

UCLA

UCLA Historical Journal

Title

Social Centers in Wisconsin, 1911-1915

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3t64698c>

Journal

UCLA Historical Journal, 8(2)

Author

Jew, Victor

Publication Date

1987

Copyright Information

Copyright 1987 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

SOCIAL CENTERS IN WISCONSIN, 1911-1915

VICTOR JEW

One year before he was elected President of the United States, Governor Woodrow Wilson of New Jersey addressed the First National Conference on Social Center Development in Madison, Wisconsin. His opening remarks on October 25, 1911, aptly described the social center movement:

It is necessary that simple means should be found by which, by an interchange of points of view, we may get together, for the whole process of modern life, the whole process of politics, is a process by which we must exclude misunderstandings ... bring all men into common counsel and so discover what is the common interest. ... There is no sovereignty of the people if the several sections of the people are at loggerheads with one another. Sovereignty comes with cooperation ... everywhere you find men ... determined to solve the problems by acting together, no matter what older bonds they may break, no matter what former prepossessions they may throw off, determined to get together.¹

What was to be the "simple means" by which people would recognize their commonality and exercise their sovereignty? What was to be the mechanism for the new citizenship? for the Madison conferees the local schoolhouse, operating as the neighborhood community center, served this purpose. At the schoolhouse citizens would organize themselves into a "deliberative body to supplant party divisions." The social center within the local school would serve as a

Victor Jew received a B.A. in History from the University of California, Los Angeles. He received his M.A. at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, where he is currently writing his dissertation on a social history of arson in the United States.

consensual meeting place for all Americans liberated from the partisan environment of saloons and boss-controlled assembly halls. In this environment they could rationally and efficiently solve public problems for the good of all instead of trading votes for narrow interests.

The preamble to the recommended "Constitution of the Neighborhood Civic Club" summarizes the intent spirit of the social center vision. "We the citizens .. are now united in one political organization as members of the voting body." Hence the voters would become a political organization of themselves and for themselves, conscious of their political obligations and powers, and wielding their heretofore dormant sovereignty - independent of political parties. For what purpose should such powers be manifest? "The responsibility (of) voting demands organized preliminary deliberation." Therefore, "(w)e the citizens ... do constitute ourselves a deliberative organization or Neighborhood Civic Club, to hold meetings in the public school building for the open presentation and free discussion of public questions and for such other civic, social, and recreational activities as give promise of common benefit."²

The social center movement reached across the nation to garner support from numerous persons identified by historians as "Progressives." The roster of supporters included such individuals as Frederic C. Howe, formerly of the University of Wisconsin faculty and director of the People's Institute in New York City; Frank P. Walsh, chairman of the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations; Margaret Woodrow Wilson, daughter of President Woodrow Wilson; John Collier, organizer and first secretary of the National Board of Censorship of Motion Pictures; Dr. H.E. Dearholt, Director of the Bureau of Health Instruction in the University of Wisconsin Extension division; Zona Gale, a leading woman author; Walter T. Sumner, Chairman of the Chicago Vice Commission; Dwight H. Perkins, School and Recreation Architect of Chicago; Mary V. Grice, National President of the Home and School Association; Clarence A. Perry of the Russell Sage Foundation; and the Rev. Dana Bartlett, leader of the Social Center movement on the Pacific Coast.³ In the 1912 presidential election the Democrat Woodrow Wilson, the Republican incumbent William Howard

Taft, and the Progressive Party candidate, Theodore Roosevelt, all endorsed the social center ideal. Such unanimity across party lines gave the social center reformers both hope and hubris. With the election of Wilson one social center advocate effused, "it is not impossible that the basic program of the social center - the self-organization of the voting body into a deliberative body ... may be effected in one administration."⁴

In 1911 the State Teachers Association of Wisconsin and the University of Wisconsin's Extension Division lobbied and prodded the state legislature to enact a law allowing local schools to become social centers for political deliberation, educational lectures, and community recreation. This legislation, the first of its kind, successfully passed muster and authorized school principals to establish "evening schools, vacation schools, reading rooms, library stations, debating clubs, gymnasiums, public playgrounds, public baths, and similar activities" while allowing the free use of school buildings to "nonpartisan, nonsectarian, and nonexclusive associations of citizens."⁵ Following Wisconsin's leadership, seventy-one cities in twenty-states established social centers by 1913 and the following year seventeen states passed "wider use legislation" - the geographic balance clearly seen in the following breakdown: five states in the East, five in the mid-West, four in the far-West, and three in the South.⁶

