company Printers, 1912.
- “Statesmen and Politicians: Political Economy—No. 1.” *Niles’ Weekly Register*, June 7, 1817.
- Stead, William Thomas. *If Christ Came to Chicago: A Plea for the Union of All Who Love in the Service of All Who Suffer*. Chicago, IL: Laird & Lee, 1894.
- Steffens, Lincoln. “Ben B. Lindsey: The Just Judge: III.” *McClure’s Magazine (1893-1926)*, December 1906.
- Stein, Harry H. “American Muckrakers and Muckraking: The 50-Year Scholarship.” *Journalism Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (Spring 1979): 9–17.
- Sterett, Susan. “Serving the State: Constitutionalism and Social Spending, 1860s-1920s.” *Law & Social Inquiry* 22, no. 2 (1997): 311–56.
- Stillion Southard, Belinda A. “Militancy, Power, and Identity: The Silent Sentinels as Women Fighting for Political Voice.” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10, no. 3 (Fall 2007): 399–417.
- . *Militant Citizenship: Rhetorical Strategies of the National Woman’s Party, 1913-1920*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2011.
- Stob, Paul. “Pragmatism, Experience, and William James’s Politics of Blindness.” *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 44, no. 3 (2011): 227–.
- Storrs, Landon R. Y. *Civilizing Capitalism: The National Consumers’ League, Women’s Activism, and Labor Standards in the New Deal Era*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

- Stovall, A. T. "Standards Proposed by United States Commission on Uniform Laws." In *Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, 17–23*. New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911.
- Stoy, Elinor H. "Child-Labor." *The Arena*, December 1, 1906.
- Stratton-Porter, Gene. *Freckles*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap Publishers, 1904.
- . *Michael O'Halloran*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1915.
- <http://books.google.com/books?id=TqNEAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=Michael+O%27Halloran&hl=en&sa=X&ei=5epkVPDgBsflsATAqYDACg&ved=0CB0Q6AEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=false>.
- Strong, Josiah. "Local Alliances." *American Journal of Sociology* 1, no. 2 (1895): 175.
- . *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis*. New York: Baker & Taylor, 1885.
- . *Religious Movements for Social Betterment*. New York: Baker & Taylor, 1900.
- . *The Next Great Awakening*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1913.
- "Summary of the Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage Earners in the United States." Women in Industry Series. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1916.
- Taft, Philip, and Philip Ross. "American Labor Violence: Its Causes, Character, and Outcome." edited by Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr, 1:221–94. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1969.

- Tanenhaus, David S. "Between Dependency and Liberty: The Conundrum of Children's Rights in the Gilded Age." *Law and History Review* 23, no. 2 (2005): 351–85.
- Tanner, Amy E. "Glimpses at the Mind of a Waitress." *American Journal of Sociology* 13, no. 1 (July 1907): 48–55.
- Taylor, Charles Alan. *Defining Science: A Rhetoric of Demarcation*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996.
- Taylor, Graham. "A Quiz on Trades Unions." *Chicago Daily News*, March 14, 1903.
- . *Pioneering on Social Frontiers*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1930.
- . "Social Aspects of Life and Labor." *Chicago Daily News*, November 22, 1902.
- . "The Social Function of the Church." *American Journal of Sociology* 5, no. 3 (1899): 310.
- . "What Chicago Needed for Christmas." *Chicago Daily News*, December 26, 1903.
- The Child Workers of the Nation: Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois, January 21-23, 1909*. New York, 1909.
- https://books.google.com/books?id=qA0XAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false.
- "The Columbus Juvenile Court." *The Juvenile Court Record*, April 1910.
- The Compact with the Charter and Laws of the Colony of New Plymouth: Together with the Charter of the Council at Plymouth and an Appendix, Containing the Articles of Confederation of the United Colonies of New England, and Other Valuable Documents*. Boston, MA: Dutton and Wentworth, 1836.
- "The Crusade Against Vivisection." *Cosmopolitan Magazine*, May 1910.

“The Eight-Hour Day and Prohibition of Night Work. Report of Public Hearing Before Committee on Labor, General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.” In *Child Employing Industries: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference Boston, Massachusetts, January 13-16, 1910*, 239–74. New York, 1910.

http://books.google.com/books?id=vtAJAAAIAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbg_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false.

