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ABSTRACT

Risk emplacement is a way we might better understand how power relations are built into people’s everyday lives, and thus how they may be contested. Though previous research has documented that built form can regulate and express ideology, little attention has been paid to how buildings are employed and utilized to manage risk. In this paper, I argue that differences in ideas about risk and the built form of two residential women’s clubs in Progressive Era Chicago can be explained by emplaced risk ideologies. Risk ideologies are sets of ideas about danger, and risk emplacement is a practice that links risks to places, and places to risks. The result of risk emplacement is that places become substitutes for the putative danger associated with them.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Residential clubs for urban working women emerged in America in the mid-nineteenth century. Signifying “protection and prevention” (Ferguson 1898:142), residential clubs were both a response to and a product of a specific turning point in history. The development of these clubs was entwined with changing labour relations and ideological norms, in which transformations in the work place necessitated cheap labourers, and brought five times the number of women working to Chicago in 1890 compared to 1870 (Wright 1980). However, single women in the city were not considered in the same way as their male contemporaries. Although industrial capitalism had begun to engage them as workers outside the home, women were still associated and valued in relation to the domestic sphere (Meyerowitz 1988; Groth 1994; Wright 1980). This tension necessitated a particular kind of accommodation for urban working women (see Groth 1994; Meyerowitz 1988).

However, women’s residential clubs were not solely a response to the need for housing for women; rather they were a product of careful negotiations of multiple social actors with diverse and often competing political and economic interests. Citing different ideals about women’s new role in an increasingly urban America, reformers, capitalists and working women themselves sought to reorganize urban space, by emplacing residential clubs within the “new geography of the city” (Stansell 1982:312). For proponents of this new geography, “almost everyone seemed out of place” (Spain 2001:237). Their attempts to save and sanitize the city organized
working women, children, and immigrants into stratified redemptive places (see Spain 2001; Stansell 1982).

Though clearly linked to socio-spatial relations, little attention has been paid to the process of risk emplacement through which urban reorganization occurred. Risk emplacement is a practice through which risks are linked to places, and places are tied to risks. The culminating result of risk emplacement is that places become substitutes for the putative danger associated with them. Recognizing this also helps us to understand that if risks became indiscernible from places, spaces could be posited as the solution to risk.

I argue that the emergence and physical and symbolic form of women’s residential clubs can be explained by ideologies of urban risk. I define a risk ideology as a relatively cohesive set of ideas about what is dangerous. I contend that risk ideologies were employed and symbolically emplaced in the city according to particular ideas about women’s role within the urban industrial landscape. These ideas, which were often different for different classes of women, were centred on women as workers and women’s sexuality. As part of these socio-spatial reform efforts (see Stansell 1982; Spain 2001), women’s residential spaces were posited as the solution to many of the perceived risks of the city. Formulated and articulated through ideologies of risk, they were conceived as places of protection from the threats of city life. In this way, risk ideologies also relied on women’s clubs to maintain and reproduce the norms they proscribed. Thus residential clubs and ideologies of risk occupied a mutually reinforcing relationship; both acted as mechanisms for the other.
This paper examines the emplacement of two ideologies of risk in two women’s residential clubs in Chicago at the turn of the twentieth century, and analyzes how the built environment of women’s clubs reflected and managed the following processes: the control of bodies in space, social and economic reproduction of the labour force, and social relations in the city (see Hayden 1995).

This paper is divided into three sections to highlight the process of risk emplacement. After introducing the clubs, and a discussion of relevant literature, the first section further details definitions and implications of risk ideologies and emplacement. In the second section I discuss how risk ideologies were emplaced through a comparison of how each club saw the city and women’s place within it. This incorporates an examination of physical aspirations and leads into the third section, which discusses the negotiation of women and risks through the built environment. To conclude, I argue that differences between clubs are shaped by their distinct ideologies of risk, which are defined by attitudes towards women and capitalism.

The two residential clubs I study differed dramatically in the way they sought to protect female wage earners in the city. These differences, reliant on their risk ideologies, permeated the clubs at every level. Jane Addams and Ina Law Robertson, the founders of the Jane Club and the Eleanor Club respectively, each saw her club as serving a different class of women from that of the other.\footnote{Robertson noted this in her diary after meeting with Addams in 1913.} This was carefully calculated and controlled through the rent each club collected.

Although both clubs proclaimed to set their rents as cheaply as possible, they did so with full knowledge of contemporary wages, and the Eleanor Association drew
attention in its literature as to what kind of woman-worker could afford their rent. Eleanor Clubs housed women who worked as teachers, in offices, or in higher paid positions in department stores. Committee meetings stated the need to weed out women who were not fit to live in the clubs, either because they were too old or earned too much or too little. In fact, Ina Law Robertson believed that the Eleanor Association, accommodating girls who earned $7 per week, “exists especially for this class” (Law Robertson 1905: 80). Law Roberston’s choice of words was pertinent as vacancies were filled by girls who earned more than this. Similarly, when the Educational Department increased its wages in 1915, the Eleanor Clubs began accommodating women with higher wages to compensate. Thus the occupation of residents, or their class was actually deemed more important than their wage.

The converse was true at the Jane Club, which housed women who were likely to work in factories, as domestics or in low-ranked positions in department stores. These women’s wages were not a precondition of their residency. Moreover, although the Jane Club committee stipulated that residents must be able to afford $3 a week in rent, the first month’s rent was always paid for newcomers. Each club had its own idea about women in the city. Though both clubs made use of their built environments to support these notions of the ideal working woman, the ways they did so were different both symbolically and physically.

Risk and the built environment

Beck (1992) equates risk with modernity. Incorporating capitalism, industrialization, and institutional surveillance (see Beck; Lupton 1999), modernity relies on notions of risk to manage the population. In The Production of Space, Lefebvre (1991) claims that every mode of production has shaped and produced a distinctive social space, which in turn reproduces the mode of production. The
combination of these theorists’ work suggests that notions of risk and manifestations of socio-spatial relations relate to a particular given economic, ideological and historical moment (for risk see Lupton 1999). More importantly, they are related to the rise and mechanisms of capitalism. Following this theme, Hayden’s (1995) work shows how capitalist relations are often economically produced and socially reproduced in one space. This occurs through:

the space in and around the body (biological reproduction), the space of housing (the reproduction of the labor force), and the public space of the city (the reproduction of social relations)

(Hayden 1995:19).

