

children that reach that stage, if it becomes necessary for their own good to take them away, must be made to feel—to know—that it is because they are not performing their duty to the state. Not that the state should continue to interfere with them in the way it used to do before we had juvenile legislation—not that the state, taking them away, should treat them as criminals, should merely punish them, should deal with them by putting them into institutions for criminals; not at all. The present theory of the best method of dealing with delinquent children is, that when the state takes them away, it should take them away with one single purpose—of eradicating those things that are producing a tendency towards wrong and giving them a thorough training; putting them not into prisons, but into schools; educating them and raising them into decent citizens. To my mind it is a valuable thought that the state should do this; it is valuable in its psychological impress on the child that has done those things which made its taking away necessary; and, therefore, I believe that in dealing with the delinquent child our first aim should be to join hands with all other members of the community, to see that the state does its duty in the right way; that the state furnishes the right kind of institutions—schools, not prisons—for these children, and that in these schools all of the children be given the opportunity that children have in their homes of learning the principles of their own religion, and of getting a training in accordance with those principles. That, to my mind, is the ideal toward which we ought to work, rather than the one suggested by the speaker, of founding more specifically Jewish institutions for the delinquent child. And I say this not by any means by way of criticism of the great Jewish Protectory in New York, because in New York they were facing a condition. The state was not doing its duty, and it seemed well-nigh impossible to get the state to do its duty in full measure, as it ought to do it towards these children. In New York there is a sort of combination of state and private philanthropy under which all of the private institutions are in a measure quasi-public institutions because the state pays each of these institutions so much per week for the care of the children, and the

whole history of that development has made it the desirable thing, no doubt, in New York that a distinctly Jewish Protectory be established; in fact the Jewish children were being raised not in state institutions, but in Catholic and Protestant, distinctly sectarian institutions.]

If I may be permitted just one word more on another point. I agree entirely with the suggestion of the value of some person working with the Jewish inmates of the various public institutions. I would not term that person necessarily a "chaplain," although I believe that a rabbi, provided he had the education that a modern rabbi ought to have, and therefore be not really a rabbi but a trained social worker, would probably be the best person for that place; but we heard this morning how we began to do our work in the relief phases when we first took on paid workers. We employed the worn-out members of the community who were good for nothing else, and for that reason alone were deemed good enough to do this work. Do not let us fall into that same mistake when we begin to choose the social worker for the Jews in the institutions.

DISCUSSION.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have to postpone the discussion of this paper and lay it over until tomorrow. Dr. Stephen S. Wise has requested the privilege of reading his paper this afternoon, as he has to leave the city tonight, and we will now give him the opportunity to address us on the subject of "The Function of the National Conference of Jewish Charities."

THE FUNCTION OF THE CONFERENCE OF JEWISH CHARITIES.

DR STEPHEN S. WISE, New York: I have been wondering for sometime whether this biennial meeting of the Conference of Jewish charities has been arranged at Richmond in the early summer in order that the atmospheric conditions might belie the insinuation implied in a placard said to have been suspended in a drug store in the center of the crowded East Side district

of New York: "Soda water, cold as charity." I remember not very long ago to have heard of a countess, who, being asked if she was interested in philanthropy, replied that she was deeply interested, but that she limited her philanthropic activity to the summer months "because in the winter the poor keep their windows shut and then they're so stuffy that I can't stand them." Happily Richmond has given us a genially warm welcome which makes us rejoice to be with you.

I shall deal today with the main title of the theme of this afternoon, "The Functions of the National Conference of Jewish Charities," ~~leaving it to the men who are to come after me to deal with the sub-heading, which is almost a paper in itself.~~ I take it for granted that we are met together not for the purpose of self-congratulation, but self-scrutiny; that we are come together not for mutual admiration, but for reciprocal aid. If I were a physician, after a careful study covering many months—yes, and years—of the problem of Jewish charities in America, I would venture to offer the diagnosis that the ailment of Jewish charities in America is not functional, but organic. Any seeming criticism that I may make today is directed not against organized charity, but against disorganized charity; not against over-organized, but rather under-organized philanthropy. I remember to have heard some years ago a memorable debate in the course of which one of the disputants urged: "I agree with my opponent in toto, save for two things—his premises are false and his conclusions are erroneous." I am glad to make a somewhat less sweepingly general summary touching the work of Jewish charities in America.

