Political Science Faculty Works   Political Science

2016

Toward A More Inclusive Community: The Legacy Of Female Reformers In The Progressive State

Carol Nackenoff
Swarthmore College, cnacken1@swarthmore.edu

Recommended Citation

10 • Toward a More Inclusive Community
The Legacy of Female Reformers in the Progressive State
Carol Nackenoff

Many social welfare initiatives that have found their way into the administrative state can be traced to proposals advanced by the mobilized women of the Progressive era. These female reformers identified a range of new social problems and pressed government to address them with new policy initiatives.[1] Behind their efforts lay the vision of a new polity, a national community built from the bottom up and transformed by maternalist perspectives and sensibilities. These reformers sought to foster a new, interconnected citizenry by developing inclusive and dynamic democratic practices. They aimed to empower citizens to participate more fully in community life. They sought to cultivate civic knowledge through increased exposure to the different backgrounds and traditions of the American people. Maternalism was not just a strand of Progressivism, but also a holistic understanding of reform and of the Progressive program itself. It was the self-confident assertion of values missing from the public sphere; the ambition was to confer the qualities and values of women onto a reconstituted nation.

This vision of national community anticipated significant changes in how Americans would relate to one another and to the state. The key elements were association, collaboration, and mutual learning. The potential reach and broad compass of these values tend to be obscured in strongly critical assessments of the narrow and culturally defensive posture of Progressivism, and it is easy to see why. When theory was put into practice, a variety of tensions in the maternalist vision came to the fore. In retrospect, it appears that the project was undermined in headlong pursuit of its own ambitions, and that the conception of a holistic change in national life kept bumping up against the particular character of the agents promoting it. It was not that the vision was

weak or narrowly conceived. It was in fact arrestingly new and strongly demo-cratic. But this vision came from only a part of the Progressive movement and indeed from only a segment of American women. Disagreements with other Progressives and disagreements among women were accentuated in on-the-ground problem solving and policy implementation. The problem was not a narrow conception but a narrowing in the execution.

This chapter examines three particular tensions that emerged as the vision of a national community of newly empowered and aware citizens operating at local levels to solve newly uncovered social problems clashed with other values shared by the reformers. First, the inclusiveness of the project and the aspira-tion to build mutual respect among equals was in tension with the idea of maternalism, which employed sex differences and female sensibilities as the basis of social transformation. Second, and relatedly, there was a clash be-tween the reform processes advocated and the substantive ends sought. Re-formers recognized the civic and educative value of diversity, but they worked to achieve particular policy goals that often devalued the very alternatives that civic diversity brought to the fore. And third, the aim of empowering citizens to act locally on their own behalf proved incongruous with a simultaneous emphasis on expertise and a keen interest in the specialized knowledge needed to solve social and economic challenges of the day. Consequently, a vision meant to recast the community at large, to draw insight from diversity, and to empower the marginalized tended in practice to lock in traditional gen-der roles, traditional notions of proper family life, and reliance on expertise and administration to achieve political ends.

For many female reformers, creating new, interconnected citizens through more inclusive and dynamic practices of democracy was vital to the success of the Progressive project and to governing in modern America. They demanded not only access to the public sphere but also fundamental changes in its orien-tation and operation. And their determination to develop practices that might further open the public sphere to groups previously excluded unleashed enor-mous energy and political creativity. Nevertheless, these hopes were largely unfulfilled. The experience of Progressive women reformers is suggestive of problems likely to arise in the course of reform efforts more generally. This holistic vision of a new community had its origins in a part of the whole, and that proved self-limiting. Indeed, it seemed to channel reform toward anti-thetical ends.

The gap between aspirations and performance haunts all reform move-ments. The shortfalls are not to be denied, but neither are they an indictment

of the effort itself. These female reformers accomplished much, and their ex-
perience offers some constructive lessons for our present moment. These re-
formers located politics in the borderlands between public and private, self
and community. They opened relations of power and authority within those
spaces to political scrutiny and political contestation. They brought problems
not previously seen as state work into the public sphere.[2] Identifying their
objectives can inspire new approaches to the political problems they perceived;
identifying the obstacles they encountered can inform new reform strategies.

Building a Democracy Through Interaction with Difference

Female Progressive reformers, especially those influenced by the settle-
ment movement and in particular by Jane Addams's practices of pragmatism,[3]
contended that new democratic citizens had to be forged if twentieth-century
social problems were to be addressed effectively. Industrialization, urbaniza-
tion, and the shift toward the provision of many traditional household goods
and services outside the home challenged older ideas of self-reliance and
rugged individualism. Reformers argued that provisions for food safety,
health, sanitation, water, light, and the protection of children and homes could
be better arranged collectively. Just as many urban homes shared walls, the
fortunes of Americans were increasingly interlinked.[4] For Addams, the forms
of social action that women were promoting countered the male-dominated
ethos of individual autonomy that had prevailed in the nineteenth century,
and embraced the interdependent society that was fast emerging as a matter
of fact.[5] In the words of one female Chicago reformer, "Individuals are so in-
terrelated and dependent that each one depends on the rest for obtaining his
own ends."[6] Even many philanthropic activities that had been the purview of
late-nineteenth-century women were becoming matters of public concern,
and women who clung (mistakenly, in Addams's view) to traditional notions
of domesticity were left "in a household of constantly narrowing interests."[7]
The world was opening to the concerns of women, and it was drawing women
out of the confines in which they had pursued those concerns in the past. Just
as clinging to outmoded notions of women's place in the domestic sphere was
inappropriate, the expression of individual self-interest was no longer a viable
expression of citizenship.[8] For Addams, such obsolete ideas perpetuated "a
great deal of wrong."[9]

The female reformers linked to Addams and to the settlement movement
were hardly alone in stressing the obsolescence of the individual as a force in

modern democratic politics. Mass-membership organizations such as the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the National American Woman Suffrage Association were already networking across the nation, and theories linking associational activity to democracy were not far behind. Arthur Bentley's *The Process of Government* (1908) characterized the nation "as made up of groups of men [*sic*], each group cutting across many others, each individual man a component part of very many groups." Groups, not individuals, were perceived as the raw material of political life, and ideas and feelings were understood as social.[10] Collective solutions to social problems were increasingly viewed as more ethically advanced than individualistic ones, and the state itself was approached as an important association that could be usefully deployed to address social problems.[11]

Reformers' sense that new democratic citizens had to be forged along lines of association and collaboration was further shaped by the presence of immigrants from the many nations flooding into cities in the several decades before World War I. The development of urban ethnic neighborhoods in proximity to downtowns and to established bourgeois neighborhoods highlighted differences between them. In this changing environment, a number of turn-of-the-century middle-class female reformers, including those involved in the juvenile court movement, immigrant protection, child labor legislation, the unionization of female workers, and suffrage movements, worked alongside other women—and sometimes men—with very different experiences and backgrounds from their own.