As buildings that house single working women, residential clubs are an ideal place to study Hayden’s three components, and thus examine how women’s bodies are controlled in and through spaces, the social and economic reproduction of the labour force, and social relations in the city. Despite the volume of research concerning these clubs (sphere, yet industrial capitalism had begun to engage them as workers outside the home (Jackson 2000; Lawrence 2000; Meyerowitz 1988; Murolo 1997; Wright 1980), little attention is paid to the way they used risk to negotiate and mitigate capitalism.

Risk is a fluid and malleable notion, and can be adapted and modified by certain social actors for particular ends. I define a risk as a socially constructed notion of danger. Yet risks have the capacity to affect people’s behaviour due to the constituent concepts of risk as put forward by Hilgartner:

an object deemed to “pose” the risk, a putative harm, and a linkage alleging some form of causation between the object and the harm

(Hilgartner 1992:40).
Hilgartner’s conception of risk is useful because it highlights the interrelated processes though which risks emerge, are managed and symbolically emplaced. However, in furthering his model, I contend that the function of the linkage is not just to direct “some form of causation” between object and harm. In fact, linkages manage a mutually reinforcing interaction among risk objects and putative harm that serves to obscure the distinction between them. If urban spaces are the risk objects “to which harmful consequences are conceptually attached” (ibid:41), cities are sets of risk objects knitted together. Risk ideologies act as linkages that provide coherence to the city as an accumulation of individual risk objects. In this way, risk ideologies conceive the amassed risk objects and putative harm as one notion: the industrial city.

Other scholarly work addressing risk generally relies on Beck’s (1992) idea of a “risk society” in which “everyone is caught up in defensive battles of various types, anticipating the hostile substances in one’s manner of living” (Beck 1994:45). Risk societies are reflexive and constantly aim to manage and mitigate their putative ideas about risk. As Beck describes it, risk society began to emerge in the 17th century. As time went on, risk began to be associated with the individual.

By the 19th century risk was thought to lie “in human beings, in their conduct, in their liberty, in the relations between them, in the fact of their association, in society” (Ewald 1993:226). This “new way of viewing the world and its chaotic manifestations” (Lupton 1999:6) differed from earlier notions of risk which held nature, fate, or religion responsible for social relations. However since individuals were now thought to be culpable, states saw the need to “harness their populations productively” in order to “deal with the social changes and upheavals wrought by

2 Although Hilgartner discusses “emplacing” risk, his use of the term applies to symbolic emplacement and has nothing to do with the emplacement of risk with which I am concerned.
mass urbanization and industrialization as part of the Industrial Revolution” (Lupton 1999: 6). Thus an emerging risk society changed social relations by individualizing risk and providing a need to control populations of people.

We can also think about the management of risk society using the concepts of biopower and governmentality. Coined by Foucault, biopower and governmentality (1997) are the organized practices through which populations are constituted and managed, respectively, in order to ensure self-governance. Both of these processes are also important to how women’s residential clubs relied on notions of risk.

Although some studies have addressed how people’s notions of risk are tied to certain places (see Burgess 1998; Lupton 1999), and how institutional settings have used spatial arrangements to negotiate risk (see Foucault 1995), there is a lack of work addressing how ideas about how residential places and spaces are strategically employed and utilized to manage risk. Examining this is important to a sociological understanding of the mediated processes that connect risks to places, and the extent to which they may be contested. Before exploring how these processes are located and normalized through the built environment, it is critical to identify the practices which shape built form, and recognize these as socially constructed artefacts.

Built environments can never be autonomous from social and political change. This is partly because the people in control of resources also control the construction of buildings (Brain 1994; Dovey 1999). However, it is not only the design and construction of buildings that are shaped by contextual factors; buildings are understood specifically in certain cultural contexts (Robinson 2008). The designers of buildings participate in the process of communicating and producing cultural expectations (Robinson 1989) and the features of buildings act as cues for expected behaviour (Robinson 2008). Buildings seem unquestionable (Foucault 1995;
Robinson 2008). In fact the more such expressions of power are “embedded in the framework of everyday life, the less questionable they become and the more effectively they can work” (Dovey 2002:2). Thus it is especially important to understand how buildings come to be as (a) they are usually uncontested, yet powerful, vehicles for reinforcing power relations, but also (b) because questioning the built environment also penetrates the power relations it reinforces.

Literature addressing the built environment and power posits that buildings regulate in two ways: through a) the spatial structure, and b) discursive or symbolic framing (Dovey 2002; Gieryn 2002; Markus and Cameron 2002; Robinson 2008). The physical spatial structure has to do with a building’s built form (Dovey 2002) and directly affects movement of the body (Robinson 2008). Thus, buildings have physical power. Symbolic or discursive framing, on the other hand, relies on associations that people have previously made with spatial forms (Robinson 2008). This symbolic power advises people how to act in relation to their environment. Although both tools are significant, I am interested in the way they reinforce one another, rather than dissecting and labelling them as different processes. In other words, I am concerned with how buildings stabilize social ideologies.

Incorporating discussions of physical segregation and symbolic stratification, Spain (2001) has applied theories of “gendered spaces” to urban women at the turn of the twentieth century. Gendered socio-spatial stratification and exclusion are often related to ideas about risky places (see Lupton 1999); yet few sociological studies have not addressed the physical and symbolic power of built environments in this process.

Those studies that have attended to working women’s clubs have highlighted the importance placed on domesticity (Scanlon 1995; Ohmann 1996; Wright 1980,
In this vein, Wright (1980) addresses changing notions of Victorian moralism, and illuminates how “norms concerning family life, sex roles, community relations, and social equality” (ibid:1) are played out through domestic architecture. In other work, she documents how housing has been planned in different ways as a solution to social problems (Wright 1981). Reformers' ideas about the city, their attempts to “make the whole world homelike,” and their ideals of the single-family home (Wright 1980) certainly influenced residential clubs (ibid; Groth 1994).