In common with charities throughout the land, Jewish charity is ideal save in two respects—lacking in extensiveness and in intensiveness. Stated more simply, there ought to be more of it and what of it there is should be better done. If it be held that I am dealing with the general theme, the inadequacy of charity in general and of Jewish charities in particular, rather than with the assigned subject of the hour, the functions of a Jewish charity conference, I venture to submit in reply that I conceive it to be the function of the National Conference of Jewish Charities to guide and to inform, to correct and strengthen Jew-

ish charities throughout the land. I know that this conference has no executive or administrative function to discharge, but I believe that this conference may, if it choose, exercise an advisory or consultative jurisdiction. For one thing, it needs to be made clear today that it is the business of the Conference of Jewish Charities to seek to discover and, having discovered, to lay down fundamental truths. If this conference fails thus to function, it is virtually, though it may not be admittedly, defunct.

For one thing it is the function of this conference to call attention to the incontrovertible truth that the Jewish charities of the land are not completely and efficiently doing that which they purport to do. Upon returning to New York little more than a year ago, I heard a great deal of the overlapping which obtains among the different Jewish charities of that city. I found some overlapping, but I also find some big and wide gaps, concerning which less had been said—in a word, more gapping than overlapping.

The reference to adequate social serving suggests that something be said respecting those very kindly and well-intentioned Jewish charity workers, both men and women, who need to be reminded that an empty stomach cannot be fed and filled with rent receipts. ~~The social relief nurse in the largest Jewish hospital in the land related to me within a few days the following incident concerning a Jewish relief society in New York, auxiliary to that institution of which we are all justly proud, the United Hebrew Charities.~~ The society had for several months paid the rent for a woman whose husband was insane. The woman was very ill, but managed somehow to care for three little children. When this non-Jewish social worker asked the paid visitor of the Jewish society why no provision was made for food and clothing for the woman and her children, the reply was: "Well, we think it better to leave that to their neighbors." After their rent had been paid they were left to the mercy of their neighbors, who were wretchedly poor Italians, which meant that their neighbors did and ~~could do nothing for them.~~ I am heretical enough to believe that relief ought to be measurably adequate; that in certain cases of poverty housing does not wholly suffice to make the pangs of hunger endurable.

Putting it differently, it is the office of the Conference of Jewish Charities to proclaim today, and to continue to proclaim until it get itself heard, that the higher charity is not barely and half-heartedly to meet old needs, but bravely and whole-heartedly to seek out new needs. The higher charity ought to be governed by the rule of a Jewish philanthropist of another day: "The cause of him I knew not I searched out." ~~We do not search out.~~ We do not seek for opportunities of service. We set out to do only that which cries to be done in the ordinary course of our effort. How little could any other serious business thrive if conducted in the same spirit. How often do the so-called leaders in charity work take counsel together, with a view to meeting needs as they arise, instead of improvidently postponing consideration, as is usually done, until after the need has assumed the proportions of a problem?

By way of illustration, let me point out that it became necessary within the past weeks for a non-Jewish judge, sitting in a criminal court in New York, to summon a Jewish friend and call his attention to the circumstance that, while the Roman Catholics had their representatives in court in charge of the youth of their own church, who were placed upon probation by the court, and while, of course, the Protestants did likewise, the Jews had arranged for no probation officer in court to deal with youthful Jewish offenders, though large numbers of Jewish lads were there arraigned. After the matter had thus been brought to the attention of some Jewish men, a Jewish philanthropist agreed to pay the salary of a Jewish probation officer for the term of three years by way of trial. I cite this case in proof, though none be needed, of my contention that in the main we limit our concern to the things which must obviously be done, instead of being, as we ought to be, on the lookout for possible tasks. ~~I repeat that it is a grave reflection on the clear-sightedness and earnestness of the leadership of Jewish charity that a non-Jewish judge found it needful to urge upon the Jewish community the need of stationing a Jewish probation officer in a court before which scores of young Jews are annually summoned.~~

I could adduce many further illustrations from among which I choose a typical one. We have all heard something of the c

convalescent relief work, inaugurated by Dr. Cabot in the Massachusetts General Hospital, and undertaken on a considerable scale in a number of American hospitals. Outside of Bellevue Hospital, which, it may surprise even New Yorkers to learn, is in part a Jewish hospital, seeing that at least two thousand Jewish patients are annually treated within its walls, there is only one Jewish hospital in New York which has made even a beginning in the direction of convalescent relief service. That beginning, while made possible by the generosity of a Jewish supporter of the institution, is the task of a non-Jewish nurse, whose actual service is unsupplemented by co-operation on the part of any of the thousands of contributors in money to the institution, save for the one family, already mentioned, whose gift has made it possible to inaugurate the work. But this, I submit, is not social relief nor social service; the service of one paid worker, vainly attempting to do what should freely be done by hundreds, is not social.