For these reformers, wider experience "becomes the source and expression of social ethics." In sharp contrast to other Progressives on the national stage, such as Teddy Roosevelt, whose vision of national community embraced eugenics, female reformers associated with the settlement movement tended to value the experiential and educational potential of interacting with multiple and diverse groups. To build this experience required open-minded and social scientific inquiry; democratic practitioners needed to understand the lives of diverse people with diverse experiences, as Addams put it, "not only in order to believe in their integrity, which is after all but the first beginnings of social morality, but in order to attain to any mental or moral integrity for ourselves or any such hope for society."[12] In Dewey's formulation, "the extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own, is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory which kept men from perceiving

the full import of their activity." With "more numerous and more varied points of contact" there is "a greater diversity of stimuli to which an individual has to respond."[13] And, for Addams, appreciation for varied perspectives and experiences required contact, understanding, sympathy, humility, discussion, and deliberation—both outside and inside political institutions.[14] The writings and practices of some of these reformers demonstrate a nuanced approach to diversity that undermines contemporary critics' blunt charge that all Progressives were wholly racist or inattentive to the value of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

This urban vision of interaction within and among diverse ethnic communities went hand in hand with the Progressive emphasis on developing state-of-the-art methods of data collection. Importantly, such data was not only to be used to promote policy goals. Rather, the process of its collection would foster a democratic spirit in and of itself. Through data collection, reformers would acquire knowledge and wider experience of their neighbors. It would encourage the breakdown of economic and social barriers that defined urban spaces. Hull-House residents and affiliates had engaged in data gathering since 1893. In that year, U.S. Bureau of Labor staff members joined Florence Kelly to collect data on their local community door-to-door, and in 1895 they produced the *Hull-House Maps and Papers*.[15] Turn-of-the-century women's organizations embraced data collection and the dissemination of reports in newspapers, journals, and pamphlets as a means of acquainting themselves and their communities with social problems in their backyards. As they did, their projects filled out an emerging vision of a more activist democratic governance. Inclusion demanded information; it "emphasized social science ideas and methods, organization, and collective responsibility for social conditions."[16]

Data collection was envisioned neither as a one-way dynamic nor as a single instance; it was to be part of an educational, interactive, and iterative process of mutual discovery. The self-expressed needs and interests of the people with whom the reformers met were expected to shape the reformers' own perceptions of problems and policy options. For those inspired by Addams, Dewey, and William James, inquiry, continually applied, would yield good policy choices, but for this practice to be successful, ongoing community relationships had to be maintained. Knowledge acquisition was a dynamic process, involving ongoing adjustment on the basis of experimentation and experience.[17]

According to urban female reformers of the settlement movements, engaging with the experiences and standpoints of others was the very means by which men and women would transform themselves civically and politically.

Interaction and deliberation might not make differences in goals and values disappear, but the experience of face-to-face communication would better teach each citizen, dynamically and incrementally, consideration for others' preferences. Addams and her contemporaries pressed for a sort of "strong democracy"—"civic activity [that] educates individuals how to think publicly as citizens." Put another way, creating new democratic citizens depended on personal interactions at the neighborhood level, on building social capital and trust face to face, and on facilitating "coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit."[18] Creating a decidedly *social* ethic was central to the task of fostering the development of new democratic citizens. Inclusion, respect, cooperation, and a sense of community were vital for Addams and her colleagues.

Given how things turned out, it is notable that reformers explicitly warned against imposing their own view of what was desirable or healthy on the communities under study; they knew that imposition would backfire and tempt failure. Hull-House is illustrative: when specially trained settlement residents offered local neighbors foods prepared according to the latest nutritional science at Hull-House's cooperative Diet Kitchen, the intended beneficiaries, with "wide diversity in nationality and inherited tastes," did not like the fare; a far more successful coffeehouse was substituted.[19] It is likely, then, that the continued engagement of Hull-House-inspired reformers in some of the public programs they helped create was strategic—an outgrowth of the belief that ongoing relationships with those the programs were designed to serve was necessary for what we might today refer to as constructing positive "feedback loops": experience, experimentation, practice, and dynamic knowledge production were part of the process of policy design. Hybrid governing arrangements were implicit in this iterative process. The case of Chicago's juvenile court, in which reformers incrementally designed experimental programs that succeeded in developing and modifying the court after its formal establishment, illustrates the dynamic that reformers sought.[20]

For these female reformers, forging new democratic citizenship required work at multiple levels. It involved the state, large-scale organizations, and interactions in the neighborhood. The approach here again was pragmatic. Rather than envisioning stark choices between state or nonstate action, or top-down versus grassroots efforts, these urban Progressives understood their objective as requiring all these approaches. Consequently, these reformers were not, in any simple sense, nationalist Progressives.[21] For them, the appropriate level of government to be applied to an identified social problem depended on the nature of the problem itself and the constitutionally plausible warrants for

involving the national government. Since solutions to industrial and social problems were better and more ethically advanced when they were collective and associational rather than individualistic or laissez-faire, the state was often considered a desirable location for addressing them. The Progressive-era state had important roles to play in the democratic project: enabling concerted action to address poverty and social welfare needs through new institutions, policies, and resources, and suppressing harmful behaviors and practices through legislation and regulation.

What Became of This Vision?