Wisconsin offers a good case study of this national movement, not only for its legislative precedent. The Badger State possessed several unique attributes that provided a tailor-made environment for the community center movement. First, Wisconsinites such as Dr. Charles McCarthy of the Legislative Reference Library and Governor Francis McGovern advocated the "Wisconsin Idea," an ideology that justified the extensive state action that social centers required. Second, the University of Wisconsin's Extension Division offered an institutional arm of the state for the movement's propagation. Both the Wisconsin Idea's "service state" ideology and the University Extension department endorsed the agenda of transforming local schools into crucibles of democracy. Finally, Wisconsin's first (and only) supervisor of the Bureau of

Civic and Social Center Development was a man who articulated the movement's vision and purposes in his book, The Social Center. His name was Edward Joshua Ward.

How did the movement progress in the land of the service university and the service state? If one equates accomplishment with large numbers, the social centers proved to be a modest success, since by 1915 there were over 500 such community centers. On the other hand if one judges this experiment by its own standard of bringing democracy to the people the social center movement in Wisconsin was a failure. This defeat could be attributed to the personality quirks of the head of the Bureau of Civic and Social Center Development; however, this fact notwithstanding, the social center vision was flawed at its core and the Wisconsin experience reflected its internal contradictions.

This research note draws upon evaluations written by University Extension agents on the performance of the social centers and its adviser, Edward J. Ward. These evaluations were candid reports to Louis Reber, the University Extension Dean, and represent some of the best records we have of the social center experiment in Wisconsin. Other helpful documents such as the papers of Dean Ward or the records of the Bureau of Civic and Social Center Development are lost. The reports I discuss in this article have remained untapped by historians and I offer both an examination of their contents and the light they throw on the social center movement in one Midwestern state.⁷

Edward Joshua Ward's entry in Who Was Who in America, 1943-1950 identifies him as a social engineer and that description accurately describes his major concerns throughout a varied career. Born on March 9, 1880 into a Buffalo, New York clergyman's family, Ward would follow his father's footsteps and enter the ministry as an adult. He graduated from Auburn Theological Seminary in 1905 at the age of twenty-five and pastored the First Presbyterian Church of Silver Creek, New York. While there, he saw a glimmer of what would later dawn as the social center movement. In Silver Creek, Ward lent his church building as a facility for various city club meetings and recreational activities.

Ward decided to pursue his calling outside the church and became an assistant professor of

history and English at Hamilton College. In 1907-1910 he left this academic environment to enter public service. The social center movement began to take hold in Rochester, New York, in 1907 and Ward supervised its development. That experience significantly shaped his theories on the civic clubs. In 1910 the University of Wisconsin Extension Division hired Ward to take charge of neighborhood community centers in the Badger State. Receiving the job title of "Adviser for Social and Civic Center Development," he was listed as associate professor and received a salary of \$2,500 a year. Ward would leave this position four years later, not without alienating a considerable number of people and confounding them on the purpose and plan of the social centers. Before discussing Ward's tenure in Wisconsin it would be helpful to explain some of the political assumptions of the neighborhood civic club movement.

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF WARD AND SOCIAL CENTERS

The social centers exemplified political values many historians today identify with Progressivism. Ward in The Social Center (a book published in 1913 by D. Appleton and Company in its National Municipal League Series) defended the social centers because they were anti-partisan, consensual, efficient, and "scientific." The social centers, according to Ward, promised to usher in the new Progressive polis, the true fulfillment of American democracy.

Ward's theory of government was democratic - in an abstract manner. He stressed the sovereignty of the citizen, the "people" were their own best governors. He wanted to return to the New England town meeting ideal where they could exercise their own judgement without politicians intervening. To achieve this ideal, the nation had to be organized into community centers where individual citizens could meet and deliberate on the public issues. Democracy would be realized at the local level through the employment of neighborhood schools as social centers.