“The Messenger Service.” *Journal of The Telegraph* 3, no. 12 (May 15, 1870): 146.

The Social Evil in Chicago: A Study of Existing Conditions with Recommendations by The Vice Commission of Chicago. Chicago, IL: Gunthrop-Warren Printing Company, 1911.

“The Social Gospel.” *The Biblical World* 40, no. 3 (1912): 147.

Third Annual Report of the Children’s Aid Society. New York: M.B. Wynkoop, Book and Job Printer, 1856.

http://books.google.com/books?id=uDsVAAAAIAAJ&pg=RA1-PA5&dq=Children%27s+Aid+Society+Third+Annual+Report&hl=en&sa=X&ei=vN-SUbiIC9P_4AOq_oHgBQ&ved=0CE0Q6AEwBg#v=onepage&q=Children%27s%20Aid%20Society%20Third%20Annual%20Report&f=false.

Thompson, E. P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1963.

———. “Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism.” *Past & Present*, no. 38 (December 1967): 56–97.

- Thornton, Brian. "Muckraking Journalists and Their Readers: Perceptions of Professionalism." *Journalism History* 21, no. 1 (Spring 1995): 29.
- Tiffin, Susan. *In Whose Best Interest? Child Welfare Reform in the Progressive Era*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982.
- Toft, Jessica, and Laura S. Abrams. "Progressive Maternalists and the Citizenship Status of Low-Income Single Mothers." *Social Service Review* 78, no. 3 (2004): 447–65. doi:10.1086/421921.
- Tolman, Frank L. "The Study of Sociology in Institutions of Learning in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 8, no. 1 (1902): 116.
- Tonn, Mari Boor. "Radical Labor in a Feminine Voice: The Rhetoric of Mary Harris 'Mother' Jones and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn." In *The Rhetoric of Nineteenth-Century Reform*, edited by Martha S. Watson and Thomas R. Burkholder, 5:223–53. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2008.
- "Topics of the Times. Messenger Boys in Peril." *New York Times*, May 2, 1910.
- Trattner, Walter I. *Crusade for the Children: A History of the National Child Labor Committee and Child Labor Reform in America*. Chicago, IL: Quadrangle Books, 1970.
- . "The First Federal Child Labor Law (1916)." *Social Science Quarterly* 50, no. 3 (1969): 507–24.
- Troen, Selwyn K. "The Discovery of the Adolescent by American Educational Reformers, 1900-1920: An Economic Perspective." In *Growing Up in America: Historical Experiences*, edited by Harvey J. Graff, 414–25. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1987.

- Trolander, Judith Ann. *Professionalism and Social Change: From the Settlement House Movement to Neighborhood Centers, 1886 to the Present*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.
- Truth, Sojourner. "Speech to the Anniversary Convention of the American Equal Rights Association." In *American Rhetorical Discourse*, edited by Ronald F. Reid and James F. Klumpp, 3rd ed., 635–36. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 2005.
- Turner, George Kibbe. "The City of Chicago: A Study of the Great Immoralities." *McClure's Magazine*, April 1907.
- . "The Daughters of the Poor: A Plain Story of the Development of New York City as a Leading Center of the White Slave Trade of the World, Under Tammany Hall." *McClure's Magazine (1893-1926)*, November 1909.
- Twain, Mark. *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1917.
- "Typhoid Fever Is Menacing City." *Chicago Daily Tribune*, August 6, 1903.
- Unger, Irwin, and Debi Unger. *The Vulnerable Years: The United States, 1896-1917*. Hinsdale, Ill.: Dryden Press, 1977.
- Uniform Child Labor Laws: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, March 9-12, 1911*. New York: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1911.
- Upton, Harriet Taylor, ed. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Convention of the National-American Woman Suffrage Association, Held in Washington, D.C., February 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, 1894*. Warren, OH: Chronicle Print, 1894.

