*The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* **16** (2017), 163–182
doi:10.1017/S1537781416000645

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

***Emily Mieras***

# IN SEARCH OF A “A MORE PERFECT SYMPATHY”: HARVARD’S PHILLIPS BROOKS HOUSE ASSOCIATION AND THE CHALLENGES OF STUDENT VOLUNTARISM

This article examines an early twentieth-century town-gown conflict to illuminate the class and religious tensions that complicated student voluntarism at Harvard University, where the Phillips Brooks House Association (PBHA) formed in 1900 to unify the university’s religious and service organizations. With PBHA, Harvard joined universities across the country in promoting student service and joining Progressive Era reform initiatives. The controversy following a student’s talk at a Protestant Boston church—where the speaker criticized predominantly Catholic East Cambridge—shows why university representatives had trouble achieving their goals. In the decade following, PBHA struggled to articulate its mission, torn between its commitment to the Protestant Christian Association and a more secular approach, while striving to train effective volunteers and establish smooth relationships with professional social service organizations. This story of PBHA’s early years exemplifies the challenges universities faced as they sought to put idealism into practice and transform students into social servants.

In February 1903, Harvard student Phillips Endecott Osgood ’04 made headlines when he took to the pulpit and called East Cambridge “the most neglected district within a radius of 10 miles of Boston.”[1] He also jeopardized the tenuous relationship between Catholic neighborhood leaders and Protestant social reformers in Boston and Cambridge, where Harvard students were joining progressive reformers in settlement house work. Preaching on a Sunday at the Park Street Congregational Church in Boston, Osgood reportedly said, “East Cambridge was once a decent residential part of Cambridge, but the people are moving out of there, simply because they say: ‘It is the wrong sort of a place—we can’t stand that any longer.’”[2]

Osgood was describing the “philanthropic work” of his Harvard peers at Harvard House, a social settlement in the working-class eastern section of Cambridge, where, he said, his fellow student Christian Association members sought to put faith into action. *The Boston Herald* ran away with the story, headlining its report, “A Whitechapel Town.” As if this reference to the infamous poor and crime-plagued neighborhood of London—once home to Jack the Ripper but also the site of Toynbee Hall, the social settlement that inspired a generation of American reformers—were not enough, the *Herald*

Emily Mieras, Stetson University; email: emieras@stetson.edu

© *Society for Historians of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*

summed up, "What A Harvard Man Says East Cambridge May Be. /The Prosperous People are All Moving Elsewhere. /Harvard is Working Hard to Save the Neighborhood."[3] This interpretation, portraying the university as a white knight swooping in to save a declining neighborhood, inspired fierce responses from the East Cambridge community and religious leaders who saw their neighborhood as anything but passive and declining, and Harvard students as not much in the way of saviors.

Within a week, the East Cambridge Catholic parish leadership responded with a pamphlet titled "Is East Cambridge a 'Whitechapel Town'?" The pamphlet summed up the events, excerpting Osgood's speech, the *Herald* story, the letter from the parish's Father John O' Brien to the *Herald*, Osgood's letter of apology, and O'Brien's reply to Osgood, in which he called for ending "all Harvard student work in East Cambridge."[4] Critics sarcastically dismissed Osgood: "this sage authority, whom nobody had ever heard of before," and suggested that "vice" was more likely to be found at Harvard than in East Cambridge. One called Osgood an "innocent lambkin," while another suggested most student service was "shallow, misinformed and absurd."[5] The ensuing controversy simmered for weeks, with the *Boston Sacred Heart Review*, the paper of the Boston archdiocese, publishing frequent updates, local papers weighing in, and East Cambridge religious leaders mobilizing to defend their community from the libel they perceived.

Clearly, Osgood touched a nerve. But why did the words of a twenty-year-old college student speaking at a church across the river from East Cambridge on a February Sunday generate such a response? The answer lies less in what Osgood actually said and more in what he represented. Not merely an earnest young man at a pulpit, he symbolized the class and religious tensions that characterized interactions between the university, its student volunteers, and the local community. In an era when Harvard students joined the larger Progressive Era social reform movement, volunteering by the hundreds at city settlement houses and other organizations, Osgood stood in for all these students and their motivations. The Osgood incident, as some locals called it, reveals the class and religious tensions that complicated student voluntarism and the many approaches that college students, their advocates, and community leaders took to social reform.

When Osgood spoke at the Park Street Church, he was at once student and teacher, reformer and preacher. But neighborhood religious leaders did not welcome these self-appointed roles. As his negative reception by East Cambridge leaders made clear, Osgood represented a host of offenses perpetrated by middle-class social reformers blind to the cultural particularities of working-class neighborhoods and committed to furthering their own religious and even elitist agendas. To O'Brien and other parish leaders, Osgood must have seemed only the latest in a wave of incursions by Protestant reformers in Catholic neighborhoods.[6] Osgood's sermon underlined both the philosophical differences between Protestant and Catholic reform and the Catholic Church's larger anxieties about Protestant influences on neighborhood and family life.[7]

The Osgood incident forms one strand in the larger story of Harvard students' turn-of-the-twentieth-century voluntarism. Osgood's speech reflected on his fellow students who volunteered through the student Christian Association (CA), the university's branch of the Young Men's Christian Association, which had established chapters on college campuses across the country in the late nineteenth century.[8] Harvard students also organized the university's Social Service Committee and the Prospect Union night school. These

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

groups, recently united in the new Phillips Brooks House (PBH), were about to form the Phillips Brooks House Association (PBHA), which institutionalized student social service efforts at Harvard.[9] Set against this larger effort, the Osgood incident illustrates the challenges for student volunteers who idealistically crossed town-gown boundaries to fight urban poverty. In the years following Osgood's speech, PBHA leaders debated their mission, the place of Protestant Christianity in their organization, and the best means to train responsible volunteers. While Osgood's speech suggests that students wandered blithely into city neighborhoods without thinking about the implications, the efforts PBHA leaders took to build their institution show otherwise. Examining the Osgood incident in relation to the larger universe of Harvard student voluntarism in this period reveals a multifaceted student service movement that sometimes fell short in the ways Osgood's critics charged, but other times soared, promising to transcend lines of class and faith and forge what one volunteer called "a more perfect sympathy" with the poor and working-class people of Boston and Cambridge.[10]

Osgood and his Harvard peers were neither the first nor only college students to answer a call to service. In the Progressive Era, college students became crucial practitioners of the voluntarism sweeping the nation.[11] They ran reading rooms, led boys and girls clubs, volunteered at settlement houses and city missions, and taught English to their own college maids.[12] Their work helped redefine their identities as educated women and men as well as the role of colleges and universities in responding to the challenges of modernization. As Steven J. Diner has described, universities in this period established extension schools, settlement houses, and other means of community outreach.[13] Students themselves performed the day-to-day work. Caught up in the national effort to make universities relevant to contemporary social challenges, student service advocates promoted collegians' special suitability for service emphasizing that service would transform the students themselves.[14] Yet in the copious scholarship on Progressive Era social reform, the role college students played as volunteers, and the ways that work shaped their sense of self, their institutions, and the relationships between town and gown, has gone largely unexamined.[15]

This article addresses that omission by examining Harvard students' contributions to Progressive Era social reform. Historians have understood the period's reformers in various ways. Moving beyond interpreting social reform as a form of social control, recent scholars have emphasized how reform initiatives gave well-meaning middle- and upper-class Americans means to reconcile their own discomfort with poverty and the widening class gap.[16] For example, Shelton Stromquist argues that Progressive Era reformers, from their various standpoints, "crafted a common language that stressed the paramount need for social reconciliation in the service of democratic renewal" but did not, with some exceptions, question "the fundamental structures of social power and property."[17] Stromquist asserts that progressive reformers formed a "movement" committed to resolving class differences while relying on a "universalistic" conception of "the people" that was "broadly conceived and undifferentiated by class interests."[18] For Michael McGerr, these reformers wanted to "transform other Americans, to remake the nation's feuding, polyglot population in their own image."[19] The students who volunteered in city and rural settlement houses and other charitable organizations, along with the professors and professional social workers who mentored them, fit both understandings. They were not a monolithic group. Even within one university,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

student reformers had different understandings of reform. At Harvard, student reformers displayed the universalistic idealism of Francis Greenwood Peabody, founder of the Prospect Union, a school for working-class men that predated PBHA and the first waves of CA voluntarism by nearly a decade. But Osgood and the CA also displayed a universalistic approach to religion, elevating their own Protestantism while sublimating the tensions between Catholic and Protestant reformers.