What of existing political arrangements and institutions? For Ward, the political parties destroyed citizen participation and undercut democracy. Partisanship was the "son of perdition who is the father of partition." For

Ward, the "party spirit" was justly condemned by George Washington as "the worst enemy" of a democracy; it undermined proper political education by turning the "supreme jury of the citizenship" into "noisy factions instead of (the people) calmly sitting together with fair hearing and free discussion in judgement." The political parties distorted the quality of information needed for deliberation and judgement by contaminating it with "private self interest." The parties kept hostage, the "will of the people" through "emotional reaction actuated and controlled by the 'committee on rumor.'"⁸

The social centers would provide an alternative to the political party. People (primarily men as voters, although women had a role paralleling their responsibilities in the domestic sphere) would gather at the neighborhood school and rationally seek out the truth. In this antiparty "mugwump" vision, voters would

get together, by neighborhoods, in the district public buildings not to get this or that privilege ... or to get a certain candidacy or theory advanced, but to learn the facts about any public matter, to find the answer to each problem as it arises, to think out what is needed, and to select the best men to do what the majority agree should be done.⁹

For Ward, this was the proper way to approach politics because it was rational, scientific, cooperative, and efficient.

THE SOCIAL CENTERS IN PRACTICE

The social centers enjoyed the support of educators' associations and key officials within the University. Moreover, the ideology of the Wisconsin Idea legitimized its establishment; nevertheless, how did the social centers actually work?

According to Ward (admittedly a biased source), the social centers failed to progress much beyond its start-up phase. Three years after the state legislature mandated the school boards to provide "for the free, convenient and gratuitous use of the public school buildings for the meetings of the citizenship," only a relatively small number of school districts attempted this project and even a greater number failed. In 1914, Ward would glumly note that "social center development has begun in no more

than three hundred districts throughout the state." Moreover, many school districts' efforts began to "languish after a time and in many cases ... the community civic assembling had been abandoned."¹⁰

Ward attributed this failure to the lack of salaried professional leadership in the local community centers. He so advised Dean Reber in his report of June, 1914 and argued that

In order to bring about the systematic and continuous use of the public school buildings as headquarters of citizenship deliberation by adults, as training places in self-government for youth ... and as recreation centers, it is NECESSARY that the person in each district who is to serve as secretary ... be definitely authorized and made responsible, by being remunerated for this service.¹¹

And who was to serve in this official capacity and be so remunerated? Ward's plan called for the local school principal to fulfill this obligation. The school principal already administered the school during its "normal" role as educator of youth; he would assume a new role as the general civic secretary for the local social center. To bolster his recommendation, Ward cited the response level to a questionnaire he sent to a number of school principals: "Do you believe that the schoolhouse should be made the civic, social and recreational center of the district if the school principal or teacher is paid for the extra service as secretary of adult activities and director of young people's activities?" Ward duly noted that the response of 800 school principals was an unanimous "Yes."¹²

Professionalism would replace a volunteer force of ad hoc social center secretaries with school administrators properly compensated for their efforts; this would inevitably lead to greater morale and leadership. Ward traced the failure rate directly to this problem and noted that "where no authorization and definite remuneration of district secretarial service has been provided" then the "limit of volunteer willingness to perform public service for nothing has been reached" and subsequent social center activity suffered.¹³

But there was a deeper malady afflicting Wisconsin's social center development, and much

of it could be traced to Edward Joshua Ward himself; however, the movement itself contained contradictions that undermined it. Ward's job was to propagandize the social center ideal; to do so he delivered powerful revival messages for community democracy. Unfortunately the man often got in the way of the message. Arrogant, haughty, distant, and altogether too taken with his theory, Ward's performance caused many to complain. "The Bureau of Civic and Social Center Development has been doing too much hot air shooting and not enough real simple, definite, concrete work that can be measured in the form of tangible results." Such assessments were common in a number of reports to Dean Reber.¹⁴ One district representative of the University Extension system reported to Dean Reber that while Ward's prepared remarks "inspire(d) most of the audience with a desire for Civic Center activities," his informal discussions "antagonized a few influential people who opposed the movement more strongly than ever."¹⁵ The Secretary of the Lecture Department reported that "(i)ndividuals have sometimes found fault with his personality, since he sometimes impresses people at first sight as being egotistical, overbearing and snobbish."¹⁶