“Women Adrift”

Within a general history of “women adrift” in Chicago, Meyerowitz (1988) details the huge influx of women arriving to the city between 1880 and 1930. She provides a rich account of the daily practices and physical surroundings of these “women adrift.” Other scholars have addressed the specific architecture of institutional housing (for a general history of the development of residential hotels, rooming houses and boarding houses, see Groth 1994; for YMCAs, see Winter 1997; 2002; and for women’s Eleanor Clubs, see Lawrence 2000) of that period. For example, Lupkin (1997) cites examples of how the architecture of YMCAs was designed to produce the right kind of man. This ranged from panoptican floor plans, monumentalism, homelike features to orderly floor plans intended to transmit a Protestant work ethic (Lupkin 1997). As a piece of architectural history, Lawrence’s (2000) informative article tells a story of the evolution of the architecture of Eleanor Club buildings rather than how socio-spatial relations related to wider issues in society. Other historical studies provide useful secondary sources in thinking about socio-spatial relations in Hull-House in general, though only a few pages in each attend to the Jane Club (see Harr 2002; Jackson 2000; Kish Sklar et al. 2004; Lefkowitz Horowitz 1983; Szuberla 1977).
Defining risk ideologies

Risk ideologies are critical to understanding socio-spatial relations in the city because they are employed to negotiate capitalist relations. Moreover, risk ideologies offer a comprehensive explanation for the socio-spatial manifestation of these relations, as well as for the built form of women’s residential clubs. Mechanisms of ideologies of risk include the construction of “mental maps” of places, which define some as ‘safe’ and others as ‘risky’ (Lupton 1999).

This ‘mental map’ does not simply rely on geographical aspects of space or place, but also draws on ideas and assumptions about social relations and the kinds of people who inhabit or pass through these spaces and places at specific times of day and night (Lupton 1999: 144).

However, risk ideologies can also utilize physical representations of mental maps. In her discussion of the London Underground map Vertesi (2008) details the ways the map’s representational organization:

> enables narratives of movement and manipulation and ... locate[s] the boundaries and points of interaction for particular communities of users (Vertesi 2008:26, emphasis in original).

The adoption and articulation of both kinds of maps (“mental” as well as physical) provides a mechanism to control people in and through spaces, the social and economic reproduction of the labour force, and social relations in the city. In this way, ideologies of risk can mitigate capitalist relations. Their power to do so also rests in the fact that risk ideologies do not have to be based in actual risk. Thus, rather than women fearing for their safety in their workplace, dominant ideologies of risk worked to convince them of the danger of public places.

Although in Risk Society (1992), Beck claims there is a difference between a risk and the public perception of risk, in later work he concludes that perceptions of
risks and risks themselves “are not different things but one and the same” (Lupton 1999:60). While these may overlap, this is not as important at the way ideas about risk are strategically employed. Applying the paradigm of ideologies of risk allows analysis of this.

Although authors have used the term “risk knowledges” (see Tulloch and Lupton 2003) as a way of conceptualizing risk appropriation, I do not find this to be sufficient for my purposes. Risk knowledges are similar to risk ideologies in that they are “historical and local” (Tulloch and Lupton 2003:1). Indeed, “what might be perceived to be ‘risky’ in one era at a certain locale may no longer be viewed so in a later era, or in a different place” (ibid.). Yet risk knowledges are individual and are formed through personal experience (Tulloch and Lupton). Risk ideologies, on the other hand, are the culmination of risk knowledges, which may in fact defy personal experience and certain knowledges. In this way, ideologies of risk can be thought of as hegemonic risk knowledge.

Although theories of a “risk society” are theoretically and empirically linked to a particular point of post-industrial capitalism (see Beck 1992; Lupton 1999), Beck claims that industrial capitalist societies were well on their way to this state of postmodernity at the turn of the twentieth century. However, we should not assume that this was a linear and pre-determined path. Ideologies of risk are not restricted to late twentieth century capitalism. By exploring different ideas of risk at the turn of the twentieth century, this paper emphasizes the mutually reinforcing relationship between risk ideologies and capitalism, yet leaves room for the emergence of other paths that do not automatically and necessarily lead to risk society.

There are many indicators of the evolving importance of individualised risk, and enforced self-regulatory practices such as governmentality. There are also
instances of reactions and rejections of this. These should not get swept into general notions of “resistance” to a now obvious pre-determined development of a risk society. Any such reactions should be thought of not as rejections of a clearly defined historical route, but rather as responses to existing issues as they were seen at the time. Recognising this ensures that we understand that risk ideologies, whether dominant or otherwise, were not grand schemes of managing risk that can be placed somewhere on a continuum of the development of a risk society. Instead they were the culmination of everyday practices and knowledges that led to loosely coherent ideologies. These ideologies were then reproduced and institutionalized through urban organizations such as women’s clubs in order to manage the new population of women workers in the city. In this way, risk ideologies originated in capitalism and gender relations, yet were maintained by daily interactions and practices.

By the latter part of the 19th century, capitalism had necessitated both the arrival of the new population of “women adrift” (Meyerowitz 1988), and the social and economic control of this new urban populace. Although thousands of men also flocked to cities for work and were subject to moral and social restrictions (see Mjagkij & Spratt 1997) the disparate nature of these limitations deems it prudent only to discuss ideas about risk for one gender at a time. Society viewed working men and women so differently at this time partly because single male workers were not a new sight in the city. It is precisely because women constituted a new category in the city that renders risk ideologies such a useful tool of analysis; they were being worked out for the first time as a biopolitical response (Foucault 1997). In other words urban social actors developed risk ideologies not only as a way of controlling the new population, but as a technique for constituting the population by organizing women into a group with a shared sense of danger. In this way, those controlling ideologies
were not only able to capitalize on ideas about risk by indicating appropriate ways of living so as to minimize risk, but they were also had the power to create the groups for which certain risk ideologies and ways of living were suitable. Thus, while dominant risk ideology proffered ways to protect women by engaging women with capitalism whilst maintaining their domestic role, different groups of women were constituted and practiced risk ideologies at odds with this. To better understand how different, and often contradictory, ideologies existed at the same time, we need to recognise the instability of ideologies as well as their stabilisation through the built environment.

**Historical comparison of the built environment**

The power of built form lies in its ability to “give structure to social institutions, durability to social networks, persistence to behavior patterns” (Gieryn 2002: 35). Yet, as Gieryn (2002) notes buildings “stabilize social life” (ibid:35) through two different processes. He claims that buildings “do as much to structure social relations by concealing as by revealing” (Gieryn 2002:38) as, once they are built, “they hide the many possibilities that did not get built, as they bury the interests, politics, and power that shaped the one design that did” (ibid:39). Though both buildings still obscure other possibilities, a comparison of two women’s clubs is a way of surmounting, albeit partially, the ability of these buildings to conceal. In this way, comparative analysis is a useful way of unpacking social relations that have been solidified and normalized through built form.