Even when they were successful in creating new institutions and new policies, the vision of these female reformers was challenged on a number of fronts. Many of the difficulties encountered were what one might expect for any movement advocating social change. The problems identified were often too complex for the solutions devised. Resistance from oppositional forces and established institutions was often intense. Unexpected developments in the economy shifted the ground from under once well-positioned activists.[22]

But beyond these generic problems, Progressive women were plagued by specific tensions internal to the women's movement and to reform in Progressive-era America. Their democratic vision was undermined in part from within. First, there was a clash between a maternalist project for empowering women, on the one hand, and a parallel desire to forge rich collaborative relationships among citizens considered equal. The project not only was inspired by an ethic of sex difference, but also tended to reinforce a white, middle-class gender norm. The contention that a woman's perspective harbored the makings of a new democracy unintentionally tended to lock many women into roles that limited their opportunities and discredited alternatives. Relatedly, the value these women ascribed to diversity, interaction, and learning was constantly challenged by their sense of what an advanced civilization should look like. In other words, these reformers were invested in a clear, substantive policy outcome even as they valued a radically new process of achieving that outcome. Ultimately, their preconceived substantive vision conflicted with the democratic and educational value that reformers placed on learning through interaction and data collection. Third, the project of empowering citizens stood in tension with other Progressive projects. While the maternalists adopted an instrumentalist view of the state, their ambitions were all too easily deflected and absorbed by other Progressive reformers whose goals more explicitly involved building and empowering the state.

The maternalist vision of democratic reform held no monopoly on Progressive ambitions. Different Progressive ideals were vying to shape the national political community and, with it, emerging political institutions and policy choices. While the pragmatist-inspired urban reformers emphasized local interaction as the route to social knowledge, other Progressives had a different understanding of good government and scientific management. Some proponents of Progressive democracy embraced a top-down approach, contending that concentrating power at the center was the most effective way to increase popular control over government.[23] Consequently, these urban reformers competed ideologically and politically not only with opponents but also with other Progressive forces. Agreement on the imperative to create a new democracy was far wider than agreement on exactly what it should look like and how it should be built.

Empowering Women with Maternalist Appeals
Versus Forging Equal Citizenship

As they participated in identifying social problems and positioning themselves to become part of the solution, middle-class female reformers found new pathways to power. By developing specific expertise in particular policy domains through practice, research, and investigations, they created openings in local, state, and federal governments that they were uniquely suited to fill. For example, Julia Lathrop, one of the crusaders for the establishment of the Juvenile Court of Cook County, moved from local success to become, in 1912, the first head of the federal government's Children's Bureau. But women empowered to help shape social policy did not readily empower many women, especially those who were targets of social policies.

The maternalist approach has a complicated legacy. The reformers grounded their case in a claim that they brought different and vital perspectives and values to public life; their contribution to democratic governance was derived from their experiences, roles, and responsibilities within the family and the community.[24] By the last years of the nineteenth century, they had used new organizational models and employed home-extending metaphors to expand notions of public work and their own role in it.[25] Maternalists who read or knew about the work of Antoinette Brown Blackwell, Lester Ward, Patrick Geddes and J. Arthur Thomson, and William I. Thomas had been given reason to believe that among advanced civilizations, the female was not simply equal to the male but indeed the more highly evolved of the two sexes.

Evolution was supposedly tending toward "both social feeling and social organization"—functions in which women specialized.[26] Women needed at least to have an equal place in the public sphere because their skills were very much needed. Whether because of nature, experiences, or social roles, for many of these reformers, "it seemed perfectly clear that women were the only people in America capable of bringing about a new order in which democracy would find social as well as political expression."[27]

For Addams, men valued individualism and independence, while women gravitated toward social action and social consciousness. Women therefore stood in the vanguard of a more advanced democratic project. Women were associated with a more mature, social, and ethical democratic citizenship: "To attain individual morality in an age demanding social morality, to pride one's self on the results of personal effort when the time demands social adjustment, is utterly to fail to apprehend the situation."[28] In "If Men Were Seeking the Franchise," Addams argued, somewhat playfully, that women would want to consider carefully the male proclivity for destructive military ventures and expenditures and for celebrating individual competition and unbridled capitalism. Blame for the social and industrial ills of the city and for the failure to address the problems of immigrants and industrial workers could be laid at the feet of men. Women were community builders and nurturers, and were more committed than men to education, industrial safety, and social welfare.[29]

Addams's aspirations for developing collaborative and respectful processes for building a social ethic among equals did not mesh well, however, with maternalist imagery about care, nurture, and dependency, all of which conjured up asymmetrical relationships between unequals. Consequently, maternalism of this sort carried potential challenges for the goal of forging an inclusive community of equal democratic citizens. While arguments about what women could distinctively contribute to government and society played a role in their successes, such claims also erected barriers to inclusiveness for some women and helped inscribe dependency relations into social policy formation and implementation.

State recognition of the public contributions made by mothers and mothering, and more generally of the importance of family to the state, has been claimed as an important factor in the establishment of robust welfare states.[30] Yet some early-twentieth-century policies reinforced traditional gender roles and, with them, working-class women's economic dependence on men and on the state. Maternalism defined female recipients of governmental assistance as dependents. Mothers' pensions or family pensions, for example, administered

through juvenile courts at least through the 1920s, were usually conditioned on female domesticity—providing the in-home service of raising the next generation of citizens—and were awarded or withheld according to how well women conformed to middle-class expectations of worthy behavior. Progressive reformers often touted these pensions as ushering in a new, enlightened era of family-centered policy and of recognition of the work that women performed for the state.[31] The policy was designed to enable women "to *care* for their families and not, by and large, to *provide* for them in the sense that is expected of a breadwinner." American social policy helped maintain these relations of dependency as well as women's "secondary role in financial provision."[32]

From mothers' pensions to social programs such as Aid to Dependent Children (later, Aid to Families with Dependent Children), maternalism has been charged with subjecting beneficiaries to degrees and forms of social control that those who are fully citizens do not, and should not, experience.[33] While some scholars do not find deliberate intent in the gender and race patterning of New Deal social programs, nevertheless, "public policies and institutional arrangements organize the citizenry and shape the meaning and character of citizenship."[34] Women who claimed that their special provenance derived from their identity and abilities as nurturers transposed the mother-child bond to other categories of vulnerable people (new immigrants, the poor) whose problems required public attention. Even if reformers viewed dependency as temporary, images and rhetoric of maternalism helped them impose middle-class, Victorian norms on other people in a manner inconsistent with empowering equal citizens.[35] Maternalism reinforced tiered citizenship and paved the way for more privileged women, by speaking authoritatively for the interests of others, to approximate the political prerogatives of white males.[36]