Ward probably felt alienated from people he perceived as being too provincial or traditional; in his eyes they were pharisaic in their hesitancy to accept his message of political salvation. And in some cases Ward did encounter traditional attitudes that took umbrage with his tolerance of saloons and "modern" forms of social interaction. (Ward viewed saloons neutrally; they merely served a "natural" social function, one that could be satisfied by the neighborhood social center.) "Quite frequently," reported the Lecture Department secretary, "church committees have said to us that they did not like Mr. Ward's open defense of dancing." On another occasion the "leading lumberman at Hawkins" wanted to complain to the President of the University "because Mr. Ward in his address ... referred in a humorous way to the mischievous thievery of small boys. This man felt ... that Mr. Ward should have censured the small boys for stealing rather than to have sympathied [sic] with them."¹⁷ Some of the "antagonisms ... he created among the people" were clashes between outlooks; one relatively "modern," the other traditional.

Nevertheless, Ward displayed a crippling disregard for the sensibilities and intelligence of the local people he supposedly viewed as the fountain of democracy. Mr. O'Connor, the district representative for the Fourth District, wrote that in Ashland, Ward delivered a "personal narration which was not related to Ashland in any way. In fact, (the city) was not mentioned during his speech. He gave this same talk at the City Hall two years ago."¹⁸ Moreover, "after (this) talk of two years ago, (the Ashlanders) went to Mr. Ward, expressed their interest, and asked him what they should do to get this grand work started in Ashland, and that as a result he gave them no information or plans whatever." O'Connor's judgment echoed the sentiments of many: "To send a man out to advertise himself in this manner is a waste of state funds."¹⁹

Personal inefficiency compounded Ward's woes. The Secretary of the Extension's Lecture Department reported to Dean Reber that "Last year I heard some complaint that Mr. Ward did not always fill the engagements that were made for him. Sometimes forgetting to fill them, sometimes missing his train, because of his own neglect..." Nevertheless, the secretary defended the Social Center adviser and observed "(a)s is the case with many propagandists, Mr. Ward probably lacks the ability to get down to brass tacks."²⁰

Brass tacks and reality eluded Ward, especially when he propagandized the social center mission. Andrew Melville of the Second District subtitled a section of his report, "Why the Social Center is a Failure in the Oshkosh District" and he laid a good deal of that blame on Ward's inability to work with political reality. Ward, the former clergyman, dogmatized his theory of democracy. If that theory demanded that local officials participate as social center leaders then local officials would be dragooned into the effort. This proved a disaster in the Fox River Valley and Melville noted "(what) maybe alright in theory ... certainly does not work out in practice."²¹

In the city of Menasha Ward "invariably insisted upon the mayor ... being elected president of the social center club, and the city clerk as secretary." In fairness to Ward, his dogmatism reflected the political lessons he learned in Rochester, New York, where the lack of

mayoral support crippled the movement. Unfortunately for Menasha's citizens, their mayor had no interest in establishing, much less maintaining and developing, a social center. According to Melville, the "mayor owns a saloon, a gambling room, and is interested in a house of ill repute." Naturally he would sabotage any community centers that competed with his centers of "sociability." Indeed, the mayor was "absolutely opposed to anything that looks towards the betterment or welfare of the city in any way, for he knows that these innovations will hurt his business." According to Melville, the results were predictable, the social center "organized ... under Mr. Ward's direction never met, and ... he lost any prestige that he might have had ... prior to his coming (to Menasha)." In addition, the community of Algoma also suffered from Ward's "insistence (that) a man wholly unfitted for carrying on the work (be) made president of the organization."²²

Edward Joshua Ward was not meant to be the social center director of Wisconsin. His personal work habits undermined his effectiveness and credibility, his dogmatic and theoretical bent of mind proved useless to Wisconsinites who may have sympathized with him. Melville complained that Ward could not "get down to earth where he c(ould) work out any of his ideas." It almost seemed that Ward held his listeners in contempt as he refused to speak to their level. "Again and again," Melville noted, "have I heard people ask him for advice and direction, and again and again have I heard him go off on a tangent about the theory of government or the idea of the state or something of that kind."²³

Ward resigned as "Adviser to the Bureau of Civic and Social Center Development" in 1915, the bureau itself dissolved and re-emerged as the Bureau of Civic, Commercial and Community Development with Andrew Melville, the District Representative from the Second District, as its new adviser. For those who stayed behind in the University Extension, Ward was "unbalanced," a "difficult personality," and an "individualist with great enthusiasms." That he was plagued by personal troubles, much evidence exists in the record to confirm; however, political problems both internal and external to the University Extension division also contributed to the frustration of the social center movement.