Although the Eleanor Club was built in almost 20 years after the Jane Club, the two buildings are comparable. The Jane Club building was built in 1898, especially for the purposes of the working women's home after the success of an experimental women’s cooperative in a nearby building. Similarly, Eleanor Club One was built after over a decade of experimentation with other existing buildings that the
association had adapted to their needs. Both buildings were constructed specifically for use as working women’s residences, and their forms were the result of consideration about how they would be used, along with past experiences of using inappropriate space. Although variations between the buildings may have been a reflection of their different historical origins, I also contend that this does not mean we cannot compare them. The particular form each building took was a direct response to the perceived needs of their residents. Thus, though artefacts of different contextual architectural trends, the buildings were products of the same social dilemma, and their form represents distinct ideas about its mitigation.

Importantly, both buildings were situated in Chicago, which provided more than just a backdrop for emerging risk ideologies. Rather, Chicago’s status as a fast expanding, industrial city was the cause of women’s new position in the urban landscape. To be sure, other cities were following similar patterns as Chicago as industrialization gripped North America. Yet Chicago enjoyed a particular national prominence by virtue of it having been the site of the 1893 Columbian Exposition. As well as fame, this event had brought people by the thousands to Chicago, many of whom were looking for work, and many of whom were women and immigrants (see Spain 2001). In this setting:

almost everyone seemed “out of place” as these different groups collided daily, putting the city as risk of literal and symbolic pollution (Spain 2001:237).

For this reason, Chicago at the turn of the twentieth century is not a typical setting for studying working women and the residences built to manage them. Rather, it is a

3 Although Eleanor Club Six, built in 1913, was actually the first Eleanor Club building to be built specifically for their purpose, no floor plans exist for this building and it is thus less appropriate to compare.
setting in which we might expect to find the greatest putative need for negotiating women and thus the heaviest reliance on ideologies of risk.
CHAPTER TWO
EMPLACING RISK IDEOLOGIES

Risk ideologies were constantly reproduced and reconceptualised through their emplacement. In one way, linking risks to places was an important way in which ideologies could maintain themselves beyond obvious claims to risk that could be contested. Yet, in another way, emplacement was a means through which risks could be contested and renegotiated.

Risk ideologies were derived from different attitudes towards capitalism, and were expressed and managed through socio-spatial relations according to ideas about perceived threats of the city. Ideologies of risk were emplaced through ideas about where it was appropriate for women to go in the city. Thus, popular women’s journals expressed their distaste for women socialising with men according to where this may occur, as opposed to what may occur. Both U.S Department of Labor reports and popular journals make references to the ills and immorality of the dancehall and the street. Yet, the behaviour encoded within these places is acceptable in other places. Women are encouraged to dance and socialize with men in dances organised by organisations such as the Y.W.C.A., where their behaviour could be observed. Similarly, the U.S. Department of Labor (1889) belittled boarding houses without parlors since this gave women no viable option for socializing with men other than the street or their bedrooms.
Once you introduce a man friend into your own room, even though it is apparently furnished as a sitting room, a Bohemian atmosphere envelops you, and your visitor, probably unconsciously, will grow careless in his behaviour. While this excerpt highlights the importance of appropriate socio-spatial relations in the city, it also allocates places a degree of autonomy and primacy over social relations. In this way, risks often became indiscernible from the spaces in which they were both imagined and symbolically emplaced. Though these ideas may in reality have derived from perceptions of people, it was the places that were often posited as the potential problem so as to avoid confronting more complex social problems and structural inequalities of race and class which actually govern ideologies of risk. This substitution of people for places is attributable to the process of risk emplacement, through which ideas about places are used to conceal social relations, and thus obscure any occasion to contest them. Though there may have been a greater risk of physical dangers in some places, such dangers often became substituted by places.

Similarly, in an article in the *Ladies’ Home Journal*, the misery of a working woman is described in terms of her room, thus avoiding discussion of the real economic problems facing urban working women:

> A high chest of drawers with a tiny mirror above it – a mirror that would bring out all the angles and none of the curves, and which has an ugly fashion of intensifying unhappiness, and fading out hope. A couple of odd chairs, a tiny washstand, almost hidden under a bowl of one color and a pitcher of another, and then the most uncomfortable of all things, a mantel bed, on which a tired body may sleep, but certainly cannot rest – these furnish the room of the girl who has come to the city to earn her living.\(^5\)

---

\(^4\) *Ladies Home Journal*, November 1896, 16.

\(^5\) Ibid.
The common practice of substituting places and spatial attributes for social problems gave way for ideas about women’s protection to also be emplaced. It was in this way that women’s residential clubs were introduced as a way not only to provide for women, but to protect and help them to “bridge over these dark places” (U.S. Department of Labor 1889:31).

The significance of ideas about places of risk meant that the converse was also an option; since risks were indiscernible from places, spaces could be posited as the solution to this. In 1898 a U.S. Department of Labor Bulletin singled out Chicago and stated that the city’s “greatest need is homes and mothers for working girls” (Ferguson 1898). Although a number of different housing options existed for women who arrived in Chicago, women’s race, ethnicity, age, marriage status and income significantly restricted their choices. Women’s individual choices were further restricted by agents from organisations such as Traveller’s Aid, positioned themselves at train stations to wait for arrivals and lead them to appropriate lodgings. While this may have been of real assistance to some women, it also set in motion the ongoing emplacement of women according to dominant social expectations.

*The Eleanor Club*

In many ways industrial capitalism was the root of the Eleanor Club’s risk ideology since it was the force that had brought such numbers of single low-paid women workers to the city. In this way, capitalism threatened to undermine domesticity. Due to the ideological and also practical association between domesticity and women, capitalism also threatened femininity (see Wright 1980).

---

6 Although most boarding houses were segregated, in the early 1900s some YWCAs became affiliated with Phyllis Wheatley Women’s Clubs, and thus housed black women. However, some YWCAs remained white, and some Phyllis Wheatley clubs did not associate with the YWCA and remained autonomous, and specifically for black working women. For further discussion of this, see Robertson 2007). A lack of local archival materials restricts comparative examination of race in my own study.
The threat to femininity was the angle from which many reformers sought to “save” and reorder the city (see Spain 2001). Indeed, the founder of the Eleanor Association developed her idea for residential clubs after worrying about the lack of domesticated home life of girls she met at department store counters. Therefore, for the Eleanor Association, capitalism was an abstract force, the concrete economic and political effects of which should be managed rather than challenged.

The Eleanor Association saw their work as “preventative and constructive” rather than “reformative,” and, in this way, they did not differ from mainstream risk ideology. Because of this, the clubs were able to affiliate with national mainstream women’s organisations as well as associate with Chicago aldermen and business men. While this may not seem surprising, the Eleanor Association’s alliance with organizations such as the General Federation of Women’s Clubs (G.F.W.C.) could have been an instrumental part of the way they articulated risk.