These instances must suffice to make clear what it is I mean by speaking, as I do, of our laggard participation in some phases of charity today, which are the most hopeful and heartening in the realm of social effort. If you were to ask me in this hour to explain the term Jewish hospital, I would answer that the Jewish hospital is not chiefly one that offers its Jewish patients a *kosher* dietary, but one sustained by Jewish sympathy and generosity and above all inspired by Jewish ideals. Such ideals should prompt an abiding and unimpaired interest in a patient even after a surgical operation has been performed, just as I conceive not that to be an ideal Jewish orphan society which, as we shall later see, makes a home for a maximum of children within an asylum, but which finds asylum for a maximum of children within homes.

Again, it is the function of this Conference of Jewish Charities earnestly to teach that the work of charity must be done in person and not by representative. We of the house of Israel hold that vicarious atonement is no more possible between man and man than between man and God. The higher philanthropy must not become too largely hired philanthropy. Charity has well been said to be like a railroad ticket—not good if detached.

Too many Jews and Christians throughout the land imagine that charity in these days can be performed on the principle: "We touch the gold button; you do the rest." What is wanted in charity is not the touch of a button, but the human touch. Check-book philanthropy unsupplemented by personal service is unavailing. Charity work must not be so highly organized that every burden is thrown upon the shoulder of the expert.

That charity is too largely construed in terms of money comes to light in the report of your President, which dealt largely, if not altogether, with money gifts since your last biennial session and made but scant, if any, references to other lines of progress in Jewish social effort during the same term. In New York it is becoming increasingly evident that we are suffering from a dearth of volunteer social workers. I make bold to say that the manager of the United Hebrew Charities will be ready to assent to the dictum that nearly every "permanent case" ought to be the special care of a volunteer worker; that the present system, which burdens the paid workers not only with the task of investigation and immediate relief, but also with the continuous care of so-called chronic cases of destitution, is unwise and therefore bound to be inefficient. I have the personal testimony of the paid guide of one of the co-operating societies of the United Hebrew Charities in New York that nearly the whole of the work rests upon her, and that it is shared only in small part by those who are banded together in the name of sisterhood. Sisterhood presupposes not the delegating of a task to a hired substitute, but the doing of a service of love by sister for sister.

One of the dangers of over-organized charity is that too much is left to the hired man. The consecration and genius of the expert worker do not make good the evil of non-participation in social service by such as are inexpert chiefly because they have not tried. The soul will speedily depart even from a charity corporation if voluntary workers imagine themselves to be exempt or excluded from service. An illustration comes to me. Not long ago a woman died in New York, who for many years had given not only of her possessions, but of herself to the service of her neighbor. Her generous support of all communal charities was only a small part of her giving and doing. Upon her

death her children, who became the heirs of her large fortune, transferred one portion of their heritage to various charities—the care of a considerable number of men and women who had, for one reason or another, been the recipients of their mother's bounty. Such refusal to accept this personal bequest is not less hurtful to the heirs than to the beneficiaries of their mother's good will, and in the last analysis it is hurtful to the charity organizations, which cannot bear the burdens of a whole community upon the basis of meagre and grudging support. Men and women, let us have a little less of the charities and a little more of charity.

Our charity organizations must not be characterized by self-perpetuating officialism. The directors of charitable organizations ought to learn the art of resignation—a very important art to acquire and to command. Charities are not always sufficiently democratic, and when not ought to be genuinely democratized; that is, members ought to have a large part in the supervision and control of their affairs. Little bosses in little places are only less odious than big bosses in big places. Some Jewish charities are close corporations in more senses than one. Too often one finds directors of charity organizations, whose attitude toward these is one of quasi-proprietorship. The air of private ownership which pervades some directorates is conducive neither to the welfare of him who gives nor of him who receives, nor yet of the community.