Externally, Ward's resignation came one year after a state-wide conservative reaction swept the Progressive apostate, Emmanuel Phillip, into the governor's office in 1914. Phillip attacked the University and the Extension as examples of Progressive Republican profligacy. The social centers came under attack, especially in Milwaukee, where one of Ward's creations, the Institute of Municipal and Social Service, became associated with the socialist mayor Emil Seidel. To conservatives in 1914 the social center was a center of socialism.

A hostile political environment in 1915 contributed to Ward's resignation; however, the internal politics of the University Extension division were just as unfriendly. According to Chester Allen, a field agent administrator within the Division, departmental relations were acrimonious. Moreover, the Bureau of Civic and Social Center Development competed with other arms of the University. According to Chester Allen "(t)here were many difficulties in the way of conducting an effective community institute program" and the most "effective in slowing up the work" was the College of Agriculture. That school saw Ward's program as a direct threat to its own Farmers' Institutes.²⁴ Dean Reber thought the social centers could overcome a "seemingly insurmountable obstacle to the spread of university extension in rural communities," an obstacle due to "the apparent lack of public gathering places and other facilities for the meeting of groups for study." For Dean Reber, "the community gatherings at the schoolhouse center are natural assemblers" and would release "the tremendous possibilities ... (of) our school plants."²⁵ The College of Agriculture, on the other hand, had long worked in the fields of rural socialization and Country Life and defended its stake.²⁶

The demise of the Bureau of Civic and Social Center Development also reflected a new political environment. After Ward's departure, the University did not fill his position; indeed, the Bureau of Civic and Social Center Development disappeared in an act of creative destruction that established the Bureau of Civic, Commercial and Community Development. The name of this agency reflected a new agenda, Ward's social centers became passe while the University directed its efforts to aiding commercial enterprises.

This agenda reflected business-oriented concerns about industrial and commercial problems in Milwaukee and smaller cities. The Bureau of Civic, Commercial and Community Development arose in response to the University Extension-sponsored Commercial and Industrial Congress, a state-wide conference held in Madison from February 14 to 16, 1916. In light of the divisive internal politics at the University Extension, it is interesting to note that both the conference and the subsequent agency were headed by one of Ward's strongest critics: Andrew H. Melville, the District Representative from Oshkosh.

Melville wrote of the social centers' problems, as did the other four district representatives who submitted reports to Dean Reber in the spring of 1914. Signs of trouble could be discerned in such remarks as "Regret to say that Mr. Ward's lecture did not take very well here. It was not at all suited to the community."²⁷ For Mr. Roseman, then the third district representative, too much activity led to an "over organized" situation where the functions of a social center were already being performed by the "Associated Charities; Y.M.C.A.; Y.W.C.A.; Franklin public debating forum; North Side Progressive League; Board of Trade; clubs of various names in different parts of (LaCrosse); debating and literary societies in ward schools." It is "difficult to secure an audience when they are all running," he noted and concluded that it was "uneconomical in time, energy, and money ... to put across something of which the people do not feel the need."²⁸

Roseman and O'Connor realized that democracy could not be imposed from above. The social centers tried to mobilize the citizenry to fulfill the grand prescriptions of people such as Edward Joshua Ward, who never really examined the assumptions and implications of their theory. Roseman advised the Dean of University Extension that "(i)t is much more economical to find a place in which (the people) feel the necessity of developments along a certain line, and assist them in working out their problems in this particular direction." In other words, democracy should build from real-world issues through real-world coalitions, not artificial meetings to create the democratic spirit. O'Connor concurred when he wrote:

There should be no sensationalism in order to get people to come together. Neither

should a program be forced upon them. If a reasonable amount of propaganda work does not bring the people together for active cooperation on some of the problems of their individual community, it seems to me that the matter should be left alone for another year, or until some specific proposition comes up on which collective action is essential to its success.²⁹

Ward believed he could awaken that need, that he could bring people to recognize their want of a "neighborhood head-and-heart quarters." "He is a propagandist," wrote the Lecture Secretary approvingly, "and has kept the idea of a social center very prominently before the people."³⁰ Being a propagandist, Ward thought he could impose democracy upon people by giving them a vision. Once possessed of this plan they would create neighborhood clubs and follow guidelines laid down by the Social Center Adviser (on Monday evenings people were to discuss national issues; Tuesday evenings, state concerns; Wednesday evenings, local problems; and Thursdays were for recreation.) Ward's democracy was power to the people by precept.