At a G.F.W.C conference, which focused on the needs of the working girl, it was decided that girls need to be helped to feel “dissatisfied, not with their wages or their employers, but with their own inefficiency.” It was thought that by making girls dissatisfied with themselves, it would be easier to help them improve. In this way, complaints women worker’s has about capitalist relations were individualized. The club’s other associations also served to shape their ideas about risk. In 1915 an alderman led a series of lectures on citizenship at the Eleanor Clubs, residents and staff were urged to patronize businesses that advertised in their monthly association magazine, and at various times department store owners visited the clubs with the

---

7 Eleanor Association By-Laws and Charter, 1914, 10.

8 Newspaper clipping c.1910, Eleanor Foundation archives.
intention of recommending them to their workers. These relationships further subsumed residents within capitalism, but did nothing to mitigate its ensuing effects.

Although the Eleanor Association stood firm in this conservative stance, they were aware of contemporary politics and labor issues. Increasing the minimum wage, labor conditions, and suffrage were all discussed in committee meetings. However at a meeting in 1914, it was agreed that a “good home” was more important than better wages. Eleanor Club residents were also warned against attending a suffrage parade in 1916, which is especially pertinent since residents were encouraged to march together in a Dry Chicago march the previous year.

Yet, within the walls of the clubs, the Eleanor Association used what they called “municipal play festivals” to engage with politics. In such exercises, residents constructed a cardboard model city with flags “announcing the constructive measures for which the Eleanor citizens stand.”9 Groups of residents represented various Chicago wards and held mock elections for mayor, chief of police, and other city roles, revealing the importance placed on order and control. Residents also debated and enacted legislation, the results of which exposed what types of regulations were most significant to residents, such as prohibition of child labor, enforcing a “dry” Chicago, censoring movie theatres and restricting dancehall hours.10 This exercise reflected contemporaneous debates over proposed legislation; in fact many of the Eleanor Model City laws would be enacted in Chicago in the following five years.

What is more, this play festival highlights the importance of the city to the Eleanor Club and its residents. Their attempts to create a model of an ideal city focus on putative risky places such as the dancehall and movie theatre, rather than the


10 Ibid.
reasons why these places are dangerous. Their attention to labor laws seems to invert my thesis of the emplacement of risks by revealing real social relations rather than disguising them by association with a place. Yet the way in which this legislation was debated demonstrates that this was not the case.

For example, while discussing legislation for an eight hour maximum work day for women, it was noted that “too long hours diminished one's efficiency for work.” Reflective of mainstream discourse about domesticity, which sought to emancipate women from certain household chores to make them more efficient (Wright 1981), this discussion shows that some risks did not need to be emplaced in order for them to be a component of a risk ideology. Certain ideas about work and efficiency were so ingrained at the Eleanor Club, as well as in broader social ideologies, that they could be openly discussed without the need to conceal their implications by emplacing them.

Labelled by the Eleanor Clubs’ magazine as “constructive exercise[s],” these festivals were intended to be productive. In reproducing Chicago as a model, the women also produced their own version of the city. During the same period as residents were involved with these exercises, which had restricted dancehall hours in their model city, the Eleanor Association began to hold regular Saturday night dances to “help keep young people from public dancehalls.” In this way, their Model City exercise proved itself to be constructive and helped to implement changes in where social relations took place. These dances were considered especially important as, despite noting that church attendance dropped the morning after dances, the clubs

12 Ibid.
continued to facilitate and house them. Thus, these play festivals provide insight into residents’ perceptions of the perfect city, and thus ideas about flaws in the existing urban landscape. In this way the Eleanor Club was able to avoid political activism yet, through the Model City, articulate and emplace their ideology of risk.

*The Jane Club*

The risk ideology of the Jane Club differed with the mainstream ideals expressed by the Eleanor Association. The Jane Club, named after the settlement leader Jane Addams, aligned itself with the general politics of the Hull-House settlement,\(^{13}\) which organized and held frequent labor union meetings. The cooperative living environment of the Jane Club, the settlement’s labor activism and Jane Addams’ socialism framed residents’ lives and negotiated a very particular ideology of risk. Rather than individualizing blame, this risk ideology held industrial capitalism at fault and sought to confront it (see Addams 1910). While some residents likely engaged with mainstream risk ideologies at times, the dominant idea of risk emplaced in their daily lives warned them of poverty and labor exploitation.

The Jane Club was first established in order to provide a place for striking women to stay if they otherwise could not afford accommodation (ibid.). During a factory strike, workers held a meeting at Hull-House, where

> discussions made it clear that the strikers who had been most easily frightened and therefore first to capitulate, were naturally those girls who were paying board and were afraid of being put out if they fell too far behind on rent.

(Addams 1920: 54)

Thus, the club was not only the manifestation of particular ideas about mitigating risks, but built into the Jane Club were particular expectations of political and public

---

\(^{13}\) Hull House settlement housed the, largely immigrant, working poor in Chicago’s Near West Side. Its middle-class founders were staunchly political and campaigned in the labor and suffrage movements.
engagement. This was also evident in the cooperative organization of the club. In this way, the club was a social experiment which allowed women to live according to the principles they fought for. The fact that this occurred within industrial Chicago, meant that the club had to be shielded from exploitative capitalist relations, which required constant management by committee members. For example, while raising money for the new Jane Club building, the committee turned down $20,000 from a man who was notorious for underpaying the girls in his establishment and concerning whom there were even darker stories (Addams 1910:54).

Although it is not clear to what extent the committee’s opinion of the man was either subjective or based on his actual policies or real wage legislation, the refusal of such a large sum of money is indicative of their risk ideology, which held capitalists as the biggest threat to urban workers and sought to diminish their influence over the lives of workers. The event was also particularly striking when compared to the Eleanor Association, which received not only money, but buildings in donation from businessmen and a department store owner.