Treating the supposed beneficiaries of policies as children or dependents had material consequences. One stark example was found with female reformers involved in fieldwork to make Indians into "men." During the Dawes Act era (1887–1934), these reformers frequently spoke and thought of American Indians as their children or babies. Women such as Alice Fletcher were treated as authorities by friends of the American Indians back East because she had worked in the field, ostensibly on their behalf.[37] The consent of these native peoples was not essential to the policies imposed on men, women, and children alike because children did not understand what was in their best interest. Whether it was removal of the young to boarding schools, forced allotments, bans on certain tribal rituals, the undermining of tribal governance, or instruction in how to live in proper single- family homes, reformers had considerable

capacity to punish or to provide benefits, depending on compliance. Policies that enforced compliance with notions of home and family imported from middle-class urban reform circles contributed to death, destitution, and decline among many American Indian communities in the Progressive era.[38]

Valuing Diversity Versus Embracing Certainty
of Direction and Goals

It was an ironic twist. Progressive women, who believed they represented the ethical advance guard of civilization, were seeking to combat an outmoded individualism; autonomous selves were to become interdependent and social. In principle, association and collaboration were to inspire action. But the danger in attacking claims to individual autonomy was that it could easily open onto remedies that were socially coercive, and Progressive women were not well prepared to resist that alternative. Their rhetorical and, in some cases, actual commitment to becoming more informed about ethnic and cultural diversity clashed with their simultaneous acceptance of a defined civilized ideal of familial relations. And many female reformers therefore became part of a state-building project that would discipline the nation along "the model of sober, white, native-born, Protestants."[39] From this perspective, Progressive-era women's political projects that included reforming working-class behaviors and mores were directed more toward conformity with prevailing norms than toward developing empathy and understanding for the values, histories, and traditions of others.

Settlement-influenced female reformers valued diversity, but that value was romanticized, and when pursuing the substantive goals in which they had the most confidence, their actual respect for diversity was quite limited. To be sure, their maternalist arguments were grounded in a claim about the importance of incorporating different perspectives. And they routinely included newcomers and workingmen and workingwomen in their vision of a new democratic public. Addams, in particular, urged the preservation of newcomers' cultural arts and community networks of care; the latter represented primitive manifestations of the social ethic she expected the larger community—with the aid of women—to embrace. Older generations were encouraged to preserve and transmit traditions that younger members of immigrant communities were eager to forget in their drive to Americanize, and Hull-House reformers believed that maintenance of ethnic communal and familial ties could keep the young from running headlong into urban temptations and

vices. When these reformers turned to the state to bring its resources to bear on problems of national scope, they sought ways to include the voices and perspectives of those with whom they interacted.

But these were self-assured women, and they had standards of their own. Their faith in progress was not only strongly gendered but also strongly racialized. Progress was largely a white affair.[40] In the prevailing view of the period, advanced peoples were Caucasian; progress was driven by those who had succeeded rather than by the more "barbaric races."[41] Having faith that their social ethic represented the highest stage of civilization, many Hull-House Progressives had a certainty of vision; they believed they were natural leaders forward. If exposure to diversity broadened sympathy and understanding for the experiences, problems, and perspectives of others and expanded the horizons of all (including reformers), gendered and racialized visions of citizenship too frequently led to positing, rather than hearing and comprehending, the interests of others.

For example, the Immigrants' Protective League, under the leadership of Grace Abbott, participated in a successful crusade to put immigrant banks and fringe banks out of business in Chicago in the name of protecting vulnerable immigrants. The reformers not only addressed the real abuses brought to their attention but also curtailed the provision of many financial services accessed by the poor at a time when established banks maintained inconvenient hours, lacked foreign-language employees, were located at a distance from immigrant communities, and often made immigrants feel unwelcome.[42] Postal savings banks, while safe places to deposit money, did not provide the same range of services as immigrant banks.

There was little pushback from other segments of the reform community. Other Progressives, as discussed in the chapter by Nicole Mellow, were even less interested in enriching the polity with diverse experiences. The case for diversity ran up against the more general view that progress hinged on creating a more knowledgeable and rational citizenry. There was "no safe or sound democracy which is not based upon an educated, intelligent electorate."[43] Continuing waves of immigration from southern and eastern Europe could pose a direct challenge to those working for progress. "Backward" newcomers who retained so-called Old World attitudes were perceived as a threat to reform's larger goals. Especially when possessed of the ballot, immigrant males could thwart reform projects.[44] Each new wave of immigrants required remedial work. A more enlightened democratic citizenship, then, might be possible only by excluding undesirables from American shores or the ballot. Addams's

ideal position—that diversity was vital to democratic citizenship—was, by the second decade of the twentieth century, becoming a minority position within the larger Progressive movement.

Empowering Citizens Versus Empowering the State

Among the most important tensions for female Progressives inspired by Addams and Dewey was that between the turn toward the national state for solutions to many social and economic problems and the desire for vibrant, meaningful participation and interaction of diverse citizens at the grassroots. These reformers turned to the state while resisting bureaucratic claims to a kind of scientific expertise and efficiency divorced from the very people public officials were hired to serve.[45] For Dewey, "how we come to understand political problems and respond implied a kind of local knowledge and communal vision that is beyond the purview of experts."[46]

Learning through democratic experimentalism, monitoring results, and making incremental adjustments was part of the idealized process of governing. The local, state, and national policy initiatives that Addams and her associates spearheaded were experiments; they were observed, adjusted, and copied as appropriate across jurisdictions and across issue areas. Local reformers shared and borrowed one another's policy ideas. They also developed and field-tested several new institutions, funding and staffing prototypes for what would become the Juvenile Court of Cook County and the federal immigration station near the primary train station at which immigrants arrived in Chicago.[47] The Illinois Juvenile Court Act, enacted in 1899, was amended repeatedly on the basis of reformers' experience during the court's first decade.[48] Lines of responsibility were often elided as state and nonstate actors participated in building this institution. Long-term collaboration—in the community and with state authorities—was necessary to create deliberative, evolving, problem-solving institutions.[49]

But many Progressive reformers and intellectuals considered the engine of progress to be driven by professionalism, objectivity, and new social scientific knowledge unencumbered by lay input. The desire to insulate government, skilled experts, and bureaucrats from popular pressure grew out of a strain of thinking about what constituted knowledge acquisition, and how it related to democracy and progress, that was very different from Addams's vision for participatory democracy in the neighborhood and within government. The Progressives who put their faith in experts were potentially at odds with those

who celebrated the rise of organized groups and looked to them for help in designing and administering social policy.