Considering the nature of social center theory, could anyone have transformed this vision into reality? The social centers were appeals to community, consensus, and democracy, looking forward to a nation built upon neighborhood loyalty while looking backwards to some idyllic New England town meeting ideal. Social center advocates wanted a homogenous and scientific polity, one not riven by partisan or class divisions; however the social center theory never explained how existing divisions would be subsumed in the new order. Especially in Ward's vague formulas the theory implied that local schools would become neighborhood centers and democracy would magically and ineluctably follow. According to Edward Stevens, Jr., a historian of social control and Progressive era education:

... a community of values must underlie any social progress. Yet the 'source' of this community was a puzzle. If, as Woodrow Wilson had suggested, community arises from a variety of competing interests, how could that community, except through some magical dialectic, ever transcend those interests? Further, if the social center were a political forum - a marketplace for

competing ideas (interests), and if the centers themselves were to promote a community based on neighborhood, how were these two functions reconcilable? The marketplace was no place for community, nor was community any place for competing values and interests. The problem was simply magnified by a retreat to the Little Red School House and the idealized rural community it represented.³¹

Was the social center vision a total failure? However vague it might have been, the propaganda of Edward Joshua Ward did stir a number of Wisconsinites, especially rural citizens. Perhaps they took Ward's message and adapted it to their own world view and everyday needs. Perhaps they selected bits and pieces and shaped it to fit their lives. In one reported instance, the social center vision crossed class lines. While the social center movement always carried a middle class, Protestant taint, one Extension district representative reported a successful working-class center. He noted that "(i)n some towns there have been good live organizations or clubs of working men in a factory, as for instance - the men in the Gurney Refrigerator Factory at Fond du Lac, who have carried on the Lincoln social center in that town successfully for three years."³²

For some, as in the Fox River Valley, the message of Ward spoke to them about "community" and about "democracy," terms they probably interpreted in their own fashion. Ward struck a chord as Melville noted, "(t)he people want something better than (Ward's) 'visions' of democracy. They want to be told how to go about this business of getting democracy by some one who knows them and their ways, and who is able to give it to them from their point of view."³³ The representative for the sixth district reported these responses from the Eau Claire region: "some community spirit aroused;" "cleaning up of lake front resulting from this movement and that community spirit has been created;" and "the people are interested in governmental affairs and the improvement of (the) town."³⁴ Did these working class people see the promise of democracy as taking more control over their lives, or was it the less revolutionary, middle class deliberating society of Ward's speeches? The answer is beyond the scope of this paper. But if

it is true that people were concerned over "this business of getting democracy" then perhaps they shared the insurgent spirit of the 1890's first noted by David Thelen in The New Citizenship.³⁵ If it is true that people were willing to make their institution more accessible, their lives more democratic, their power fortified; if it is true that insurgency and grass-roots democracy still fired people's fervor, then the state of Wisconsin did its citizens a disservice by imposing an elitist, expert-inspired vision of "democracy." Some of the people, as did the citizens in the Fox River Valley, wanted the genuine article; instead the state gave them "hot air blowing."

This note will conclude by offering some suggestions for further research on a movement that reflected the tensions and contradictions of political Progressivism. As stated earlier, there were some positive responses to Edward J. Ward's "propaganda." Historians need to identify the social sources for the varied responses to Ward's vision. I have hinted that some people saw the empowering potential in meeting together - they were willing to use the social center mechanism as did the workers at the Gurney Refrigerator Factory. Did social center activity differ by class background? Did it differ geographically? We know the pronouncements of Edward J. Ward - that is the history of the social centers from the "top down." We need to understand this movement from "the bottom up" and the ways people appropriated Ward's ideas. As mentioned earlier, the social center movement was not restricted to Wisconsin; there existed the Social Center Association of America (of which Edward Ward was the National Secretary). How did the social centers work in the other states? Can detailed studies of local neighborhood clubs reveal insights about Progressivism? Why did people such as Professor Frederic Howe, Margaret Woodrow Wilson, and John Collier (the organizer of the National Board of Censorship of Motion Pictures) seize the social center idea as if it were a panacea? Answering questions such as these will hopefully throw light on the meanings Progressives gave such words as harmony, society, and democracy.