However, the two clubs did not always differ in their ideas about marriage; both the Jane Club and Eleanor Clubs held weddings for residents at various times. Though is unsurprising considering dominant ideological norms about marriage and family, marriage may have had additional implications for Jane Club residents and their labor activism. Though the Jane Club committee and residents fought for better labor conditions, the family unit was the focus of their activism. Their fight for equal pay for women was eventually abandoned and replaced by campaigns for an appropriate family wage because women’s needs would “coincide with those of working men once married” (Jackson 2000:143).
The fact that the Jane Club did not only encourage marriage, but facilitated it for their residents was a way of ensuring a better life for women. Indeed, marriage, as long as it was between two union members, may even have been considered a kind of political organising, administered, at least, initially by the Jane Club president, who would greet gentlemen guests at the entrance to dances held at Hull-House. In doing so she would offer to take their hats and, if a union name was printed on the inside of their hat or on their cigars, proceed to introduce them to female residents. In this way, the Jane Club also facilitated a new kind of emplacement of political marriage.

The risk ideology expressed through the Jane Club crossed into mainstream ideals and reproduced ideals about family structure. Yet, by encouraging marriage, the club also advocated beneficial socio-economic repercussions for women. In this way, the Jane Club relied on one commonly accepted social relation (marriage) in order to fight against another (capitalist relations). Risk ideologies as an analytic tool offer a way to understand this that recognizes (a) the lack of choice women had in getting married, (b) the fact that they were embedded in a society that valued marriage and thus simply may have wanted to get married and (c) that the Jane Club committee were certainly aware of arguments against marriage. These contradictory notions were symptomatic of changing as well as more stable ideas about gendered risk in society. The risk ideologies of both clubs were emplaced in a way to negotiate these notions, as well as to instruct women how to behave in other ways.

Aspirations

---

14 Mary Kenney O'Sullivan, Unpublished Autobiography, c. 1925, chapter 6, pp. 62-72, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute, Harvard University (Papers of the Women’s Trade Union League and Its Principal Leaders Microfilm, Collection VIII, Reel 1).
Women’s residential clubs presented aspirational physical settings that aimed to teach women what they should aspire to and how to negotiate risks they faced. The founder of the Eleanor Association claimed its goals were to provide a family environment in comfortable, yet modest surroundings based on what women should expect for themselves in the future (Law Roberson 1905:78).

Newspaper coverage of the Jane Club claimed that the club possessed “all the conveniences of the modern home,” was more attractive than the home of “the average well-to-do family,” (Campbell 1903) and that visitors would wish they lived there themselves (Marks 1900). Yet, in 1903 (while the Jane Club was still housed in its make-shift building), a journal article stated that:

Each tenant feels a personal responsibility, learns by practice the perfect care of the good things provided to carry into her own home if that time comes to her

(Campbell 1903:4; emphasis added).

While this alludes to the lack of explicit expectations for Jane Club residents, it is important to recognize that they themselves may not even have believed this, due to the dominance of ideology linking women to domesticity (Wright 1980). It is also interesting to note that the expensive style of furnishings of the Jane Club, supplied by Jane Addams, may not have been financially realistic expectations for the class of women residing at the Jane Club. This complicates the extent to which, through similar furnishings and spatial arrangements, clubs were thought to show women how their own homes should be.

In the case of the Jane Club, the above excerpts indicate that it is possible that visitors were the most affected by the aspirational nature of the furnishings, which

---

bolstered their notions of appropriate domestic ideals, without necessarily influencing those of the residents. While this may also have been the case in the Eleanor Club, residents there could at least expect to afford the furnishings they saw around them, and thus were perhaps more likely to aspire to the proscribed ideals. An examination of the parlor in each club house reveals more about this issue.

At the turn of the twentieth century, parlors were primarily for entertaining (see Wright 1980; Grier 1988). In middle-class family homes they were “intended to serve as the setting for important social events and to present the civilized facades of its occupants” (Grier 1988:1). Two rooms may have been used as parlors in the Eleanor Club: the club room, or the reception room (see Figures 1 and 2). Although both seem austere and stark, the number of windows and the spaciousness of the rooms help to convey the kind of sophisticated civility Grier describes. Although the Eleanor Club’s parlor represented accepted and mainstream ideas about domestic space, as a physical reproduction of symbolic norms popular in 1917, the club’s use of space was political.

Figure 1. Eleanor Club parlor, 1917 (Courtesy of The Eleanor Foundation).  
Figure 2. Eleanor Club “small reception-room”, 1917 (Courtesy of The Eleanor Foundation).
The parlor in the Jane Club was much smaller and crowded with furniture (see Figure 3). Rather than solely attempting to communicate the civility of its occupants, I propose that this parlor conveyed a different set of ideas through its physicality and furnishings. Jane Addams and others at Hull-House were advocates for the Arts and Crafts movement, which attempted to disembed architecture and home furnishings from the practice of mass industrial production, and free workers from alienation through appreciation of decor. The parlor at the Jane Club, furnished by Addams herself, is clearly influenced by this movement. Its walls are cramped with pictures and the light fitting is reminiscent of typical Arts and Crafts furnishings. The clubs were built over a decade apart and thus their decors undoubtedly reflected different styles due to current trends. Yet, because of the foundational premise of the Arts and Crafts movement, the distinctiveness of the Jane Club’s interior can still be thought of as an expression and embodiment of overtly politicized ideas about decor.

The clubs were not only expressive in their choices of decor, but also in the way they negotiated their paradoxical role within society. Though intended to be temporary and transient residences for women, clubs both encouraged women to
aspire to leave, yet also to reside in them in the meantime (for Eleanor Clubs, see Lawrence 2000; for the transient nature of boarding houses in general, see Meyerowitz 1988; Spain 2001). The club’s contradictory position assumed that women would get married and move into their own homes but housed them as workers in the meantime. However, the way each club managed this contradiction was a result of the club’s own risk ideology, which either sought to challenge or conform to the status quo.
CHAPTER THREE

SPATIAL NEGOTIATIONS OF RISK IDEOLOGIES

The club buildings

The processes through which the built environments of the Jane Club and Eleanor Club came to be were similar in many ways. Both had previously occupied buildings not intended as residential clubs for working women (for a discussion of ways single-family homes were adapted for use as multi-person residences, see Groth 1994). Because of this, both clubs had grown accustomed to adapting their environment to their needs, and sometimes vice versa. Use of these imperfect buildings had allowed both clubs to construct their own idea of an ideal building and layouts for their uses (for Eleanor Club, see Lawrence 2000; for Jane Club, see Pond 1902). Built specifically for their purposes, the new Jane Club and the new Eleanor Club One were the physical realisation of specific, albeit different, principles about housing for working women. How this relates to each club’s ideology of risk is made clear through analyses of the buildings themselves, their interior spaces, and also the clubs’ relations with their surrounding areas.