Rather than empower a democratic public, processes of knowledge acquisition developed by urban reformers could unwittingly bolster the control that bureaucrats or experts had over policy decisions. As Hull-House activists—often college-educated women with developing social scientific skills—collected data and wrote reports to broaden their understanding of the problems faced by their fellow citizens and neighbors, they sought to persuade others that public action to alleviate these public problems was necessary. But they also contributed to the modern state's capacity to see and control categories of people.[50] While the interactive process could foster relations on the ground in line with urban reformers' robust localist democratic vision, the data produced from these interactions could and would be used in efforts to expand bureaucratic control and regulation. In naming new public problems and working to frame them, these women were not just engaged in a project of expanding state activity into new arenas. The work they did helped emerging institutions and actors within them "see" like a state. They were part of a modern state-building project of making unruly and inconvenient subjects legible and manageable.[51]

These women expanded mechanisms of governance, too, by entering homes and tenements in the private sphere, where men could not readily go, to collect information about family members and their habits.[52] This move was facilitated by the efforts that Addams and her contemporaries had made to shift political discourse by telling new stories about the porous borders between public and private spaces and about the role of women's skills, traditional areas of expertise, and "brooms" in a shifting public space.[53] The reform movement that created the nation's first juvenile court, in Cook County, Illinois, affords a good example. Progressive reform women implemented (and for a while funded) a system of paid and volunteer probation officers (many of whom were women), who assisted the court by entering homes and tenements and collecting data. They recommended which children should be removed from homes, determined who was a fit parent, and attempted to regulate habits, behaviors, and living arrangements. Parents or guardians who allowed young people to frequent poolrooms, bars, dance halls, or to roam the streets could be legally deemed guilty of neglect, as could those too poor to provide for their young. Such a judgment brought them within the purview of the juvenile court system.[54] Although the juvenile court movement emphasized supervision and rehabilitation of the young and their separation from

the adversarial criminal justice system, the reform agenda fit equally well into the effort to expand the reach of the law and the administrative state by extending legal supervision to older youth and even to parents and guardians.

Reformers were overly optimistic about the prospects of making institutions dynamic, flexible, and responsive. New public policies and programs created bureaucracies, constituencies, and stakeholders, further complicating the kind of experimentation and knowledge building that Addams and Dewey envisioned. Not only were participation, feedback loops, and iterative processes for adjustment to new evidence at odds with emerging bureaucratic rules and regulations, but the data gathered from these processes also produced opportunities for regulatory expansion. And the solutions chosen to address social problems established path-dependent trajectories that made change difficult. These policies became sticky over time, gathering entrenched interests, and chances for innovation waned.

Progressive Resonance: Ongoing Work and Promising Rediscoveries

The female reformers' vision succumbed to the limitations of its agents, and it was in many ways in advance of their actual practice, but it continues to inspire. Despite the tensions and shortfalls, the relevance and appeal of parts of this reform aspiration have never been completely extinguished. The reformers' focus on the interrelationships among gender, citizenship, and inclusion, and their interest in flexible institutions, can inform efforts at innovation today.

First, though maternalist rhetoric declined after women gained the franchise, the differences between men and women that Addams playfully tweaked did not disappear. Even before the gender gap emerged in voting behavior, many surveys picked up a persistent gender difference in public policy preferences. Regardless of whether these differences are essentialist or normatively constructed over time, women are consistently found to be somewhat more supportive than men of government spending for social welfare, education, health care, and regulation of unsafe practices; women are less inclined to support the death penalty, the unregulated accessibility of firearms, recent wars, and the use of force more generally.[55] More than their male counterparts, they continue to support key aspects of the social welfare state, much in the way Addams suggested they did a century ago. One reason advanced for why these gendered preferences are not reflected in political agendas in the

contemporary era is the failure of women's organizations to mobilize around females' sentiments on these issues, alongside a decline of the kinds of nationally organized, participatory, mass-membership organizations that prevailed a century ago.[56] Women remain underrepresented in elective office, and many governmental policies better reflect men's than women's preferences, so gender continues to be linked to power and policy choices. There is still much that women, mobilized around gendered perspectives, can accomplish.

We are beginning to understand, however, just how much deeper the problem of inclusion reaches. The early-twentieth-century effort to shift public and private boundaries and include women's historic interests and concerns in the public sphere encountered formidable resistance. What recent feminist scholars have seen, and what perhaps Addams and her allies did not, is how much women's absence from the public sphere was due to the limits of liberalism and not simply to "the misogynist prejudices of early modern moral and political theory." Building a national political community entailed challenging public-private boundaries, but the sphere of discourse that Addams and her supporters embraced—one that associates the female with the realm of nature, the household, and the private sphere—maintains gendered notions of individual autonomy in ways that underpin modern liberalism. Individualism has remained more resilient than Progressives expected, and the sphere of care and child work still remains largely outside the realm of politics.[57] The inability of female reformers and fellow travelers to more fully displace these boundaries—despite their new narratives about public work—meant that the prospects of Progressive reform would likewise remain constrained.[58]

Moving to the institutional side, it is becoming increasingly clear that centralization generates challenges for building a vibrant democratic community of the sort envisioned by Progressive women. The dominant narrative about the transition from the nineteenth- to the twentieth-century state is of a shift in power from states to the national government and from private and voluntary activity to public and governmental responsibility. And yet the New Deal state hardly absorbed all private or voluntary initiatives, and may even be seen as another variant on a historical pattern of "intermingling of state and private means of extending public authority."[59] In other words, rediscovering the original Progressive commitment to public-private partnerships, one that was perhaps most fully embraced by female reformers, is crucial to revitalizing contemporary progressivism and challenging the persistent conservative critique of modern liberalism as being capable only of turning to the state. While political conservatives imagine themselves as the champions of current

proposals for public-private partnerships, room remains for modern progressives to rethink possibilities for collaboration between state institutions and nonstate organizations. If the role of such collaborations during the Progressive era and other periods of American history is better understood, then their potential benefits and liabilities in state building and governance today may be more fully assessed.