NOTES

¹Edward J. Ward, ed., The Social Center (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1913), p. v. Hereafter referred to as Ward.

²"Suggested Constitution of the Neighborhood Civic Club." Appendix to Ward, p. 339.

³Edward J. Ward to Louis Reber, June 2, 1914. In the Richard Van Hise Collection, University of Wisconsin. University Archives. Hereafter referred to as Van Hise Papers.

⁴Ward, p. vi.

⁵Edward W. Stevens, Jr., "Social Centers, Politics and Social Efficiency in the Progressive Era." History of Education Quarterly (Spring 1972):16. Hereafter referred to as Stevens.

⁶Charles Zueblin, American Municipal Progress (New York, 1916), cited by Stevens, p. 16.

⁷These documents are found in the Charles Van Hise Papers in the University of Wisconsin Archives. They consist of five reports from the University Extension's district representatives: Melville (Second District), Roseman (Third District), Hamilton (Fifth District), O'Connor (Fourth District) and Ames (Sixth District). No report exists from the first district. These documents have no date but a similar report from the Secretary of the Lecture Department of the University Extension is dated June 4, 1914. This latter report mirrors the content of the district representatives' work. The other documents in the file are dated from May 30, 1914 to June 2, 1914; it is reasonable to infer that the five reports were written around the same time period.

⁸Ward, pp. 19-42.

⁹Ward, pp. 19-42.

¹⁰Ward's report to Dean, June 1, 1914, "Definite Remuneration of District Secretarial Service Necessary for Systematic and Continuous Social Center Development" in the Van Hise Papers.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Report of Mr. Andrew Melville, District Representative, Second District. "The Bureau of Civic and Social Center Development, And How It Has Functioned In the Life of the People of the Oshkosh District." n.d. Van Hise Papers. Hereafter referred to as Melville report.

¹⁵Report of Mr. O'Connor, District Representative, Fourth District. n.d., p. 7. Van

Hise Papers. Hereafter referred to as O'Connor report.

¹⁶"Report from the Secretary of the Lecture Department upon Mr. Ward's work." June 2, 1914, p. 2.

¹⁷Both references are from Ibid., p. 2.

¹⁸O'Connor report, p. 7. On the twice given talk O'Connor related that a "man who heard the talk at the City Hall gave me a complete resume, thus proving that there is no question as to the identity of the two speeches."

¹⁹O'Connor report, pp. 7-8.

²⁰Secretary's Report, June 4, 1914, p. 2.

²¹Melville report, p. 2.

²²Melville report, p. 2.

²³Melville report, p. 3.

²⁴Chester Allen, "University of Wisconsin: The Louis E. Reber Administration." June 1955. Unpublished manuscript in the Chester Allen Papers. University of Wisconsin Archives. University Extension Division. General Administration, p. 93.

²⁵Quoted in Ward, p. 321.

²⁶Given the fact that the University Extension agents worked with the College of Agriculture, it is not irrelevant to ask whether the reports of the district representatives were especially harsh in their judgments of Ward in 1914.

²⁷"Report from the Secretary of the Lecture Department upon Mr. Ward's work." June 2, 1914, p. 2.

²⁸"Report of Mr. Roseman, District Representative, Third District," pp. 3-5.

²⁹Roseman, p. 4. O'Connor report, p. 8.

³⁰"Report from the Secretary of the Lecture Department upon Mr. Ward's work." June 2, 1914, p. 2.

³¹Stevens, p. 30.

³²Melville report, p. 2.

³³Ibid.

³⁴"Report of Ames, District Representative, Sixth District" in Van Hise Papers, University of Wisconsin Archives, p. 10.

³⁵David Thelen, The New Citizenship: Origins of Progressivism in Wisconsin, 1885-1900 (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1972).