This study also challenges assumptions about men and women's roles in progressive social reform. While scholars have rightly emphasized the major roles middle-class women played in pioneering urban reform organizations, men were by no means absent. They were counted among the movement's major leaders, but they were also counted by the thousands among students who volunteered at settlement houses, reading rooms, boys' clubs, and other charitable sites. This article tells the story of some men—adult educators and reformers and student volunteers—who shaped this movement. Though gender considerations take a backseat in this telling, they were integral to students' understanding of their mission and their approach to working-class men and boys.

Encouraged by educators and social reformers, student volunteers were inspired by faith, altruism, passion for self-improvement, and a desire to bridge the widening class gap in American society. Like many of their mentors, these students believed they had a special responsibility for improving the lives of America's poor.[20] In practice, they often fell short of these goals, blocked by the very class and educational advantages they believed made them worthy ambassadors across class lines. The Osgood affair represents these challenges. In the early years of Phillips Brooks House, its leaders struggled to articulate their mission and develop an effective strategy for putting ideals into practice. They had good material to work with, building on more than a decade's worth of student voluntarism by the CA, the Social Service Committee, and the Prospect Union.

### *LAUNCHING HARVARD SERVICE: FROM THE PROSPECT UNION TO PBHA*

Before Phillips Brooks House came the Prospect Union. A night school for working-class men founded in 1891 by faculty and students and enduring into the 1910s, the Union established Harvard on the city's social reform landscape. With it, Harvard joined other universities whose administrators were making their mark as social reformers.[21] In the same era, Northwestern established the University Settlement (1891); the University of Pennsylvania Christian Association began University House (1898); and members of several women's colleges formed the College Settlements Association (1889), to name only a few.[22] Like those projects, the Prospect Union transported students from their familiar environment. The Union's working-class Cambridgeport neighborhood was close in distance but far in life experience.[23]

Like many Progressive Era social reformers, the Union's founders hoped to cross class boundaries but were too attached to their own worldview to make the journey. David B. Potts argues that the Union had a fundamentally conservative approach to social change, focusing on "self-help."[24] However, the Union's rhetoric suggested a more complex set of possibilities, as Union founder and Plummer Professor Francis Greenwood Peabody expressed:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> Here was a large body of men in Cambridge who had to work with their hands all day, but who were full of interest in the problems of the day, and saw the advantage of intellectual training; and here on the other hand, was a great University instructing a great number of young men in these same subjects of the intellectual life. Why not bring these two sets of men together? Why not make of the University, not merely a cistern to receive the water of culture, but a stream to convey it to other thirsty minds?[25]

Peabody acknowledged the potential of these men who worked "with their hands," even as he elevated college students as "culture" bearers to the masses. Four years in, the Union's chroniclers claimed success:

> [The working-men's] mental outlook is enlarged, the horizon of their understanding is broadened. … Wrong ideas of things and men are gradually dissipated. Possibilities of usefulness, resources of happiness, healthy ambitions have come to many a man whose life before had been a monotonous routine. Within him have been born a truer sense of the worth of men simply as men, a comprehension of the privileges of manliness and of knowledge, a sense of kinship with the best that men have been and done.[26]

This language revealed a gendered understanding of class identity along with a belief that an educated man had a superior view of the world. Potts describes these goals as the "conversion" of workingmen, which resonates with McGerr's understanding of progressives remaking others in their own image.[27]

However, working men might well have turned this education to their own ends. The Prospect Union's agenda held the potential for more radical transformation. Student volunteers taught history, economics, philosophy, and the natural sciences, along with reading, elocution, mathematics, and penmanship.[28] Visiting lecturers discussed Socialism, Anarchism, Woman's Suffrage, Trade Unionism, or "sources of happiness." Labor leader Eugene Debs, women's rights activist Lucy Stone, and social reformer Robert A. Woods made appearances. This curriculum held as much possibility for empowerment as containment. Within a few years, local membership reached 600, and about 60 students had volunteered as teachers.[29] Class attendance averaged 350 by 1895 and the Union, by then located in Cambridge's Old City Hall, offered more than 50 classes a week.[30]

The Union seemed a promising place for a young reformer seeking common ground with "men simply as men," its members "black and white; twenty or more different nationalities; Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Agnostics; Republicans, Democrats, Independents, Prohibitionists, Populists," and Labor Party members. Indeed, most people were admitted, as long as they were male. Women could attend only "ladies' night" every six weeks.[31] Union leaders claimed this exclusion would make the men more comfortable, as they would "feel … less timidity in exposing their deficiencies" without women present.[32] For one student, the Union was where "student meets workingman on an equal footing of common manhood."[33] Perhaps shared "manhood" could help collegians transcend their differences with Cambridge's working-class men. Many of the period's reformers made shared manhood a tool of reform, from YMCA leaders who hoped to "uplift workingmen" to settlement house workers who drew on an ideal of "social friendship" that eroticized cross-class relationships between reformers and reformed.[34]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Peabody also invoked a common humanity: "It is good for Harvard students to have real friendships with the artisans of Cambridge, to know the problems and tastes of men brought up in other ways than theirs, to learn how other honest men are living," he wrote.[35] An ideal of shared manhood and reciprocity defined the Union's mission—very different from the top-down approach Osgood described nearly a decade later. Peabody also hoped the Union would challenge negative views of undergraduates: "It is good for workingmen to learn that Harvard is not a place of mere idleness and dissipation, but abounds in earnest and manly youths."[36] Meanwhile, a student volunteer would leave the Union "prepared for the struggle which awaits him" with "an insight into the actual conditions of life."[37] Such language was typical of Progressive Era social reformers, particularly settlement house workers who often described their work as "definite" and "practical" responses to the challenges of modern life.[38] PBHA inherited this mission, but it also inherited the CA's evangelical reform. As Osgood's speech made clear, these methods were not the same. Determining the organization's direction preoccupied PBHA leaders for more than a decade.

Phillips Brooks House, the home of PBHA, opened in 1900 in a secluded corner of Harvard Yard. With its sturdy brick façade and comfortable rooms, the house was solid yet welcoming. Proclaiming "Piety, Charity, Hospitality," the building housed the CA, the St. Paul's Catholic Club, St. Paul's Episcopal Society, the Social Service Committee, and representatives of the Prospect Union. At its grand opening, Peabody hoped for cooperation between these different groups, asking, "might not … the whole social life of the University might be dignified, chastened, and uplifted by this unconstrained relation with religious faith?"[39] For Peabody, this moment culminated a career of social activism. In addition to cofounding the Union, he had infused his "social ethics" courses with a scientific approach that combined the "sentiment" of earlier charity ventures with the methodologies of Progressive Era social science.[40] Peabody founded Harvard's Department of Social Ethics and, in 1907, established the Social Museum to support it.[41] Museum curators collected social reform photographs from around the globe.[42] Peabody used this museum to teach his students about social problems.[43] PBHA, with its CA still furthering an approach more "sentimental" than "scientific," seemed to be doing the work of two eras.