Indeed, some of the ideas and approaches of the early Progressive female reformers are being rediscovered. A new generation of reformers, critical of unresponsive, inflexible public responses to large-scale problems such as the environment and the criminal justice system, has found much to appreciate in the kinds of reforms undertaken by Progressives a century ago.[60] The earlier reformers sought to foster opportunities for experimentation and knowledge building that included learning from programs' participants and beneficiaries, and from incorporating public-private partnerships in institution building. Their twenty-first-century heirs find evidence that these earlier reformers had some success in maintaining the accountability of local public officials and of community service providers, and that programs can respond effectively to local diversity.[61] In the face of recent efforts to defund and dismantle the social welfare state, experimental institutional innovations are being quietly initiated. Alternative courts for drug offenders, new community courts, human-trafficking courts, veterans' courts, teen courts with peer judges, and new problem-solving courts, all with expanded intervention options, have begun to flourish.[62] Participants consent to participate in alternative courts rather than courts that would normally have jurisdiction over the offense in question. These initiatives have begun both because traditional solutions to social problems were not working and because institutions themselves were seen to be incapable of innovation. Some argue that consumers of services should be included in coproducing such services, since consumers have unique understandings of particular and local circumstances that should be taken into account if those services are to be useful to them.[63] There is more we stand to learn by revisiting some of the social program efforts launched by the pragmatic women of the Progressive era—not just about designing effective policies but also in nourishing the growth of active citizen stakeholders.

Progressivism promised more than it could deliver,[64] and Addams's vision was no exception. She put great stock in the capacity of ordinary people, working with their neighbors, to forge a democratic citizenry that would work to build an enlightened polity. But the follow- through was disappointing.

Ultimately, shortfall is engrained in all reform projects. It is hardly surprising that the reform ideas of a century ago ran into difficulties, that their achievements were limited, or that their implementation failed to conform to our own more enlightened views. What is remarkable is the extent to which we are still grappling with the tensions and trade-offs that they encountered, and what is most astounding of all is just how vibrant and relevant their most advanced ideas remain. In our day, with progressivism under siege, it is more important than ever to recall the democratic aspirations of Progressive-era women, for many of their ideals are still very much worth pursuing.

Notes

Thanks to Stephen Skowronek, Bruce Ackerman, Stephen Engel, and participants in the Yale conference on the Progressives' century, November 1–2, 2013, and especially to Stephen Engel and Stephen Skowronek for invaluable comments on a draft of this paper.

1. On women's roles in creating modern social policy, see Theda Skocpol, *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1992); Theda Skocpol, Marjorie Abend-Wein, Christopher Howard, and Susan Goodrich Lehmann, "Women's Associations and the Enactment of Mothers' Pensions in the United States," *American Political Science Review* 87, no. 3 (September 1993): 686–701; contributions by Kathryn Kish Sklar and Sonya Michels in *Mothers of a New World: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of Welfare States,* ed. Seth Koven and Sonya Michel (New York: Routledge, 1993); Virginia Sapiro, "The Gender Basis of American Social Policy," *Political Science Quarterly* 101, no. 2 (1986): 221–38; Paula Baker, "The Domestication of Politics: Women in American Political Society, 1780–1920," *American Historical Review* 89, no. 3 (1984): 620–47.

2. On boundary construction as a social process, see Charles Tilly, *Stories, Identities, and Political Change* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002), 11.

3. I refer to Addams's practices rather than Dewey's writings. For Addams's influence on Dewey, see Louis Menand, *The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2001), 310–16; and Charlene Haddock Seigfried, *Pragmatism and Feminism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 29–30, 45, 48–49, 58–66, 73–78.

4. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, *The Home: Its Work and Influence* (New York: Source Book, 1970 [1903]), 330–35.

5. Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull House* (New York: Macmillan, 1923 [1910]), chap. 18; Addams, *Democracy and Social Ethics,* ed. Anne Firor Scott (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1964 [1902]), 86.

6. Jessie Taft, *The Woman Movement from the Point of View of Social Consciousness* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916), 49. Taft had earned a University of Chicago Ph.D. under the direction of George Herbert Mead.

7. Jane Addams, "Why Women Should Vote," *Ladies' Home Journal* 27, no. 1 (January 1910), 21 (reprinted in pamphlet form, New York: National American Woman Suffrage Association, 1912, 14); Addams, "Philanthropy and Politics," *Ladies' Home Journal* 30, no. 1 (January 1913), 25.

8. Carol Nackenoff, "New Politics for New Selves: Jane Addams's Legacy for Democratic Citizenship in the Twenty-First Century," in *Jane Addams and the Practice of Democracy,* ed. Marilyn Fischer, Carol Nackenoff, and Wendy Chmielewski (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2009), 119–42, quotation on 119.

9. Addams's Iowa College lectures on "ethical survivals," delivered in March 1898, quoted by Louise Knight, *Citizen: Jane Addams and the Struggle for Democracy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 398.

10. Arthur Bentley, *The Process of Government* (Evanston: Principia Press of Illinois, 1949 [1908, 1935]), 204.

11. Brian Balogh, *A Government Out of Sight: The Mystery of National Authority in Nineteenth-Century America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), chap. 9, especially 352–55; Arthur F. Bentley, *The Process of Government,* ed. Peter H. Odegard (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1967 [1908]), 199, 262. Bentley did not draw a sharp distinction between government and other forms of social activity.

12. Addams, *Democracy and Social Ethics,* 11, 176, quotation at 177.

13. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1920 [1916]), 101.