Among the methods of charity work which are to be improved, none is more in need of correction than that which commonly determines the choice of directors of charities. Men are not to be chosen to office in charity organizations because of the hope that such election will flatter them into generosity, when such susceptibility to flattery is their sole qualification. Membership in charity directorates is not to be allotted to some men as a rung on the ladder that leads to social preferment. Permanent tenure of office is not to be permitted exclusively to such as lack the initiative of self-effacement. Election to the governing bodies of Jewish charity ought to be preceded not primarily by the acquisition of a certain sum of money, but by the attainment of a certain

degree of acquaintance with the problems to be dealt with. Such election should be conditioned not by the mastery of a fortune, but by apprenticeship in some form of service.

Reference has often been made to the much-vaunted peril of overlapping. I find such danger of overlapping in the directorates of our many agencies and institutions. Behold the overlapping of a comparatively small group of men who parcel out among themselves, not without good intentions, the directorates of a score or more of institutions. Here is the real overlapping—men spreading their limited strength over vast and varying areas, instead of concentrating and specializing. Such is become the half-justified disrelish of a limited group dominating the whole range of philanthropic activity that the proposed federating of Jewish charities in New York, which is not only rational and needful, but inevitable, was rejected. Rejected it was though, it should be added, in part by those who are intolerant of every tyranny save their own.

Nothing is more needful than that this conference seek to elevate the status of the Jewish social worker. In the old days, as has been said, the office of the social worker was reserved for those whose chief qualification was their need of being honorably supported at public expense. To have broken down under the burden of the ministry was accepted as adequate proof of ability to support the burden of social ministry. No reform in social service is more pressing today than that the place of the social worker be made one of dignity and of power. It is obvious to all of us that these places cannot be made alluring in the matter of emolument, but, I submit, they ought to be made places which, when worthily filled, insure for their occupants respect and honor. The social worker is not to be lightly esteemed by the unsocial idler.

To the end that the calling of the social worker be honored as one of high serviceableness to the public weal, practical, not merely theoretical, schools of philanthropy should be established. But such schools of philanthropy are not to become adjuncts of seminaries for the training of the ministry, unless seminary methods are first become unreservedly and undisguisedly scientific. Jewish schools of philanthropy are not to be incorporated into

seminary curriculum unless the leaders of seminaries have caught glimpses of "the glory of facing facts." Efficient social leaders cannot be trained in seminaries as long as the heads of these institutions are not frankly unafraid of the perils of truth-seeking. A training school of philanthropy, or, using the better term, of social service, ought to be made part of the equipment of every considerable Jewish charitable institution in the land. Young men and women, who are desirous of making social service their life task, ought to be invited to sit by the side of directors and superintendents of our charity organizations and there, day by day, familiarize themselves in turn with the problems which face the leaders. And such genuine apprenticeship, which might readily be made test of fitness as well as preparation for service, should be supplemented in the case of promising young men and women by opportunity through the award of traveling fellowships of becoming familiar with the problems and methods of parallel organizations in the Jewish centers of Russia, Roumania, Austro-Hungary as well as of Western Europe.

But there can be no real betterment of the position of the Jewish social worker until the directors of our Jewish charity institutions come to understand that the manager or superintendent ought to be something more than a diligent clerk or capable administrator. Directors of Jewish charities, who are not invariably chosen because of expertness in dealing with social problems, must learn to welcome the leadership of those who are trained and expert. Not infrequently is it possible to note the indisposition on the part of directorates to accept the leadership of the so-called "paid worker." The superintendents of Jewish charities ought to be men of leadership and of power, men of initiative and of statesmanship, and these are the very things the faintest symptoms of which directors are usually quick to resent and vigorous to repel. As a result, save for a few notable exceptions, the foremost social workers in the land are not occupying administrative posts in Jewish philanthropy. When, during the past year, I was arranging for a series of addresses under the auspices of the Free Synagogue on "Social Problems," it was not easy in every case to come upon Jews who were conspicuous by reason of their contributions to the working out of such problems.