PBHA founders also drew inspiration from the legendary Episcopal Bishop Phillips Brooks of Boston (1835–1893), a Harvard graduate.[44] Renowned for his interdenominationalism and personal charisma, Brooks had attracted thousands to his sermons, offering a progressive vision of Christianity and calling for worshippers to make a personal connection to God. In a time marked by increasing secularism, Brooks's "Christian humanism" reassured his followers.[45]

Phillips Brooks House opened in a university sympathetic to social reform. Like many of his fellow university presidents, Harvard's long-time leader, Charles W. Eliot, believed in making the university relevant to social issues.[46] Eliot envisioned a university that would serve society, though not necessarily a place that would eliminate differences of class, talent, and social position.[47] Hugh Hawkins writes that for Eliot, "The university … was for the people, but not of them."[48] Eliot had his detractors, but over nearly forty years wielded enormous influence in shaping Harvard and, in company with like-minded university presidents, setting the direction for American higher education. Like other leaders of his times, from settlement house heads to Theodore Roosevelt, Eliot adopted an action-oriented

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

language of manhood: "We seek to train doers, achievers, men whose successful careers are much subservient to the public good. We are not interested here in producing languid observers of the world, mere spectators in the game of life, or fastidious critics of other men's labors."[49] Eliot was less interested in maintaining the CA's religious mission at PBHA, a stance in step with his ideas about the role of religion in the university. As Julie A. Reuben describes, Eliot supported a nonsectarian, tolerant religiosity as the key to liberal arts learning.[50]

Peabody hoped for "common ground" between the groups that organized officially into the Phillips Brooks House Association in 1904.[51] But finding common ground was not always easy. The CA had been central in PBHA's founding, and it dominated the organization's mission and leadership for the first two decades.[52] Meanwhile, the reformist mission of the Union and the loosely organized Social Service Committee helped set the agenda.[53] The Catholic Club soon became a marginal player in PBHA activities.[54]

Though Osgood was part of PBHA, his main allegiance was to the CA. Adopting the Social Gospel approach that influenced evangelical Christianity at the turn of the twentieth century, the CA vigorously promoted student voluntarism. Like many student Christian Associations across the country, the Harvard group shifted from campus missionizing to community reform.[55] CA member Arthur Holcombe implored his fellow students to accept social responsibility: "We cannot, we must not, live for ourselves alone; from each according to his ability the world expects, and has a right to expect, contributions toward the common weal. Unless the college man comes to realize this fact … he may easily grow up into a one-sided man … a man who will always be the world's debtor."[56] Service was a duty the educated owed to their society. This philosophy was still new to the national YMCA at the turn of the century but was dominating its campus branches.[57] Harvard Christian Association handbooks issued to all freshmen emphasized the "spirit of service" at the university and catalogued volunteer sites like the Riverside Alliance, where "about forty college men [were] engaged in conducting boys' clubs in chair caning, basket weaving, whittling, wood carving, manual training, basketball, gymnastic drill, dramatics, and in teaching Sunday School classes."[58] These handbooks promoted "practical service," a term that made intuitive the connection between Protestant evangelicalism, student voluntarism, and university life.

### *THE OSGOOD CONTROVERSY IN THE COMMUNITY*

Osgood championed exactly this "practical" work. But he couched it in explicitly Protestant terms, emphasizing the importance of religious mission in social service. No longer were men meeting man-to-man; rather, in East Cambridge, Protestants were meeting Catholics. This distinction fueled the conflict between Osgood and East Cambridge community leaders. Coming just as PBH was establishing itself, the Osgood affair called attention to the challenges student volunteers faced in crossing class, faith, and neighborhood boundaries.

Sensing a story in the words of the Harvard student turned public servant and preacher, *The Boston Herald* played up the conflict with its sensational headline, "A Whitechapel Town: What A Harvard Man Says East Cambridge May Be." Juxtaposing the infamous London neighborhood with "A Harvard Man," the headline highlighted the experiential

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

gulf that separated Harvard students from East Cambridge residents and community leaders. Though Osgood asserted (and the article supports) that he did not say "Whitechapel" in his talk, the damage was done. The East Cambridge portion occupied only two paragraphs of the *Herald* article. But an incendiary two paragraphs it was. Osgood's description of East Cambridge as "neglected," and its residents as a different "class of people" from the rest of Cambridge would have read as code to East Cambridge residents and community leaders.

Addressing the importance of religion for the "college man," Osgood described East Cambridge voluntarism as expressing the "real, true religion in college men." He began with the 24th Psalm, which identifies those with "clean hands and a pure heart" as destined to receive God's blessing.[59] He claimed that the qualities the psalm identified could "be found … in those universities where so many young men are banded together for the purpose, we hope, of making other people better for their education." Echoing other social reformers who saw collegians as natural volunteers, Osgood added, "The terrible earnestness of a college man or any young man is perfectly natural. We have all our lives before us—so little behind."[60] Here, Osgood tapped a central theme in YMCA discourse about college leadership, suggesting that college students had a responsibility to turn their "influence" to social good.[61] Yet this very influence was what Catholic community leaders feared.

Osgood's dismal vision of East Cambridge differed significantly from the reality. Indeed, he had reportedly not been to East Cambridge himself, a charge he did not refute. Osgood's damning two paragraphs sold short the vibrant ethnic communities and local organizations that characterized the busy, industrial neighborhood with its strong Catholic organizations and relatively little serious crime. Built on land once separated from the rest of Cambridge by marshes and canals, the area supported pork packing, woodworking and metal working, sugar refining, and printing, as well as distribution centers for oil and ice, and "eight coal or lumber dealers."[62] Originally of English origin, the population was diversifying rapidly as the Irish residents who had dominated since the mid-nineteenth century were joined by Polish immigrants moving through Boston's West End to resettle in East Cambridge.[63] Land was cheap, and with its water access, the area was convenient for industry, trade, and workers from other neighborhoods.[64] The majority of the unskilled workers lived in the neighborhood or nearby Cambridgeport and were Irish, Polish, or Portuguese. Skilled workers included "Americans, the older Irish, Swedes, Germans, and a few Portuguese."[65] As new immigrant groups arrived, longer-term residents moved on to higher-paying jobs and more upscale neighborhoods.[66] This pattern was typical of immigrant neighborhoods and did not, as Osgood suggested, demonstrate a flight impulse.

The Catholic Church provided social services and community organization as well as religious leadership. Irish immigrants established the neighborhood's first Catholic church in 1841, and the second, and larger, opened under the leadership of Father John O'Brien in 1876. Polish and Italian immigrants joined the Portuguese residents, further increasing the Catholic population.[67] In 1902, the Portuguese population organized its own church.[68] An Armenian community held services in the Sacred Heart space.[69] Osgood's two paragraphs dismissed all this Catholic activism, noting only the "four Protestant churches in East Cambridge," that "have all they can do to take care of themselves."[70]

In contrast to Osgood's account, contemporary researchers Robert A. Woods and Albert J. Kennedy described a strong community. Though they presented recent

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

immigrants as "neither city-bred nor sophisticated," they also noted vibrant family and community connections that brought people together for Sunday celebrations of weddings, christenings, or funerals, along with abstinence organizations, a literary society, and political groups.[71] Though Osgood described neglect and "250 minor arrests" of youth, Woods and Kennedy reported the most common crimes as public drunkenness, gambling, and disorderly conduct, concluding, "East Cambridge is a remarkably safe and law-abiding place." The biggest problem was "the pervading atmosphere of drab mediocrity and inertia … At best, life here is constricted and unbeautiful."[72] Though certainly not positive, this depiction was far from Osgood's, and given Woods's and Kennedy's status as researchers and social reformers, offers a more accurate picture.

For Catholic neighborhood leaders, Osgood's easy public dismissal of their leadership was insulting and threatening. This Protestant student, member of an educational elite, speaking at a storied Boston Protestant church, reiterated the long-time anti-Catholic prejudice that animated evangelical Protestants.[73] Tensions between Protestant reformers and Catholic neighborhood leaders had a history in Boston. At Boston's Denison House settlement, founding resident Helen Cheever reported testy encounters with a local priest soon after the house opened in 1892. Billings expressed anxiety about local children being separated from their homes. Together, reformer and priest negotiated limits for children's settlement activities. Billings realized that the settlement workers—despite hoping, as Cheever said, only to "increase home life," also threatened the role of the Catholic Church. Like East Cambridge Catholic leaders a decade on, Billings eventually repudiated the reformers, warning Catholic children away from the house altogether.[74] It was no surprise that Catholic leaders in Boston and Cambridge similarly responded in force to Osgood's two paragraphs.