14. On deliberation and participation inside bureaucratic institutions, see Camilla Stivers, *Bureau Men, Settlement Women: Constructing Public Administration in the Progressive Era* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000).

15. *Hull-House Maps and Papers: A Presentation of Nationalities and Wages in a Congested District of Chicago* (Boston: Crowell, 1895) was the Chicago portion of a national study commissioned by Congress of the slums of four major cities.

16. Baker, "Domestication of Politics," 641.

17. Carol Nackenoff, "The Private Roots of American Political Development: The Immigrants' Protective League's 'Friendly and Sympathetic Touch,' 1908–1924," *Studies in American Political Development* 28, no. 2 (Fall 2014): 129–60; Erik Schneiderhan, "Pragmatism and Empirical Sociology: The Case of Jane Addams and Hull-House, 1889–1895," *Theory and Society* 40 (2011): 609.

18. Benjamin R. Barber, *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 152–53; Robert D. Putnam, "The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life," *American Prospect* 13 (Spring 1993): 35, 40; Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000).

19. Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull-House,* 131; Schneiderhan, "Pragmatism and Empirical Sociology," 608–9.

20. Nackenoff, "Roots of American Political Development"; Carol Nackenoff and Kathleen S. Sullivan, "The House that Julia (and Friends) Built: Networking Chicago's Juvenile Court," in *Statebuilding from the Margins: Between Reconstruction and the New Deal,* ed. Carol Nackenoff and Julie Novkov (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 171–202.

21. On nationalist Progressives, see Marc Stears, *Progressives, Pluralists, and the Problems of the State: Ideologies of Reform in the United States and Britain, 1909–1926* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002). A number of chapters in Nackenoff and Novkov, *Statebuilding from the Margins,* focus on the development of institutions at the state level during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

22. Skocpol, *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers,* 527.

23. Walter E. Weyl, *The New Democracy* (New York: Macmillan, 1912), 159.

24. Alice Paul's crusade for equal rights starting in the 1910s stands as an exception; see Christine A. Lunardini, *From Equal Suffrage to Equal Rights: Alice Paul and the National Woman's Party, 1910–1928* (New York: New York University Press, 1986).

25. See Elisabeth S. Clemens, "Organizational Repertoires and Institutional Change: Women's Groups and the Transformation of U.S. Politics, 1890–1920," *Journal of Sociology* 98 (January 1993): 755–98; Robyn Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform, 1890–1935* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Daphne Spain, *How Women Saved the City* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001); Carol Nackenoff, "Gendered Citizenship: Alternative Narratives of Political Incorporation in the United States, 1875–1925," in *The Liberal Tradition in American Politics,* ed. David F. Ericson and Louisa Bertch Green (New York: Routledge, 1999), 137–69.

26. See Rosalind Rosenberg, "In Search of Woman's Nature," *Feminist Studies* 3 (Fall 1975): 141–54; Patrick Geddes and J. Arthur Thomson, *The Evolution of Sex* (London: Walter Scott, 1889).

27. Jill Ker Conway, "Women Reformers and American Culture, 1870–1930," *Journal of Social History* 5 (Winter 1971–72): 164–77.

28. Addams, *Democracy and Social Ethics,* 86, quotation at 2–3; Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull-House,* chap. 18.

29. Addams, "If Men Were Seeking the Franchise," *Ladies' Home Journal* 30, no. 6 (June 1913), 21.

30. Eileen McDonagh, "Ripples from the First Wave: The Monarchical Origins of the Welfare State," *Perspectives on Politics* 13 (2015): 992–1016; and McDonagh, *The Motherless State* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

31. Sapiro, "Gender Basis of American Social Policy," 221–38; Frederic C. Howe and Marie Jenney Howe, "Pensioning the Widow and the Fatherless," *Good Housekeeping,* September 1913, 282–91; Kathleen S. Sullivan and Carol Nackenoff, "Family

Matters as Public Work: Reformers' Dreams for the Progressive Era Juvenile Court," paper presented at the 2013 meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago.

32. Sapiro, "Gender Basis of American Social Policy," 224–25, 230–31, 235, quotations at 231 and 235. See also Susan M. Sterett, *Public Pensions: Gender and Civic Service in the States, 1850–1937* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2003), 127; Sonya Michel, *Children's Interests, Mothers' Rights: The Shaping of America's Child Care Policy* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1999), 3.

33. Gwendolyn Mink, *The Wages of Motherhood: Inequality in the Welfare State, 1917–1942* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1995), 8.

34. Suzanne Mettler, *Dividing Citizens: Gender and Federalism in New Deal Public Policy* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998).

35. Peggy Pascoe, *Relations of Rescue: The Search for Female Moral Authority in the American West, 1874–1939* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

36. Nackenoff, "Gendered Citizenship," 165; Pascoe, *Relations of Rescue.*

37. Alice Fletcher was one prominent figure who used such language in the late 1800s; see Joan Mark, *A Stranger in Her Native Land* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1988).

38. Carol Nackenoff, "Constitutionalizing Terms of Inclusion: Friends of the Indian and Citizenship for Native Americans, 1880s–1930s," in *The Supreme Court and American Political Development,* ed. Ronald Kahn and Ken I. Kersch (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006), 366–413.

39. Ken I. Kersch, *Constructing Civil Liberties: Discontinuities in the Development of American Constitutional Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 28, quotation at 75.

40. In *Race, Hull-House, and the University of Chicago* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2002), Mary Jo Deegan notes the persistence of a color line at Hull-House: the "Hull-House life and worldview" was "neither particularly comfortable nor welcoming to black Americans" (38). Gail Bederman emphasizes the role that Charlotte Perkins Gilman played in this discourse; she "magnified the importance of race to civilization and minimized the importance of gender"; Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Race in the United States, 1880–1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 44.

41. Rosenberg, "In Search of Woman's Nature," 142–44.

42. Mehrsa Baradaran, "How the Poor Got Cut Out of Banking," *Emory Law Journal* 62 (2013): 483–548; Jared N. Day, "Credit, Capital and Community: Informal Banking in Immigrant Communities in the United States, 1880–1924," *Financial History Review* 9 (April 2002): 65–78; see also Grace Abbott, "Report of the Director," in *Sixth Annual Report of the Immigrants' Protective League: For the Year Ending January 1st, 1915* (Chicago: Immigrants' Protective League, 1915), available from the Internet Archive, http://archive.org/details/annualreportofim1919091917immi.