The office of the Conference of Jewish Charities is simplified by the recognition of certain truths which Jews, who are in earnest, are beginning to face. Fundamental to these are certain convictions of which we need to have the courage. Back of all preventive, if not remedial, treatment of poverty must rest the conviction that poverty is not a crime. If poverty be a crime, and when poverty is a crime, it is, saving exceptional cases, a social or anti-social crime, the crime of society and not the crime of an individual. I rejoice to recall in this hour that the Jew never viewed poverty as a proof of wrongdoing. Such poor-laws as stained the statute books of Western civilization seem most cruel and ruthless when judged by the side of the juster and humaner provisions of the earliest pentateuchal enactments. Whittier, his biographer tells us, once quoted this saying of his father, illustrating his opinion in regard to public charities: "There are the Lord's poor and the devil's poor; there ought to be a distinction made between them by the overseers of the poor." The Jew concerned himself not at all with the devil's part in the making of the poor. His succor was limited to the Lord's poor only so far as he conceived of all the needy to be the Lord's poor and entitled of right to a brother's care and service.

Happily for himself and the cause of social progress, the Jew possessed no such scapegoat as intemperance upon which to pile every social ill and wrong. It were indisputably easy to refer to alcoholism a host of social evils, but, owing to his sense of proportion, the Jew realizes that alcoholism, which ordinarily is one of the effects rather than the causes of poverty, is not even a symptom of the *Elend* of the Jewish masses. Facing the hideous evils of poverty, which is largely anti-social in its origin and effect, we are without the excuse which our neighbors find so convenient and useful—namely alcoholism. Nor do we utilize environment and heredity as amply as we might in explaining certain ugly facts of life. Environment and heredity are beginning to rival the Jew in point of usefulness to the nations as an explanation of disagreeable economic conditions. Let this conference dare to urge that in dealing with particular phases of poverty and with many forms of social evil we indulge less and less in the generality, environment, and refer more and more to particulars, ill-lighted factories,

unsanitary sweatshops, death-dealing tenements. Instead of using the dubious though high-sounding term, heredity, let us frankly speak of underpaid fathers and overworked mothers, who, alas, must needs bequeath to their children an heredity which spells doom, who, with their children, must live amid an environment which means disease and not health, death and not life.

Shall this conference fear to proclaim that Jews ought not to surrender their Jewish personality in their social effort? Must we accept as inevitable the mechanicalization of much that goes under the name of the higher charity? Too often we accept our neighbors slogans and shibboleths just as they are about to cast them away. I cannot bring myself to believe that it is the office of the Jew ever to lag behind in the task of social reconstruction. It behooves us to be pioneers rather than imitators, not satisfied to be the echo of the older insistences, but to see with our own eyes, to hear with our own ears, to work with our own hands, to stand upon our own feet. The readiness of certain Jews of leading, rather than of light, to follow any beaten track, rather than be pathfinders, reminds one of Zangwill's reference at a Judean dinner to those Jews who twenty or thirty years ago eagerly disposed of their Sabbath lamps for a song and are now more eager to purchase them again from fashionable art dealers as beautiful antiques. I have heard of a good Jewish woman who purchased a Catholic Church stole at a high price, which, upon examination, proved to be her grandfather's *talith*.

In the light of our dread of pioneering in social service and our readiness to accept the primacy of any other, one is moved to echo the plaint of a teacher in American Israel, who said that we were in no need of begging an oversoul, seeing that our forefathers rejoiced in the possibility of rising to the heights of the *neshamah yetherah*, that is, the supersoul, that we were not to pick up some crumbs that had fallen from our neighbor's table and fancy that we had feasted upon a rich and toothsome banquet. The Jewish Conference is not to be a miniature reproduction of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, plus a *kosher* sign. This Conference ought to rest upon Jewish principles and Jewish convictions. Failing to do this, it were not only superfluous but impertinent. Thus I have heard it seriously mooted that the synagogue should appro-

appropriate certain methods in vogue among the faith-healing cults in order to hold its own. But if our own be flabby-bodied and flabby-minded beings, obsessed by the desire for health and the hunger for longevity, then better disown them than our faith. Judaism would not purport to offer its disciples the means of prophylaxis against disease and death. Judaism is not to be an imitation of every new fashion in religion and to pretend to give men a cure for thanatophobia. In the fundamental things of social service, Israel is to be true to itself, as it is to be true to its genius in all that is primal and vital in our spiritual heritage.