The façades of the Jane Club and Eleanor Club buildings were different from each other, not only in architectural style (for details of the architectural style of the Eleanor Cub, see Lawrence, 2000; for the Jane Club, see Pond 1902; Szuberla 1977), but in their intended function. At the expense of constructing additional rooms, the Eleanor Club was built in a U-shape (see Figure 4) in order to set the entrance back from the street (Lawrence 2000). Although this design could have been an attempt to
maximize light and air, coupled with the club’s adoption of evening curfews, it seems likely that the building was used to control who entered the building and when. Because U-shaped buildings were not yet popular in Chicago (ibid.), and because the loss of additional rooms meant a loss of rent, it appears that the control over movement into and out of the building was more important than either money or contemporary architectural trends. This form of regulation also attests to certain notions of risk in the city.

Figure 4. Eleanor Club One, 1917 (Courtesy of The Eleanor Foundation).

The location of the clubs:

As the street and the stranger were posited by Eleanor Clubs as the biggest threats to urban women, their ideal building was constructed in such a way so as to attempt to minimise these threats. At the time of the opening of the new club, adverts for the Eleanor Club emphasized it as a safe place to live. The contrasting and assumed unsafe places are unnamed and abstracted from why they are unsafe. Thus
the risk associated with them could not be questioned, imbuing the club building with a kind of irrefutable claim to managing risk.

The Eleanor Club’s surrounding area had undergone recent changes due to the 1893 Columbian Exposition, and it was soon to be the site of University of Chicago expansions. While the Columbian Exposition caused a building boom of large and imposing exhibition spaces, building in the area after the fair focused on providing homes for families, “university bachelors” and professors (Block 1978). Located on the South Side of Chicago, the Hyde Park neighborhood was also in close proximity to the Union Stock Yards, and the Illinois Central Railroad. These neighborhood characteristics were important to the risk ideology of the Eleanor club in two important ways. Firstly, the building was positioned amongst a number of large open spaces left over from the exposition such as the Midway Plaisance as well as parks and the beach. Secondly, the nearby meat-packing and railroad industries brought with them thousands of immigrant workers about whom current residents, who were likely to be white and not working class, were not happy (Block 1978). It was thus these spaces, unidentified officially by the Eleanor Association itself, which provided sites for the emplacement of risks for residents.

However, the only record testifying to a specific danger in the Eleanor Club archives is from a committee meeting in 1926, when an unknown man was seen in one of the club buildings without authority. Due to the attention committee members paid to this incident, it seems unlikely that there were similar incidents that occurred without being documented. In this case, this sole incident attests either to the Eleanor Clubs’ successful management of urban risks or the lack of risk in the first place. While in the area immediately surrounding the Eleanor Club there was “no sense of
tightness [or] restriction” (ibid: 88), the opposite was true of the area surrounding the Jane Club.

The Jane club’s immediate surroundings were comprised of other settlement buildings; however its wider surrounding area was also important to ideas about risk professed through the Jane Club. The settlement was surrounding by slums, occupied by a very poor and largely immigrant population (for details of ethnicity and income, see Kelly 1895). Streets were filthy, and buildings were crowded (Addams 1910). Although these neighborhood features epitomized dominant ideologies of risk at the time, in contrast to the isolated and fortress-like Eleanor Club building, the Jane Club had a door leading directly to the congested and markedly public street. Moreover, the building was adjacent to an alley, and had a side door directly facing the Hull-House quadrangle. The quadrangle was a very public place. It was the main point of entry for the public when they attended meetings and classes at the settlement, and it also led to other settlement apartments such as the men’s club. In fact, the four-storey occupied a central corner within the Hull-House settlement.

This is in striking comparison to the Eleanor Club, which attempted to physically control and protect women from the perceived threat of public space. Not only did the entrance to the Jane Club lead straight to the street, but it led directly to a distinctly public and politically active part of the city. In this way, as with the Eleanor Club, the built environment echoes how women were thought to be at risk in the city.

Other ideas about women were also expressed through the club’s location. The Jane Club’s neighbouring building was the nursery and playground which were built before the Jane Club in 1895. It is possible that this group of single women may have been intentionally placed nearby children. On one hand, the placement of the
club according to these expectations and assumptions about women fails to make much sense considering Jane Club residents did not have children. However it is important to consider this as a physical and symbolic manifestation of the Jane Club’s ideas about women and risks they faced. Since it was only through family that women could hope for a decent wage, it made sense that women should be associated with children – even amongst an environment of radical politics. This association with children did not necessarily mean women would act upon it and marry; indeed many Jane Club residents never married. However, engaging with discourse promoting the importance of the family was one of the few tools at women’s disposal to secure better wages, and thus mitigate the effects of capitalism. For this reason all residents, whether interested in marriage for themselves or not, may have sought to reinforce women’s role at wives and mothers because of the risks they faced otherwise.

Therefore, the Jane Club did not focus on protecting women from the city, but rather sought to empower residents against their own notions of risk: capitalism and poverty. This was done by locating women near to children, but also through the Jane Club’s proximity to the settlement which organized labor union meetings.

*Layout of the clubs:*

In both cases, the layout of each building further expressed ways women were regulated according to certain ideologies of risk. In 1917, the professional journal *Architectural Forum*\(^\text{16}\) printed floor plans of each of the building’s floors, yet when the new Eleanor Club opened, among pictures of the club’s parlors and façade, the Eleanor Record chose only to print floor plans of the first and “bed-room floors,” thus omitting the basement. Since the Eleanor Record was distributed among all Eleanor

---

\(^{16}\) *Architectural Forum.* 1917. 27(4): plate 70.
Clubs, we can think about the floor plans as the kind of “visual technology” Vertesi (2008) discusses. These plans were representations of the buildings, highlighting only public places in the building. In this way, the floor plans served to enable “narratives of movement and manipulation” and draw the attention of “particular communities of users” (Vertesi 2008:26) to certain places.

In other words, future and current residents, as users of these spaces, were presented with the large parlor, reception hall and dining room, but not the laundry, the basement and fire exit (see Figure 5). We can assume that showing alternative exits may have drawn attention to possibilities to leave and enter the club without being seen. Similarly, the corner room to the left of the large parlor is unnamed on the floor plan, marking it as off limits. As visual technologies, these floor plans present certain rooms, and thus the activities which may take place in them, as out of bounds for Eleanor Club residents.