- U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Cities, Towns, Villages, and Boroughs, 1890*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1890.
- http://www2.census.gov/prod2/decennial/documents/1890a_v1-12.pdf.
- Van Vorst, Mrs. John, and Marie Van Vorst. *The Woman Who Toils: Being the Experiences of Two Ladies as Factory Girls*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1903.
- Vincent, George E. "The Province of Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 1, no. 4 (January 1896): 473–91.
- "Wage & Hour Divisions (WHD) - Employment/Age Certificate." *U.S. Department of Labor*, January 1, 2016.
- <https://www.dol.gov/whd/state/certification.htm#Maryland>.
- Wander, Philip. "The Ideological Turn in Modern Criticism." *Central States Speech Journal* 34 (1983): 1–18.
- Ward, Lester F. *Outlines of Sociology*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1898.
- . "The Place of Sociology among the Sciences." *American Journal of Sociology* 1, no. 1 (July 1895): 16–27.
- Warnick, Barbara. "Judgment, Probability, and Aristotle's Rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 75, no. 3 (1989): 299–311.
- Warnotte, D. "The Solvay Institute of Sociology, Brussels." *The Survey*, September 11, 1909.
- Washington, Booker T. *Up from Slavery: An Autobiography*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1907.

- Watson, Martha S., and Thomas R. Burkholder. "Introduction: The Gilded Age and the New America." In *The Rhetoric of Nineteenth-Century Reform*, edited by Martha S. Watson and Thomas R. Burkholder, xix–xxi. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2008.
- Weinberg, Arthur, and Lila Weinberg, eds. *The Muckrakers: The Era in Journalism That Moved America to Reform - The Most Significant Magazine Articles of 1902 - 1912*. New York: Capricorn Books, 1964.
- Wells, Karen. "Child Saving or Child Rights: Depictions of Children in International NGO Campaigns on Conflict." *Journal of Children and Media* 2, no. 3 (2008): 235–50. doi:10.1080/17482790802327475.
- Wertheim, Elsa. "Chicago Children in the Street Trades." Juvenile Protective Association, 1917.
- Wharton, Edith. *The Age of Innocence*. New York: Windsor Editions, 1920.
- "What Becomes of the Lazy Boy? How Does He End His Days?" *The Juvenile Court Record*, June 1909.
- "What T. J. Morgan Has to Say. The Notable Feature of the Afternoon Meeting at Central Music Hall." *Chicago Tribune*. November 13, 1893.
- Whisnant, David E. "Selling the Gospel News, or: The Strange Career of Jimmy Brown the Newsboy." *Journal of Social History* 5, no. 3 (1972): 269–309.
- White, Deborah Gray. *Too Heavy a Load: Black Women in Defense of Themselves, 1894-1994*. 1st ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 1999.

- Wichelns, Herbert A. "The Literary Criticism of Oratory." In *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans*, edited by A. M. Drummond. New York: The Century Co., 1925.
- Wiebe, Robert H. *The Search for Order, 1877-1920*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1980.
- Wiggin, Kate Douglas. "Children's Rights." *Scribner's Magazine*, August 1892.
- Williams, Raymond. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Rev. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Williams, Robin M., Jr. "Sociology in America: The Experience of Two Centuries." *Social Science Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (1976): 77–111.
- Wilson, Kirt H. "The Racial Contexts of Public Address: Interpreting Violence During the Reconstruction Era." In *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, edited by Shawn J. Parry-Giles and J. Michael Hogan, 203–28. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Wines, Frederick Howard. "Sociology and Philanthropy." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 12 (July 1898): 49–57.
- Wischnewetzky, Florence Kelley. *Our Toiling Children*. Chicago: Women's Temperance Publication Association, 1889. <http://ocp.hul.harvard.edu/dl/ww/004521168>.
- Wishy, Bernard. *The Child and the Republic: The Dawn of Modern American Child Nurture*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1967.
- "With 'Everybody's' Publishers." *Everybody's Magazine*, January 1908.
- "With 'Everybody's' Publishers." *Everybody's Magazine*, January 1909.