The higher charity, let this Conference not fail to make clear, is not so much in need of banknotes as of key-notes. Banknotes without key-notes in charity are almost worthless; given key-notes and banknotes will be given. I revert again to my earlier urging that we should not postpone taking up a new propaganda until such time as its advocates are ready to supersede it by taking a more advanced position. Putting it differently, it sometimes seems as if we were never ready to take our stand by the side of our neighbors in advanced positions in social service until after they were on the verge of deserting in order to occupy higher ground. I shall adduce one or two questions touching which, I repeat, we are content haltingly to follow, when, if we were possessed by our fathers' passion for social equity and obsessed by their abhorrence for social inequity which is iniquity, we would bravely lead the advance.

Let us consider an illustration of widest interest. The placing-out system has been under discussion for a term of years. It is for us here to lay down some fundamental propositions. The place for a homeless child is a childless home. Only as a last and inescapable resource, ought the state or organized charity suffer a home to be broken up and children to be placed out, if the mother can be enabled to maintain it and keep her children under her own roof. I say little or nothing of orphan asylums, whose work is done. The orphan asylum of today will be transformed into a central placing-out agency tomorrow. Happily there are some orphan asylums, which have already begun to render both services, knowing that the next task of the orphan asylum is to make itself virtually superfluous by planning and directing a system of homes for the children under its charge. The home for an orphan child

ought not, I repeat, generally speaking, be an asylum; the asylum of an orphan child ought to be a home. Wendell Phillips called attention to this truth fifty years ago—that the only adequate substitute for a home for homeless children is another home. Placing-out, however, needs to be supplemented by placing-in. What do we mean by declaring that placing-in is as preferable, other things being equal, to placing-out, as placing-out is more desirable than the housing of homeless children in large asylums? I cite here two cases, which will suffice to show that we are dealing with adamant facts and not with airy fancies. There was brought to the attention of the Social Service Department of the Free Synagogue, in the course of its regular ministrations, the plight of a woman who lay dying in a hospital. Some years earlier she had been widowed, and left penniless, and unable to support her children, who were committed to asylums. For some time she had supported herself as best she could, and finally broke down under the strain. Now the time had come when the older children were almost ready to leave the orphan asylum and become self-supporting, and behold the mother perishing on the eve of the reuniting of the family, which should never have been separated. The funds contributed by the city of New York to the asylum for the support of her three children, supplemented by a proportionate amount of the funds needed for the upkeep of the institution, would have been ample to have kept the home together, and might even have averted the tragedy of the mother's death.

We are now prepared to define the term, placing-in. The state that placed out the children in an asylum and paid for their maintenance ought to have placed these children with their mother, which might have been done at the same outlay, added to institutional upkeep, and, assuming that the preservation of the home durst not entail a larger burden of expense upon the state than is involved in the home-scattering and home-blighting plan now too generally in vogue. This is not a question of socialism at all. The state does assume a paternal attitude and perform a social office in placing out homeless children in the care of institutions. The question is rather—shall the state be wisely social or unwisely anti-social in dealing with the social problems, which even the most fanatical of individualists will be prepared to admit must

become the portion of the state? Such is our dread of anything savoring of socialism that we are in grave peril of drifting into the anarchy of anti-social performance of social duties. As for the homeless but not parentless child, why should the state ever place it out with strangers, with a foster-mother, unless, as in rare cases, it be inevitable, instead of placing the child in, whenever it be at all possible, with her upon whose fostering care it has an unanswerable claim, with the child's own mother? If it be socialistic to hold that the state ought to place in fatherless and deserted children with their mother, supporting her when necessary in order to keep the family together, then I hold that it is little less than anarchic, that is, in violation of every law of sanity and wisdom, to take children from their own mother and pay another woman, as is sometimes done in some places, to care for them.

The state today virtually takes the position in these cases of punishing the mother who has lost her husband through death or desertion, as if she were a wrongdoer. The state does not deliberately aim to break up homes, but such is the occasional result of its practice. Nor do I say that the United Hebrew Charities of New York views complacently the disruption of a single home which ought not to be suffered to be broken up. Moreover, it is expending large sums of money annually for the support of widowed mothers, but much more remains to be done because of the failure of the Jews of New York adequately to support the United Hebrew Charities, and the consequent failure of the state to place children with their rightful guardians from whom they must needs seem to be taken in order that they may find shelter and maintenance.