Osgood made the students' missionizing intentions clear. Before even mentioning East Cambridge, he praised activist religion, noting that more than 500 students did volunteer work.[75] In East Cambridge, being active meant missionizing, particularly among youth. At Harvard House, 200 boys attended "26 boy's clubs in various kinds of industrial work, athletics, debating, chemistry, physics and astronomy" staffed by 100 student volunteers. These projects gave the Protestant CA members an entrée into this predominantly Catholic community.[76]

Quickly perceiving the furor he had caused, Osgood attempted damage control. Only two days after the *Herald* article, he wrote Father O'Brien with an apology at once contrite and defensive: "The article was a reporter's transparent attempt at sensationalism. The headlines were wholly fiction … In … a thirty-five minute speech, only about four minutes were given to the discussion of the work in East Cambridge … I should be the last to question the efficiency of the work of your church in East Cambridge." He denied that Harvard students sought to replace existing social service organizations: "I have repeatedly been assured by them that they hope only to assist and supplement agencies already at work there."[77] When this communication went public, the *Boston Herald* protested and the reporter wrote Osgood directly, asserting he had accurately summarized the speech.[78] Meanwhile, Osgood futilely reiterated that he had never used the words "white chapel."[79] Given the context of Osgood's talk, however—the Catholic-Protestant tensions, the discriminatory attitudes of Protestant reformers—it seems likely that, despite the sensational headline, the *Herald* reporter got the most important news exactly right.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Osgood concluded his letter to O'Brien with hope his words would not hurt the "efforts" of the volunteers or "bring them into your disfavor."[80] But it was too late for that. O'Brien launched a public war of words on Osgood and his Harvard cohort, rallying support from the community and area clergy. Ten days later, he dismissively included part of Osgood's apology in a special section of the *Sacred Heart Review* that protested Osgood's depictions of the neighborhood and the very purpose of student service in East Cambridge. Though O'Brien had the reputation of wanting to foster "better relations … between Catholics and Protestants," he saw no room for discussion on Harvard student service.[81]

The section, "Is East Cambridge a 'Whitechapel' Town?" was "distributed in thousands."[82] Included was O'Brien's sarcastic response to the *Herald*: "The context of Mr. Osgood's address makes it plain that he means to say the religious interests of the Catholic people of East Cambridge are neglected. As pastor of these people during the last thirty years, I wish to assure Mr. Osgood and the rest of the 100 Harvard students who, he says, are working and praying for us all, that our religious interests are very fully cared for." He enumerated the six clergymen in the parish, the thousands who attended the seven Masses celebrated on Sundays, religious meetings throughout the week, and the St. Vincent de Paul Society's work for the poor.[83]

Other Catholic leaders, newspapers, and community members chimed in weeks later. These supporters offered a positive view of East Cambridge, and they challenged the legitimacy of Harvard student voluntarism. Local defenders scornfully called Osgood a "sage authority, whom nobody had ever heard of before," and suggested he "temper his youth with modesty and his zeal with common sense." One writer emphasized that poverty did not equate to lack of moral character (a distinction the era's social reformers often overlooked) and turned the tables on Harvard:

> There are, it is true, poor people in East Cambridge, but nobody but a prig or an ignoramus would confound honest, hardworking poverty with infamy and vice. We venture to say that the stranger visiting the University City would seek otherwhere for vice than among the honest folk of East Cambridge. We venture to say further that he would be more likely to find it even in the classic precincts of Harvard, itself.….[84]

Another critic noted "the patronizing airs of those callow Harvard students who wish to pose as [East Cambridge people's] teachers, helpers or organizers of philanthropic works," calling their efforts "simply an impertinence and an insult."[85] Another writer described Osgood as an "innocent lambkin." The *Sacred Heart Review* editors said Osgood was committing a "gross calumny on an orderly, virtuous, and Christian community."[86] It was no accident that these writers reclaimed the word "Christian" for these East Cambridge Catholics, whom Osgood and his self-identified "Christian" Protestant cohort had ignored. One writer condemned the whole of student service:

> A great many of the amateur philanthropists who condescend to notice the poor, through college settlement work and other such schemes, are shallow, misinformed and absurd. Mr. Osgood is not any more so than the rest of the so-called sociological students. He is typical of the whole crowd. They think they have a mission to the poor, particularly the Catholic poor, who know more about true religion in a minute than the most supercilious settlement worker may ever hope to know, except through a miracle of God's grace.[87]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

These criticisms provide quite a contrast to college students' own assessment of their duty to others and Francis Peabody's lofty claims for student voluntarism. Though this writer lumped together varied impulses for service—Osgood's was a religious mission, not the sociological approach that guided many student volunteers at schools like Northwestern, for example—the writer clearly identified the challenges of crossing class, religious, and ethnic boundaries. These criticisms suggested that student volunteers might not be taken seriously at all. The East Cambridge clergy concluded, "Harvard students, outside of college bounds, whether on a lark in the city or playing reformer in East Cambridge, are a nuisance and a menace to peace and order."[88] These writers neatly reversed the usual claims of disorder that reformers made about urban neighborhoods, equating student service to the student mischief associated with Progressive Era college life.[89]

The Cambridge papers also sided with the neighborhood. *The Cambridge Chronicle* observed, "No Protestant clergyman could care for the thousands to which the church of the Sacred Heart ministers, or would attempt it, but the Catholic Church is accustomed to do this, and its powerful influence for good must be recognized." *The Cambridge Press* described Osgood as "a young Harvard religious enthusiast who seems to be showing more zeal than good taste and good judgment," noting that the transition occurring in East Cambridge as older residents moved out and newer immigrants moved in "is precisely the same change that has taken place in all large cities the world over."[90] The *Review* noted, "The Protestant people of East Cambridge are at one with their Catholic neighbors in denouncing 'The Harvard House as a nuisance.'"[91] Suddenly, the issue was not only one of Protestant and Catholic, but of town and gown. The reputations of Phillips Brooks House and of student volunteers across the country were on the line.

Not everyone sided with the neighborhood. PBHA member Raymond Oveson wrote a course paper on Harvard philanthropy, noting a decrease in volunteer numbers that he attributed to the "temporary suspension of the work at the Harvard House." Oveson blamed the newspapers: "the Catholic priest … was aroused and too furious to listen to truth or reason and forbade every family under his charge allowing their children to go to Harvard House. Since the whole neighborhood, practically, are Catholic, nothing could be done by our men. The boys wished to come, but of course a priest has almost dictatorial power over his flock so the boys were obliged to remain away from Harvard House." Oveson said some of the clubs "were so fond of their respective leaders that they slipped away and met for a few times in the Student Leader's room in College."[92] This interpretation highlighted the Catholic-Protestant tensions at play in this conflict. Words like "aroused" and "dictatorial" reasserted stereotypes of Catholic priests as domineering and irrational, thus referencing deeply held American Protestant anxieties about the role of Catholics, and Catholic schools, in a democracy.[93] Oveson's choice of topic also suggests that the controversy and its consequences generated discussion on campus as well as in local media.

O'Brien ultimately won his battle against the Harvard volunteers. Harvard House had suspended its work by 1904, and later Harvard service listings did not include the East Cambridge settlement. Nor does it appear in the 1911 edition of Woods's and Kennedy's exhaustive *Handbook of Settlements*.[94] The Church of the Sacred Heart at 6th and Thorndike Streets, on the other hand, still stands today.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*PBHA'S STRUGGLE TO DEFINE MISSION AND METHOD*

Osgood's rhetorical missteps came at a pivotal time for PBHA. In its early years, student leaders and their mentors struggled over the organization's purpose. Would it be based in the evangelical methods of the CA? Or the secular goals of the Union? Or would they be influenced by the quantitative methods of social scientists? Like other university-affiliated social reform projects, PBHA promised to make higher education relevant to social problems. PBHA volunteers embodied shifting conceptions of higher education as professors and administrators balanced secular and religious claims. Educators, as Reuben argues, "hoped to create new institutional forms that would embody their belief that truth incorporated all knowledge and was morally relevant, and also provide the basis for scholarly progress."[95] PBHA could be such an institution. However, as the Osgood affair revealed, these student servants were under scrutiny and their success was by no means assured.