Although the Eleanor Club was built to house roughly triple the number of women housed in the Jane Club, both buildings were comprised of similar types of rooms. Echoing the dominant social and architectural practice of specification of rooms for single purposes (see Ohmann 1996; Wright 1981), both clubs had rooms devoted to certain activities, such as libraries, sewing rooms, trunk rooms, parlors and dining rooms, as well as bathrooms and bedrooms (both had single and shared bedrooms).
Despite the similarities, the clubs used their social spaces differently; delineating and controlling access in ways corresponding with their concerns about risk and regulation. For this reason rules about who was allowed in which spaces were particularly significant.

Due to the contradictory importance presented by men, the regulation of male visitors was discussed frequently in Eleanor Club committee meetings. Women were expected to socialize with men in order to find a husband; and the committee believed that men treated women better by virtue of their affiliation with the association. However, women were also clearly believed to be morally at risk from men. That men were both welcome and unwelcome at Eleanor Clubs required a distinct negotiation of space.

In addressing the architecture of the Eleanor Club buildings, Lawrence (2000) claims that the heavily surveilled gradual delineation between public and
private space was a way of protecting women from men, yet also of complying with social expectations of heterosocial relations and marriage. Once male guests were inside (after being invited and arriving at an appropriate time) the movements of these men and the female residents were controlled. The parlor was on the first floor – near to the entrance and reception hall. When visitors arrived they passed, under surveillance by staff and other residents, through the entrance hall and reception hall, into the large first-floor parlor. The Eleanor Club embodied the idea that social relations had appropriate places in which they ought to be practiced, and that mismatched socio-spatial relations were risky for women. Hence, no men were allowed above the first floor in any of the six Eleanor Clubs, and socializing was restricted to the parlor.

The fact that there were no rules governing men’s visits to the Jane Club, exemplifies their attitude towards risk. Although residents were free to make their own decisions, they were both immersed within and restricted by ideas about what was proper conduct. It is impossible to know whether implicit prohibitions at the Jane Club were as effective as their explicit counterparts at the Eleanor Club. However, both types of regulation relied on ideas about appropriate socio-spatial relations. In this way, although men’s visits were not officially restricted to the parlor, the Jane Club promoted this idea by advertising the wicker chairs in its parlor as places men would feel comfortable.

Similarly, a “club room” on the second floor of the Jane Club (see Figure 6), “functioned as intermediary social space” between the bedrooms and more public receiving rooms on the first floor (Jackson 2000:141-142). Moreover, more intimacy was possible on the second floor as it was more out of sight than spaces on the first
floor. These conscious negotiations of socio-spatial relations allowed the Jane Club to adhere to dominant ideals as well as staying true to more empowering ideologies of risk.

Figure 6. Jane Club second-floor floor plan, c.1900 (Courtesy of UIC Special Collections).

These negotiations were further evident in the types of freedoms residents had, which worked to instil in them what and where risks were. A particular ideology of risk was communicated to Jane Club residents as they were largely free to do as they pleased, even had their own keys to the club building, but were encouraged to partake in labor unions. These socio-spatial mechanisms informed residents about what was and was not risky. The fact that residents had keys their building is striking when juxtaposed with a proposal from the Eleanor Association, which, contrary to fire regulations, requested special permission to lock the back doors of their clubs to prevent unregulated comings and goings. This could be regarded as an attempt to communicate to Eleanor Club residents the risks of misconduct as well as the risks of
public space. It is also evidence of the fluid nature of ideas about risk, and possibilities for these processes to mediated. In order to best articulate their ideology of risk, the committee chose to diminish the significance of the risk of fire in the club. This shows a renegotiation of risks and hints that this renegotiation was necessary to maintain control. The Eleanor Club prided itself on providing a safe environment, but this safeness was subjective and capable of being manipulated.

Changing methods of spatial control within clubs, such as the proposed locking of the back door and the adoption of new rules fining residents for tacking items to walls at the Eleanor Club, presupposes the existence of such acts. There are no reports of misconduct at the Jane Club, and similarly there is no evidence of changing socio-spatial regulations that may suggest such transgressions. Foucault (1994) claims that no architecture can ever be entirely freeing or disciplinary. Rather, he claims, only practice can ensure liberty or discipline. Therefore, although the architecture of the Eleanor Club is used to control women’s socio-spatial relations, their actual practices within this built environment may have defied this control. The adoption of new architectural and other place-based mechanisms is a way any such defiance may then be used to reconstruct and bolster ideologies of risk.
CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

Two differing ideologies of risk emerged in Chicago at the turn of the century which derived from differing attitudes to capitalism. Importantly, both ideologies necessitated residential clubs for working women. Yet their physical manifestations as club buildings and their symbolic expressions through the use of the built environment articulated and managed risk in different ways. As the design of a factory “structures social life by exposing the abstractions of capitalism in a material form” (Gieryn 2002: 38), the built form of women’s clubs structures social life by negotiating the tensions of competing ideas of how to mitigate the effects of capitalism. The socio-spatial processes through which this can be thought of as emplaced ideologies of risk.

Ideologies of risk also explain the built form of women’s clubs and the ways their built environments were used to a) control bodies in space in order to maintain the “appropriate” women through conduct in the boarding house; b) to aid social and economic reproduction of the labour force through the stratification of women through wages and space; and c) and to regulate social relations in the city through ideologies of risk, which were often expressed through architectural form. Yet, this was practiced differently in the two clubs. Indeed, differences in politics fostered difference in ideas about control, which were mediated through notions of risk and spatial relations. The buildings involved in this process assisted women in practicing the use of space that was expected of them.
APPENDIX A:

TABLE OF COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLUBS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eleanor Club</th>
<th>Jane Club</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home</strong></td>
<td>Home as aspirational setting</td>
<td>Home as social experiment to mitigate capitalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work</strong></td>
<td>Risk of not being good worker</td>
<td>Risk of exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexuality</strong></td>
<td>Risk of immorality</td>
<td>Risk of immorality Club promoted marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club promoted marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk</strong></td>
<td>At risk from street, city</td>
<td>At risk from capitalism, poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Politics</strong></td>
<td>Warned against political activism</td>
<td>Encouraged to be politically active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building access</strong></td>
<td>Building away from street, controlled access</td>
<td>Building faced street, quadrangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial relations for visitors</strong></td>
<td>Visitors only allowed in public parlor</td>
<td>More private 2nd floor parlor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrounding area</strong></td>
<td>Large open public spaces, newly built homes and apartments</td>
<td>Crowded, dirty street and settlement buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrounding neighborhood characteristics</strong></td>
<td>Middle, upper and working class residents. Many new residents were immigrants</td>
<td>Majority very poor labouring class and immigrant families.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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