- Wohl, R. Richard. "The 'Country Boy' Myth and Its Place in American Urban Culture: The Nineteenth Century Contribution." *Perspectives in American History* 3 (1969): 77–156.
- Woirol, Gregory R. *In the Floating Army: F.C. Mills on Itinerant Life in California, 1914*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992.
- Wood, Stephen B. *Constitutional Politics in the Progressive Era: Child Labor and the Law*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Woods, Robert A. "The Neighborhood in Social Reconstruction." *American Journal of Sociology* 19, no. 5 (1914): 577–91.
- . "University Settlements." *The Andover Review* 18 (October 1892): 323.
- Woodward, C. M. *Manual Training in Education*. New York: Scribner & Welford, 1890.
- Wrage, Ernest J. "Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 33 (1947): 451–57.
- Young, Ella Flagg. "Scientific Method in Education." In *The Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, 3:143–55. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1903.
http://books.google.com/books?id=tWxMAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA144&lpg=PA144&dq=%22attitude+of+the+scientist+is+that+of+the+intelligent+seeker+after+truth%22&source=bl&ots=e2TR1jOKMN&sig=v_N-IUYetlFOu3Ki78h3tTB2eKY&hl=en&sa=X&ei=WJ8xU7mAFM6L0QHG_4GgAQ&ved=0CEMQ6AEwAw#v=onepage&q&f=false.
- Younger, Maud. "The Diary of an Amateur Waitress." *McClure's Magazine*, March 1907.

Zarefsky, David. "Argument Fields." In *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, edited by Thomas O. Sloane, 37–40. Oxford University Press, 2001.

———. "Goodnight's 'Speculative Inquiry' in Its Intellectual Context." *Argumentation & Advocacy* 48 (Spring 2012): 211–15.

———. "Reflections on Making the Case." In *Making the Case: Advocacy and Judgment in Public Argument*, edited by Kathryn M. Olson, Michael William Pfau, Benjamin Ponder, and Kirt H. Wilson, 1–15. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2012.

<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/umd/reader.action?docID=10603801>.

Zelizer, Viviana A. Rotman. *Pricing the Priceless Child: The Changing Social Value of Children*. New York: Basic Books, 1985.

Zuckerman, Michael. "The Paradox of American Adolescence." *The Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth* 4, no. 1 (2011): 11–25.

doi:10.1353/hcy.2011.0014.

Legislation:

An Act Regulating the Employment of Persons as Messengers for the Distribution, Transmission or Delivery of Goods, Messages or the Performance of Other Service (1911), *Cumulative Supplement to the Compiled Statutes of New Jersey*, ch. 363 (1924).

An Act Relating to Child Labor (1911), *Laws of the State of New Hampshire*, ch. 162 (Concord, NH: Secretary of State of the State of New Hampshire, 1911),

<https://archive.org/stream/lawsstateofnew1911newh#page/176/mode/2up>.

An Act Relative to Employment in the Night Messenger Service (June 28, 1911), *Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, ch. 629 (1911), 713, *An Act Relative to Employment in the Night Messenger Service, Chap. 629*, 1911, <http://archives.lib.state.ma.us/actsResolves/1911/1911acts0629.pdf>.

An Act to Amend an Act Entitled "An Act Regulating the Employment of Child Labor,..." (February 21, 1911), *General Laws of the State of Oregon*, ch. 138 (1913).

An Act to Amend Subsections... (June 30, 1911), *Wisconsin Session Laws*, ch. 851 (1911), 567-576.

An Act to Prohibit the Employment of Telegraph, Telephone, or Messenger Companies as Messengers of Any Persons Under Fourteen Years of Age (April 8, 1910), *Laws of Maryland*, ch. 587 (1910).

An Act to Provide for the Health, Safety, and Welfare of Minors (May 13, 1915), *Laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, ch. 177 (1915), 286-89.

An Act to Supplement Section 12996 of the General Code Relating to Restricting the Employment of Boys in Messenger Service at Night (May 10, 1910), *Ohio Revised Statutes* (1910).

U.S. Congress. Congressional Record. 59th Cong., 2nd sess., 1907. Vol. 41, pt. 4.

U.S. Congress, "Naturalization Act, 1790 (excerpt)," U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, *American History Online*, Facts On File, Inc., accessed May 7, 2015, <http://www.fofweb.com/activelink2.asp?ItemID=WE52&iPin=E14167&SingleRecord=True>.