In the years after the Osgood controversy, the CA revisited its own mission, though it is unclear whether this move was related to the public dressing-down its volunteers had received. In 1908, leaders voted to loosen membership rules, weakening the evangelical criteria in an effort to appeal more widely. At stake was whether to preserve the standard national YMCA criteria for college branch membership, which required students to be active in evangelical churches. Harvard's CA entered a fierce national debate about the issue.[96] Supporters, including most members of the Graduate Advisory Committee that determined PBHA policy, argued that the CA was already accepting students who were not church members, and that open membership would draw more students while streamlining the organization's operations.[97] Opponents like George Gleason, who represented the International Committee of the national YMCA, believed the change masked an effort to "drive out the evangelical religious society," and was "unfair to the cosmopolitan spirit of Harvard."[98] Gleason warned of withdrawing from "the powerful Young Men's Christian Association of North America and the world," predicting Harvard would lose influence with YMCA leaders and might even see a decline in evangelical Protestant attendance at Harvard.[99] Another who weighed in was seminary student Charles W. Gilkey '03, an influential alumnus who later became minister of the Hyde Park Baptist Church in Chicago and Dean of the Rockefeller Memorial Chapel at the University of Chicago. Gilkey supported the change, proposing an amendment requiring new members to pledge that this basis was their "personal desire and purpose." He believed this addition would preserve "vitality" in Harvard's CA and make the change seem "well-considered."[100]

Early in 1908, change advocates succeeded, and the Harvard Christian Association adopted a policy admitting "all members of Harvard University who desire to be disciples of Jesus Christ in life and service, and to associate their efforts in the extension of His kingdom among young men."[101] Gilkey's recommendation was accepted, and new members signed cards affirming the CA's purpose.[102] Foreseeing a backlash from the national YMCA, Joseph Davis, the graduate secretary of PBHA (a leadership role) wrote a two-and-a-half page letter to John Mott, the legendary director of the YMCA Student Department. Davis appealed, "We shall be extremely sorry if our action should result in cutting us off even nominally from the national [YMCA] movement."[103] Mott responded briefly, expressing "regret" but promising to consider his response,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

having no wish to "sever the relation of the Harvard Association from the Student Movement of North America and of the world."[104] Harvard President Eliot showed no ambivalence. Telling a PBHA leader that the change was the "best course," he added, "In my view, if the Harvard Association should lose all connection with the International Committee, or the International Association, it would be by no means an irreparable misfortune."[105] This response fit Eliot's larger view of the role of religion in institutions of higher education, where he believed it should inspire morality without requiring denominational commitments.[106] The CA's membership debate resonated with larger questions about how universities would balance religious and secular approaches to social change as they transformed their mission for the modern world.[107]

In the following years, PBHA—and its newly inclusive CA—struggled to find direction. Davis believed the organization and its volunteers lacked "a definitely comprehended purpose." "For some the 'work' is its own reward," he wrote Gilkey. "But too many, as several have confessed to me, find themselves after giving money to the House feeling that no goods have been delivered, so to speak, or after working conscientiously on committees or in Bible Study groups or Social Service work wishing they had spent the time and energy elsewhere."[108] He questioned the motto of "Piety, Charity, and Hospitality," adding, "I am afraid of shooting into the air, and whether we like it or not, that is the disagreeable impression of a good many fellows about a good deal of Brooks House work."[109] Gilkey, by then a newly minted pastor on a seminary tour in Scotland, replied sympathetically: "It is the same problem which every organization faces whose task it is to inspire progress toward a 'flying Goal' to realize ideals that are only progressively definable to create a spirit and an atmosphere."[110] Gilkey argued for a "liberal and powerful" Christianity: "I believe that [the CA] must always be the dynamo, the center of real life and power, in Brooks House."[111] Moreover, he said, PBHA was different from other student organizations that "exist primarily for the sake of the participants." In contrast, PBHA existed for others.[112] He believed the CA should, as well. Arthur Beane, who became graduate secretary in 1911, took a different approach to recruiting, promising that students themselves would benefit from service: "No experience is equal to that of handling people," he told a Maine YMCA group. "It will help you in after life when you enter the business world. It strengthens the individual morally and spiritually."[113] PBHA leaders and recruiters were acutely aware of outside scrutiny, and with reason, as that scrutiny continued. On PBHA's tenth anniversary, one critic snidely observed that though the organization filled the functions of charity and piety and had admirable leaders, "Should the [House] suddenly be destroyed, the College would not put on mourning," an assessment based on perceived failures of hospitality.[114]

Preparing students for service was another challenge. PBHA leaders agonized over the proper training of volunteers. They worried not only about alienating local people, Osgood-style, but about working effectively with professional settlement workers, another group occasionally displeased with student workers. When some local settlement leaders reported that their Harvard volunteers lacked preparation, PBHA hosted a conference for volunteers.[115] "In most cases neither the settlements nor the Harvard volunteers quite understand each other's point of view," read the invitation. "In hope of remedying this evil, we are holding a 'Conference of Construction [sic] Criticism of Social Service Work."[116] Settlement house workers and faculty mentors would also attend. Only

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

twenty-five volunteers showed up. In 1913, discouraged organizers took a different strategy for the 1913 conference.[117] Subsequent efforts drew relatively few, suggesting that although as many as 300 students, or more than half the degree-receiving students in any one undergraduate class, signed up as volunteers in a given year, they were less enthusiastic about listening to speeches on “Methods of Training Volunteers,” “What Social Service Does for the Student,” or “What the College Man Owes the Community.”[118] Conference planners tried to bridge a gap nearly as wide as that between college students and their working-class neighbors—that between college volunteer and professional social worker.

PBHA leaders had reason for hope. Lincoln House head John D. Adams wrote Arthur Beane: “I should far rather have Lincoln House boys associate in the way they now do with the young men you are sending us, than listen to all the moral platitudes the most finished professional is able to deliver.”[119] For Adams, the Harvard volunteers were “thoroughly the right sort.”[120] “Brooks House has come to aid every time I have been in a hole, so am very thankful,” agreed Hull Street headworker George T. Wood, who rated his seven Harvard volunteers on a scale from “fine” to “splendid.”[121]

But critics were numerous. Their problems were different from those of O’Brien and his East Cambridge supporters. Professional settlement house workers catalogued students’ lack of preparation, poor behavior, and bad attitudes. PBHA responded by sending student inspectors to service sites. Following such a visit, the investigator for Boston’s North End union, Leverett Saltonstall, reported that the Union’s heads were “disgusted with men because won’t take responsibility—wish Phillips Brooks would size up man before sending down.”[122] Miss Tyler, a full-time worker at the Cambridge Associated Charities, complained of students’ arrogance: “One man had the nerve to go in there and tell her that she was not going at the whole social problem in the proper way and proceeded to tell her all about Economics 1.” On another occasion, Tyler concluded, “Not much success with student visitors,” suggesting that these college students were “exploiting” local boys rather than taking the “responsibility” seriously.[123] By this point, Harvard was sending nearly 400 students, between 15 and 24 percent of each college class, into the community, most teaching classes or leading boys’ clubs at settlement houses. An annual survey listed only thirteen volunteers as “failures.” The majority of these simply stopped showing up.[124]

The association’s concern about training volunteers suggests either disproportionate anxiety or a higher rate of unsatisfactory work than these statistics reveal. PBHA published a flurry of pamphlets for volunteers. Rallying them in the hearty language and optimistic tones of the era’s self-help manuals (and its YMCA national leaders), such literature exhorted, “Get on the inside of the boy by being a boy yourself,” and “If you think you can bluff a boy you are mistaken.” The writers advised “cheerfulness” (“Remember that no successful project was ever put through without a smile”), “method,” “intimacy,” and “example.”[125] This last echoed a generation of YMCA teachings that emphasized the importance of face-to-face influence between college students and, in mission work, between these students and local people.[126]

### *OSGOOD’S LEGACIES ON CAMPUS AND BEYOND*

In 1919, almost two decades into its existence, and almost three since Harvard students began community service at the Prospect Union, PBHA invited political, religious, and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

community leaders to promote its mission. In the shadow of the Great War, their calls to service acquired a patriotic tone. New York reformer William Jay Schieffelin stressed "the vital need … for an increase of the national spirit, a reverence for our country, a determination to help create a prevailing public opinion that will fit her to take the lead among the nations in insuring peace and good will." Service of all kinds, he said, was the answer. Protestant minister Walter Rauschenbusch urged each college graduate "to connect with his new community through some social service." Politician and forestry leader Gifford Pinchot opined, "Unless educated men become leaders, the community gets little benefit from their education … the progress of the world comes through the younger men who see the new problems with new eyes." Pittsburgh business leader Ralph Harbison testified: "Real leadership comes not to him who desires public applause, but to him who has caught a glimpse of humanity's need and desires to invest a portion of his assets of time in actual service to his brother." Boston settlement leader Robert A. Woods stressed that postwar patriotism demanded service more than ever: "The call for volunteers in the constructive tasks of democracy is becoming morally absolute, because democracy is in peril."[127] A decade on, PBHA promotion claimed, "There is need, greater than ever before in history, for the young man or the young woman who has intelligence and courage, who will undertake to step beyond his selfish interests and do something for his neighbors and for his community."[128] Not only would service help society, it would help the students.[129] PBHA's guiding principles—social responsibility, mutual benefit, and the prospect of serving the national good—persisted. These students would serve themselves, their communities, and the nation.