One case might be cited, which illustrates the ludicrousness of the present situation. A woman came under our observation, whose husband had become unable to support her because of mental disease. On the supposition that she was actually, if not nominally without the support of a husband, her youngest child was committed to an infant asylum and a somewhat older child to another institution. When we found her, she was on the point of committing two older children to a third asylum. The city was expending between thirty and forty dollars monthly at the time for the care of the children, who were scattered in three different institutions, and all of them without the mother-care, with which the

state felt compelled to dispense before it would take them in its own charge. My point is that this conference should take a radical position—that is, go down to the root of the question—and proclaim that either organized charity must deal correctly with this paradoxical situation or else bring the state to adopt a more enlightened and humane attitude toward destitute mothers. Whenever a mother, who, through causes over which she has no control, becomes unable to provide for little children, if the state finds that she be physically and morally fit to maintain a home, it ought extend to her such help as will make it possible for her to keep up her home for her children and herself. I am not half as fearful of the radicalism of thorough and preventive treatment as of the futility and pusillanimity of halfway-measure advocates. The placing-out versus placing-in question, while one of general import, is of special significance for us, because of the proportions of the immigrant population and the numbers of our brothers, who are indirectly, but not the less certainly slain by what are paraphrastically styled "adverse conditions," but really are low wages and high rent, overwork and underfeeding.

The same general law may be laid down with respect to the prisoner. Dare not this conference go before in pleading for a sorely needed reform? If the state take a man from his family as a penalty for committing a crime, it ought to give him a chance while in prison to earn something for the benefit of such as may be dependent upon him. We say that a man is serving in prison, when in truth he serves no one. The state should in general, though it may be necessary to make exceptions, enable a man within the walls of a prison to serve those from the duty of supporting whom the state has no moral right to release him, as long as ways can be found of making it possible for him to perform inalienable duties. How can the state hope to reform a man who has been found guilty of theft, by setting him the example of committing his own crime upon a larger scale—of filching from him thousands of dollars, it may be, in time and strength and productivity because he has practised thieving upon a minor scale. On the other hand, what a long step it were on the road to social rehabilitation, if the state permitted a man to earn something for the support of those dependent upon him or to put something by with

which to make a new start upon emerging from prison! What an incentive it were to many imprisoned men to be given the chance to earn money, so that they might be enabled in all cases to sustain their own families, whenever practicable to make restitution in whole or in part to the wronged, and again to save something for the hour of freedom, thus learning the social arts of prudence, thrift, serviceableness! The crime of the individual does not exempt the state from the duty of dealing socially with him. A man can best be fitted for social living by being helped to order his life during his imprisonment along the lines of other-regarding industry and social thrift.

One further consideration touching our duty to the prisoner! What are we as Jews doing today for Jews in prisons, penitentiaries, reformatories throughout the land? At most we arrange for them for opportunities to listen to occasional sermons by Jewish chaplains—opportunities of which those in charge of prison effort do not avail themselves with the regularity and eagerness with which they commend these to their erring brothers. And if little is done for Jewish prisoners, less is done for them upon their release from imprisonment. What serious efforts are being made with a view to reclamation of the fallen after they have paid the legal penalty exacted by the state? It may be because of boundless faith in the abiding value of pulpit exhortation of the prisoner that no attempt is made to supplement such spiritual help by economic furtherance in the critical hour of release. What is done for the family of a Jewish prisoner? Are they sought out? Are any steps taken with a view to making their burdens bearable? Is it sought to hold families together pending the return of the imprisoned, however hopeful the outlook might prove, if only some one cared to look out for them? What help is vouchsafed to the reunited when, for the first time, they face a world which lawlessly and mercilessly administers a second and lasting punishment to a man after he has paid the so-called penalty of the law? I know that the family of an imprisoned man will be and are helped in common with all who “apply.” Has Jewish charity no duty antecedent to that of answering when a knock is heard at its door? Respecting all things, this National Conference of Jewish Charities must lay down certain principles not arbitrarily nor dogmatically

but none the less firmly. When a husband dies his widow ought not to find it necessary to surrender her children to the care of the state if she be so circumstanced that she cannot support them, though otherwise fit to care for them. If a man be imprisoned for committing a crime, his wife and children ought not to be deprived of their breadwinner by the state which professes to aim after correction and not to inflict retribution.