43. Carrie Chapman Catt, Presidential Address, International Woman Suffrage Alliance, Geneva, Switzerland, June 1920, quoted in Ida Husted Harper, *History of Woman Suffrage* (New York: National American Woman Suffrage Association, 1922), 6:861.

44. Even Addams was not above making the instrumental argument for women's suffrage in congressional testimony: enfranchising women would provide a counterweight to immigrant male voting, and immigrant women were unlikely to vote in large numbers; Addams, Testimony before the House Committee on the Judiciary, March 13, 1912, 77. She added that she was "not one of the people who believe that the immigrant vote is a vote to be feared."

45. Camilla Stivers, *Bureau Men, Settlement Women,* chap. 4; Stivers, "A Civic Machinery for Democratic Expression," in *Jane Addams and the Practice of Democracy,* ed. Marilyn Fisher, Carol Nackenoff, and Wendy Chmielewski (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009), 87–97.

46. Melvin L. Rogers, "Introduction: Revisiting the Public and Its Problems," *Contemporary Pragmatism* 7 (June 2010).

47. On the juvenile court, see Nackenoff and Sullivan, "The House that Julia Built," 201–2; on the Immigrants' Protective League, see Nackenoff, "Roots of American Political Development."

48. David S. Tanenhaus, *Juvenile Justice in the Making* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004); Michael Willrich, *City of Courts: Socializing Justice in Progressive Era Chicago* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

49. Michael C. Dorf and Charles F. Sabel, "A Constitution of Democratic Experimentalism," *Columbia Law Review* 98, no. 2 (March, 1998): 322. The argument about reformers' sense of ownership and desire to remain involved in the juvenile court is made in Nackenoff and Sullivan, "The House that Julia Built."

50. James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1998).

51. Ibid.*;* Kersch, *Constructing Civil Liberties,* 30.

52. See Patricia Strach and Kathleen Sullivan, "The State's Relations: What the Institution of Family Tells Us about Governance," *Political Research Quarterly* 64 (March 2011): 94–106.

53. See Nackenoff, "Roots of American Political Development." On the role of stories in contesting political borders and boundaries, see Charles Tilly, *Stories, Identities, and Political Change* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002), 11–12.

54. See, for example, William H. DeLacy, "Functions of the Juvenile Court," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 36 (July 1910): 61–63; Grace Abbott, "Abstract of Juvenile Court Laws," appendix 3 in Sophonisba P. Breckinridge and Edith Abbott, *The Delinquent Child and the Home* (New York: Charities Publication Committee, Russell Sage Foundation, 1912), 255–56; appendix 6 in ibid., 334, 340.

55. See Kristin A. Goss and Theda Skocpol, "Changing Agendas: The Impact of Feminism on American Politics," in *Gender and Social Capital,* ed. Brenda O'Neill and Elisabeth Gidengil (New York: Routledge, 2006), 323–56. Robert Y. Shapiro and Harpreet Mahajan examined 267 repeat questions from a variety of surveys in "Gender Differences in Policy Preferences: A Summary of Trends from the 1960s to the 1980s," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 50, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 42–61.

56. Goss and Skocpol, "Changing Agendas," 324–25, 327, 341–46, 350–51. They claim that more recent women's groups have redefined women's issues narrowly, becoming more like single-issue advocacy groups with self-regarding agendas. The authors assert that women of the early twentieth century achieved suffrage and policy gains by speaking less self-interestedly (349).

57. See Seyla Benhabib, *Situating the Self: Gender, Community, and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 157; Carole Pateman, *The Sexual Contract* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1988); Christine DiStefano, *Configurations of Masculinity: A Feminist Perspective on Modern Political Theory* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991), chap. 3; Joan Tronto, *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Nancy Hirschmann, "Freedom, Recognition, and Obligation: A Feminist Approach to Political Theory," *American Political Science Review* 83, no. 4 (1991): 1227–44.

58. See Eileen McDonagh and Carol Nackenoff, "Gender and the American State," in the *Oxford Handbook of American Political Development,* ed. Richard Valelly, Suzanne Mettler, and Robert Lieberman (Oxford University Press, 2016).

59. Balogh, *Government Out of Sight,* 354. An example of the argument that women developed social welfare programs and handed them off to the state is found in Baker, "Domestication of Politics." Elisabeth S. Clemens suggests that reasons for hybrid governing arrangements are inadequately captured by the argument that a weak state borrows capacity until it can take over programs ("Lineages of the Rube Goldberg State: Building and Blurring Public Programs, 1900–1940," in *Rethinking Political Institutions,* ed. Ian Shapiro, Stephen Skowronek, and Daniel Galvin [New York: New York University Press, 2006], 187–215).

60. Dorf and Sabel, "Constitution of Democratic Experimentalism," 267–473. Bureaucratic rationality tended to emphasize uniformity of policies and procedures. The kind of critique leveled against command-and-control environmental regulation of the "golden era" of the 1960s and 1970s is that rule-oriented regulatory policy is easier to administer and monitor but assumes that one size fits all, failing to take disparate situations and local knowledge into account; see Robert F. Durant, Daniel J. Fiorino, and Rosemary O'Leary, *Environmental Governance Reconsidered* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2004).

61. Dorf and Sabel, "Constitution of Democratic Experimentalism," 314.

62. On the drug courts, see Shelli B. Rossman, John K. Roman, Janine M. Zweig, Michael Rempel, and Christine H. Lindquist, *The Multi-Site Adult Drug Court*

Evaluation: Executive Summary (2011), available at the National Criminal Justice Reference Service website, https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/237108.pdf. New juvenile justice alternatives attempt to move beyond several Supreme Court cases of the 1960s that triggered a procedural-due-process revolution for juveniles and generally made juvenile courts more formalistic.

63. Dorf and Sabel, "Constitution of Democratic Experimentalism," 317.

64. Michael McGerr makes this claim in *A Fierce Discontent: The Rise and Fall of the Progressive Movement in America, 1870–1920* (New York: Free Press, 2003), xiv.