While East Cambridge's Harvard House did not survive the ferocious criticism from community opponents, Osgood did well. He graduated from Harvard in 1904, received his divinity degree from the Episcopal Theological Seminary in 1907, served as rector of St. Mark's Church in Minneapolis, and eventually returned to the city where he began his career as rector of Boston's Emmanuel Church in 1933.[130] While heading St. Mark's, he was recognized for his support of the eugenics movement, winning a prize for sermon of the year from the American Eugenics Society in 1926. He also lobbied for compulsory sterilization "for feebleminded inmates of state institutions."[131] In 1945, Osgood abandoned his long-time Episcopal faith for Unitarianism, asserting, "I am daily more sure that, for me at least, the only course for sincerity is in a creedless church where the individual's right and duty to grow his own faith is the cardinal tenet."[132]

The Phillips Brooks House Association more than survived the "Whitechapel Affair" and its own growing pains. The Phillips Brooks House in the Harvard Yard, just like the Catholic Church on Thorndike, still stands today, and PBHA remains a signature example of institutionalized student service in American colleges. Its members ignored the bluntest comments from the Osgood days suggesting that students had no business with voluntarism, and they maintained both their idealism and their practical strategy to pursue "definite" work and confront students' shortcomings. Its leaders' self-conscious attention to mission, motives, and method—maintained over the course of decades—suggests how seriously they took their role as ambassadors from gown to town. The history of its early years, however, illustrates that even the most passionate social servants remained intensely aware of the challenges college students faced when they crossed lines of class, ethnicity, and faith to volunteer in the city's poor communities. The "more perfect sympathy" they sought with the poor people of Cambridge and Boston proved an elusive goal.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

NOTES

Thanks to my colleagues in the Stetson University History Department who have offered feedback, especially Eric Kurlander, as well as the anonymous readers for JGAPE.

[1]"A Whitechapel Town," *Boston Herald*, Feb.9, 1903.

[2]"A Whitechapel Town," *Boston Herald.*

[3]"A Whitechapel Town," *Boston Herald.*

[4]"Is East Cambridge a 'White Chapel' Town," Pamph. (pub. In *Boston Sacred Heart Review*), Phillips Brooks House Association (PBHA) Records (UAV 688.27 Misc. Files 1903–14), Harvard University Archives, Cambridge, Massachusetts (HUA). All quotations from HUA materials reproduced courtesy of the Harvard University Archives.

[5]"Is East Cambridge a 'White Chapel' Town?," 4–6.

[6]Paula M. Kane, *Separatism and Subculture: Boston Catholicism, 1900–1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 59; Deirdre M. Moloney, *American Catholic Lay Groups and Transatlantic Social Reform in the Progressive Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 5, 6, 121–24. Moloney points out that Catholic lay reformers' attitudes toward the poor tended to be more inclusive than those of Protestant reformers (119).

[7]Kane, *Separatism and Subculture*, 24–27.

[8]David Setran, *The College 'Y': Student Religion in the Era of Secularization* (New York: Palgrave, 2007), 13–32.

[9]The organization began as Phillips Brooks House, where religious and service groups gathered. In 1904, its members loosely affiliated and became the Phillips Brooks House Association. "A Life of Phillips Brooks and a History of PBH," undated pamphlet, PBH Records (HUD3688.2), Folder of Misc. Undated Material, Folder: Brochures, HUA. For ease, this article will use PBHA throughout to refer the organization, and PBH to refer to the physical location in Phillips Brooks House.

[10]Quote from George Lyman Paine, "The Union and the University," Pamph., "The Prospect Union 1891–99," Prospect Union Papers (HUD 3712xxx), HUA; on "sympathy," see Kevin P. Murphy, *Political Manhood: Red Bloods, Mollycoddles, & The Politics of Progressive Era Reform* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 176–77.

[11]Emily Mieras, "'A More Perfect Sympathy': College Students and Social Service, 1889–1914" (PhD diss., The College of William and Mary, 1998); Mieras, "'Latter-Day Knights,'" The College Settlements Association and the Redefinition of Higher Education in the Progressive Era" in *The Educational Work of Women's Organizations, 1890–1960,* eds. Anne M. Knupfer and Christine Woyshner (New York: Palgrave, 2007), 101–19; Mieras, "Tales from the Other Side of the Bridge: YMCA Manhood, Social Class and Social Reform in Turn-of-the-Twentieth-Century Philadelphia," *Gender & History* 17:2 (Aug. 2005): 409–40.

[12]*Intercollegian*, Feb. 1891; The Christian Association of Wellesley College, Annual Report 1905–06, Wellesley College Archives, Wellesley, MA; "Mid-Winter Report of the Christian Association of Cornell University 1902–1903," YMCA Student Work Files, Box 16, Folder: NY/ Cornell University, Ithaca, NY. YMCA Archives, University of Minnesota, St. Paul.

[13]Steven J. Diner, *A City and Its Universities: Public Policy in Chicago, 1892–1919* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980).

[14]Mieras, "'Latter-Day Knights,'"101–2.

[15]The College Settlements Association has received most attention, though discussions of the CSA say little about its significance for student volunteers themselves. John Rousmanière, "Cultural Hybrid in the Slums: The College Woman and the Settlement House, 1889–1894," *American Quarterly* XXII (Spring 1970): 45–66; Daphne Spain, *How Women Saved The City* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), 85–88, 113–18.

[16]Key texts include Paul Boyer, *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820–1920* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978), 155–58, 221–24; Mina Carson, *Settlement Folk: Social Thought and the American Settlement Movement 1885–1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990); Alan Dawley, *Changing The World: American Progressives in War and Revolution* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003), 1–72; Sarah Deutsch, *Women and the City: Gender, Space, and Power in Boston 1870–1940* (New York: Oxford, 2000); Shannon Jackson, *Lines of Activity: Performance, Historiography, Hull-House Domesticity* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001); Regina G. Kunzel, *Fallen Women, Problem Girls: Unmarried Mothers and the Professionalization of Social Work 1890–1945* (New Haven, CT: Yale

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

University Press, 1993); Elisabeth Lasch-Quinn, *Black Neighbors: Race and the Limits of Reform in the American Settlement House Movement, 1890–1945* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993); Michael McGerr, *A Fierce Discontent: The Rise and Fall of the Progressive Movement in America, 1870–1920* (New York: The Free Press, 2003), Robyn Muncy, *Creating A Female Dominion in American Reform 1890–1935* (New York: Oxford, 1991), Mary E. Odem, *Delinquent Daughters: Protecting and Policing Adolescent Female Sexuality in the United States, 1885–1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995); Shelton Stromquist, *Reinventing "The People": The Progressive Movement, The Class Problem, and the Origins of Modern Liberalism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006).

[17]Stromquist, *Reinventing "The People,"* viii, 4.

[18]Stromquist, *Reinventing "The People*," 3.

[19]McGerr, *A Fierce Discontent*, xv.

[20]Mieras, "'Latter-Day Knights,'" 102, 106, 111; Spain, *How Women Saved the City*, 114–17.

[21]Diner, *A City and its Universities*, 3–10; David B. Potts, "The Prospect Union: A Conservative Quest for Social Justice," *The New England Quarterly* 35:3 (Sept. 1962): 347–66.

[22]William Hard, "The Northwestern University Settlement" in Arthur Herbert Wilde, *Northwestern University: A History 1855–1905 Vol. II* (New York: University Publishing Society, 1905), 379–91; Undated history, c. 1957, Box 1, Folder 13, Christian Association Records (UPS 48.1) University of Pennsylvania Archives (UPA); Ellen V. Connorton, "University House and Its Place in the Development of the Settlement Movement, with Implications for Contemporary Social Work Practice," MSW Thesis (University of Pennsylvania, May 1992), 18; Mieras, "Latter-Day Knights," 102; Spain, 113–16. Harvard established its own extension school under Eliot's successor, A. Lawrence Lowell, in 1910; see Michael A. Shinagel, *'The Gates Unbarred' A History of University Extension at Harvard, 1910–2009* (Hollis, NH: Puritan Press, 2009), 18–27.

[23]Deutsch, *Women and the City*, 11–13; on "redemptive places," see Spain, *How Women Saved the City*, 1–29.

[24]Potts, "The Prospect Union," 355.

[25]Peabody, "Aims and Work of the Prospect Union," *Prospect Union Review*, Mar. 21, 1894, Pamphlet Collection, Box 2, Folder: Cambridge, MA: Prospect Union, Social Welfare History Archives (SWHA), University of Minnesota Libraries.

[26]*Prospect Union Review*, Jan. 30, 1895, SWHA.

[27]Potts, "The Prospect Union," 363.

[28]*Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, Nov. 2, 1910, Prospect Union Papers (HUD 3712xxx), HUA.

[29]*Prospect Union Review*, Mar. 21, 1894, Pamphlets Collection, Box 2, SWHA.

[30]*Prospect Union Review*, Jan. 30, 1895, Pamphlets Collection, SWHA.

[31]The majority of these were Canadian, Irish, Scottish, English, Scandinavian, and German, suggesting that the Union's "diversity" was primarily Northern European.

[32]*Prospect Union Review,* Feb. 6, 1895, Pamphlets Collection, Box 2, SWHA.

[33]George Lyman Paine, "The Union and the University" in "The Prospect Union, 1891–99," Prospect Union Papers (HUD 3712xxx), HUA.

[34]Thomas Winter, *Making Men, Making Class: The YMCA and Workingmen, 1877–1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 4; Murphy, *Political Manhood*, 110–21.

[35]Peabody, "Aims and Work of the Prospect Union."

[36]Peabody, "Aims and Work of the Prospect Union."

[37]"The Prospect Union 1891–1895," *Prospect Union Review*, Jan. 30, 1895, SWHA.

[38]T. J. Jackson Lears, "From Salvation to Self-Realization" in *The Culture of Consumption,* eds. Richard Fox and Lears (New York: Pantheon, 1983), 3–38.

[39]Francis Peabody, "Address upon the Opening of Brooks House" In "PBH: An Account of Its Origin, Dedication and Purpose as an Endowed Home for the Organized Efforts Now Making to Perpetuate the Influence and Spirit of Phillips Brooks Among the Students of Harvard University" Pamph., Dec. 31, 1900, Phillips Brooks House Records (HUD 3688. 200.4), HUA.

[40]Julie K. Brown, "Making 'Social Facts' Visible in the Early Progressive Era: The Harvard Social Museum and Its Counterparts" in *Instituting Reform: The Social Museum of Harvard University 1903–1931*, eds. Deborah Martin Kao and Michelle Lamunière (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Art Museums, 2012), Lamuniere, "Sentiment and Science" in *Instituting Reform*, 46.

[41]Lamunière, 41.

[42]Lamunière, 48.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[43]Lamunière, 50.

[44]Robert Treat Paine, "Address," in Pamph., "PBH: An Account of Its Origin."

[45]David B. Chesebrough, *Phillips Brooks: Pulpit Eloquence* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001); John F. Woolverton, *The Education of Phillips Brooks* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995).

[46]Diner, *A City and Its Universities*, 3–10.

[47]Hugh Hawkins, *Between Harvard and America: The Educational Leadership of Charles W. Eliot* (New York: Oxford, 1972), 58–72, 84–85; Richard Norton Smith, *The Harvard Century: The Making of a University to a Nation* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986), 28–29, 40–41.

[48]Hawkins, *Between Harvard and America*, 167.

[49]Gail Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880–1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 192–93; Eliot qtd. in Smith, *The Harvard Century*, 29.

[50]Julie A. Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 77–81.

[51]Peabody, "Address upon the Opening of Brooks House" in Pamph., "PBH: An Account of Its Origin."

[52]On Christian Association role in founding, see Setran, *The College 'Y,'* 126; on establishment of college Ys, Mieras, "'A More Perfect Sympathy,'" 73–106; Setran, 13–32.

[53]"A Life of Phillips Brooks and a History of Phillips Brooks House," Undated Pamph., Folder: Brochures, PBHA Records (HUD 3688.2), HUA.

[54]George Gleason to Davis, Thayer, and Moore, Jan. 5,1907, PBH Records (UAV 688.5), Box 1, Basis of Membership, HUA (nb: handwritten note corrects date to a more likely '08.)

[55]Mieras, "Tales from the Other Side of the Bridge," 410–11, Setran, *The College 'Y,'* 134,141–49.

[56]Arthur N. Holcombe, "The Meaning of Social Service to a College Man," *Intercollegian*, Nov. 1905.

[57]C. Howard Hopkins, *A History of the YMCA in North America* (New York: Association Press, 1951), 635–36,642; Setran, *The College 'Y,'* 3–5, 131–47.

[58]1903 Handbook, Handbooks Collection, PBHA Records (HUD 3688. 190.36), HUA.

[59]Psalm 24, *The Bible*, King James Version.

[60]"A Whitechapel Town," *Boston Herald.*

[61]Mieras, "Tales from the Other Side of the Bridge," 430; Setran, 135.

[62]Susan E. Maycock, "Early East Cambridge, 1630–1915" in *All in the Same Boat: Twentieth-Century Stories of East Cambridge*, ed. Sarah Boyer and Maycock (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge Historical Commission, 2005), 3; Robert A. Woods and Albert J. Kennedy, *The Zone of Emergence: Observations of the Lower Middle and Upper Working Class Communities of Boston, 1905–1914* (orig. pub. 1914) (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1969), 98.

[63]Woods and Kennedy, *The Zone of Emergence*, 99–102; Boyer and Maycock, "Immigration Routes," viii.

[64]Woods and Kennedy, *The Zone of Emergence,* 98–99.

[65]Woods and Kennedy, *The Zone of Emergence,* 99.

[66]Woods and Kennedy, *The Zone of Emergence*, 101.

[67]Maycock, "Early East Cambridge," 9; "Proposed Landmark Designation Study, St. Francis of Assisi Church," Cambridge Historical Commission, www.cambridgema.gov/historic.

[68]Woods and Kennedy, *The Zone of Emergence,* 102.

[69]Woods and Kennedy, *The Zone of Emergence,* 109.

[70]"A Whitechapel Town," *Boston Herald.*

[71]Woods and Kennedy, *The Zone of Emergence*, 108–10.

[72]Woods and Kennedy, *The Zone of Emergence*, 112.

[73]John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism 1860–1925* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1955), 5–6, 62, 77–87.

[74]Dec. 27, 1892, Denison House Daybook, 13. Folder 72. Denison House Papers, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute, Cambridge, MA (DHP); Carson, *Settlement Folk*, 62–63.

[75]"A Whitechapel Town," *Boston Herald.*

[76]"A Whitechapel Town," *Boston Herald*; "The Harvard University Christian Association Pamphlet," Mid-Winter 1902–03, Christian Association Records (HUD 3279), Box 1, HUA.

[77]O'Brien was originally the pastor of St. John's, the first Catholic Church in the neighborhood and in Cambridge (1842). In 1873, O'Brien "began a campaign for a new church," which became Sacred Heart, opened in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1883. "Proposed Landmark Designation Study, St. Francis of Assisi Church." Osgood to O'Brien, PBHA Records (UAV 688.27/misc. files 1903–14), HUA.

[78]"The Osgood Incident," *Boston Sacred Heart Review*, Feb. 21, 1903, http://newspapers.bc.edu/cgi-bin/bostonsh.

[79]Harry J. Mulville to Phillips Endecott Osgood, Feb. 16, 1903; and Osgood to unindicated recipient, Feb. 16, 1903, PBHA Records (UAV 688.27/misc. files 1903–14), HUA.

[80]Osgood to O'Brien, PBHA Records (UAV 688.27/misc. files 1903–14), HUA.

[81]Maycock, "Early East Cambridge," 15.

[82]"The Boston Papers Give Some Attention to the Affair," *Boston Sacred Heart Review*, Feb. 21, 1903.

[83]"Is East Cambridge a 'Whitechapel' Town?," 4.

[84]"Is East Cambridge a 'Whitechapel' Town?," 6.

[85]"Is East Cambridge a 'Whitechapel' Town?," 4.

[86]"Editorial Notes," *The Boston Sacred Heart Review*, Feb. 14, 1903.

[87]"Is East Cambridge a 'Whitechapel' Town?," 6.

[88]"Is East Cambridge a 'Whitechapel' Town?," 7.

[89]Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *College Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987), 11–13, 42.

[90]Qtd. in "What the Cambridge Papers Say," *Boston Sacred Heart Review*, Feb. 21, 1903.

[91]"East Cambridge Vindicated by the Press and the People of the City," *Boston Sacred Heart Review*, Feb. 28, 1903.

[92]Raymond Oveson, "The Philanthropic Work of Harvard Men," Thesis for Philosophy 5, Dec. 22, 1903. PBHA Records (HUA. UAV 688.27/misc. files 1903–14), HUA.

[93]John T. McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2003), 11–13.

[94]Pamph., Harvard Christian Association 1903–04, Box 1, Christian Association Records (HUD 3279), HUA; Harvard Handbook, 1903, Christian Association Records, Box 3, HUA; Woods and Kennedy, *Handbook of Settlements*, The Russell Sage Foundation, NY: Charities Publication Committee, 1911; Report of the Social Service Secretary for the college year 1911–12, PBHA Records (UAV 688.27/misc. files 1903–14), HUA.

[95]Reuben, 3.

[96]Setran, *The College 'Y,'* 125–26; G. K. Shurtleff, "A Review of Opinions Concerning the Evangelical Test in American Associations," Nov.1907, Pamph., PBH Records (UAV 688.5), Box 1, Basis of Membership, HUA.

[97]"An Interview—Sometime Previous to Mar. 25, 1904," PBH Records (UAV 688.5), Box 1, Basis of Membership, HUA; Edward C. Moore to John Mott, 11 Nov. 1907, PBH Records, (UAV 688.5), Box 1, Basis of Membership, HUA.

[98]Gleason to Davis, Thayer, and Moore, Jan. 5, 1907, PBH Records (UAV 688.5), Box 1, Basis of Membership, HUA (handwritten note corrects date to '08).

[99]Ibid.

[100]Charles W. Gilkey to J. S. Davis, Jan. 4, 1908, PBH Records (UAV 688.5), Box 1, Basis of Membership, HUA.

[101]Davis to Spinney, Jan. 9, 1908, PBH Records (UAV 688.5), Group IX, Social Service Box 8, Folder: "Basis of Membership," HUA.

[102]Letter to John P. Munn, copy, author not indicated, Nov. 8, 1909, PBH Records (UAV 688.5), Box 1, Basis of Membership, HUA.

[103]Davis to John R. Mott, Jan. 9, 1903, PBH Records (UAV688.5), Group 1, Box 1: Folder, "Basis," HUA.

[104]Mott to Davis, Feb. 3, 1908, PBH Records (UAV688.5), Group 1, Box 1: Folder, "Basis," HUA.

[105]Charles W. Eliot to Arthur Thayer, Nov. 8, 1907, PBH Records (UAV 688.5), Group IX, Social Service, Box 8: Folder: Basis of Membership, HUA.

[106]Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University*, 77–81.

[107]Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University*, 36–73.

[108]Davis to Gilkey, July 24, 1909, PBH Records (UAV 688.5), Group IX, Social Service, Box 8, Folder: Social Service, Con., HUA.

[109]Ibid.

[110]Hopkins, *A History of the YMCA in North America*, 466, 607; Gilkey to Davis Sept. 18, 1909, PBH Records (UAV 688.5), Group IX, Social Service, Box 8, Folder: Social Service, Con., HUA.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[111]Gilkey to Davis, Sept. 18, 1909, PBH Records (UAV 688.5), Group IX, Social Service, Box 8, Folder: Social Service, Con., HUA.

[112]Ibid.

[113]Arthur W. Beane, "What Harvard Men are Doing for Boston Along Social Service Lines," clipping, Lewiston, Maine, Dec. 5, 1912, Harvard Biographical Files, HUA.

[114]Forest Cooke, "Phillips Brooks House," *Harvard Illustrated Magazine* (Feb. 1910), PBH Records (UAV 688.5.13), Box 30, Folder: Articles on Programs, 1910–33, HUA.

[115]Recommendations for the Fall," c. 1912, Vol. 1 Scrapbook of Forms 1912–24, PBH Records (UAV 688.280), PBH/Social Service, HUA.

[116]Form Letter, February 26, 1912, Vol. 1 Scrapbook of Forms 1912–24, PBH Records (UAV 688.280), PBH/Social Service, HUA.

[117]Handwritten annotation, Form Letter, Feb. 26, 1912, Vol. 1 Scrapbook of Forms 1912–24, PBH/Social Service, PBH Records (UAV 688.280), HUA.

[118]"Program—Social Service Dinner," c. 1916; report of the Social Service Committee, 1916–17, Vol. 1, Scrapbook of Forms, etc., 1912–1924. PBH Records (UAV 688.280), PBH/Social Service. In this period, Harvard classes had approximately 500 students who received degrees and often a couple hundred who were connected with the class but did not end up receiving a degree. See Class Reports, HUA. These reports show fewer students doing service, but they did not include responses from all members of the class.

[119]John D. Adams to Beane, Dec. 20, 1915, Vol. 1, Scrapbook of Forms, etc., 1912–1924, PBH Records (UAV 688.280), HUA.

[120]Ibid.

[121]Settlement Investigation Sheets, Group IX, Social Service, Box 8, Folder: Social Service History and Reports, PBH Records (UAV 688.5), HUA.

[122]Settlement Investigation Sheets, HUA. Leverett Saltonstall, class of 1914, and a tenth-generation Harvard student, was part of an influential Boston family, became a four-term senator and governor of Massachusetts, and was known as "the Grand Old Man of Massachusetts politics" when he died in 1979. Saltonstall, Biographical Files, HUA. "Salty" exemplified the meeting of privilege and philanthropy at PBHA.

[123]Report from Cambridge Associated Charities, Folder: Social Service History and Reports, Box 8, Group IX, Social Service, PBH Records (UAV 688.5), HUA.

[124]"Report of the Social Service Secretary for the college year 1911–12," May 5, 1912, PBHA Records (UAV 688.27/misc. files 1903–14), HUA.

[125]"Hints to Teachers," in "Social Service As An Opportunity for University Students," pamph. 1914, 1915, 1917 Social Service Committee/Reports, PBH Records (UAV 688.182.3), HUA.

[126]*Intercollegian*, "Work Among College Students," Dec. 1881; Timothy Dwight, "Formative Influences in College Life Apart from the Curriculum," *Intercollegian*, Feb. 1899; Mieras, "Tales from the Other Side of the Bridge," 430–32.

[127]"What Leading Citizens Say" in "Social Service: An Opportunity for the College Man," pamph., 1919, Social Service Committee/Reports, PBHA Records (UAV 688.182.3), HUA.

[128]Robert W. Kelso, '04, "Social Service And the Community," Social Service Committee Report for 1940 (original article 1930), Social Service Committee/Reports, PBHA Records, (UAV688.182.3), HUA.

[129]1940 Social Service Committee report, PBHA Records (UAV 688.182.3), HUA.

[130]Harvard Class of 1904 Class Reports (1914–1946), HUA.

[131]Christine Rosen, *Preaching Eugenics: Religious Leaders and the American Eugenics Movement* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 124–25.

[132]Harvard Class of 1904 Class Report, 1954, HUA.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781416000645 Published online by Cambridge University Press