This conference must not flinch. It must learn greatly to dare. It must not be over-zealous in obeying the command: Thus far shalt thou go and no further. Let us not flinch nor fail when brought face to face with the outcome of our own deliberations and investigations. Jewish charity can do no better than develop and apply the principles of the Mosaic dispensation. ~~Alas, that we submit to its fetters while we reject its emancipations!~~ It was far more radical—radicalism being the arch-sin of an age which “worships at the shrine of the well-enough,”—in the time of Moses to command that manservant and maidservant enjoy a weekly day of rest than it is to demand a living wage for every toiler in our day. The jubilee provision of the Mosaic legislation was designed to forestall the possibility of permanent tenure of land, seeking to ward off the evils which actually came to pass when the prophet was moved to hurl his wrath at those who “add house to house and lay field to field.” An attempt to avert the deadly sin of land-monopoly can, therefore, hardly be viewed as a revolutionary proposal by the descendants of those, who nearly three thousand years ago heard the jubilee law proclaimed with what they imagined to be divine warrant. For all that, an earnest and most worthy candidate for a Jewish pulpit in a city of the Middle West was rejected some years ago because he frankly avowed his faith in the land-tax theory. One is reminded of the conservative rabbi of a nearby city, who proposed to teach his people historical Judaism, whereupon he was reminded by one of the elders: “The congregation does not want to have historical Judaism; it wants simon-pure orthodoxy.” This is in truth to reject emancipation and, like the prisoner of Chillon, to be enamoured of one’s chains.

Let us not be so much concerned about seething a kid in its mother’s milk, but let us be terribly afraid of suffering a “kid” to seethe by the side of its mother in a sweatshop. Again, we are

greatly alarmed lest the provision of an unjust Sabbath-law constrain the Jew to observe two days of rest and thereby become handicapped in the economic struggle with his non-Jewish neighbor. None of us would wish to see burdens gratuitously piled upon the overweighted shoulders of our brothers. But, on the other hand, while it is unfair that the Jew be compelled to abstain from employment two days in the week, if his conscience compel him to observe the traditional Jewish Sabbath, I for my part confess that I am very much more troubled by the possibility that the Jew work on both rest days, and that thus, paradox of paradoxes, the Sabbath-giving Jew become the one Sabbathless people of the Western world.

The function of this conference is to proclaim that the old parochialism and provincialism must give way to the wider vision and the cosmic outlook, that in the place of near-sighted policy we require to have far-seeing statesmanship. Constructive statesmanship proclaims fundamental principles and builds upon them. This conference must deal with many problems which are of interest to men of all faiths, but even these questions, however general their import, it must consider in the light of Israel's native social ideals and seek to solve with the help of Israel's illuminating contributions to the progress of human welfare. A Jewish Conference must not shrink from grappling with elemental facts and educating elemental truths. With utmost appreciation of all that Jewish charity has achieved or attempted, I will not so fix my gaze in admiration of the good which has been done as to lose sight of the better that is yet to be done. The highest homage that I would yield to Jewish charity is to indulge in Dante's flattery of plain-speaking and truth-telling, remembering, too, the word of Thoreau: "As the time is short, I will leave out all the flattery and retain all the criticism."

Jewish charity will not be true to itself until it recognizes and, having recognized, cry aloud so that its voice be heeded—the half is not greater than the whole. Mankind must be in the saddle and ride things. Property is less than man. Justice is more than charity. The charity of today ought become the justice of every day. The only preventive charity is justice and justice is not charity. Charity can never rightly become more than the complement and crown of justice. Millions for charity and not one cent for justice—must be superseded by: Everything for justice. This

conference must bring much-abused but little-tried justice into better repute. Upon our age this conference must press the prophetic note: Justice, justice shalt thou pursue. It must reassert the command of Micah: Do justice, and love mercy. Before mercy, justice! Justice ever and mercy superadded! Is not much of charity necessitated by social injustice, the apparently cureless injustices of the present order? What injustice hath done justice alone can undo; what injustice hath undone, justice and not charity shall restore.

The brave and the true of our generation bear witness anew to the truths first uttered by the Hebrew prophets. "As much charity as you choose, but no justice,"—said Ruskin with mordant sarcasm, but he also said: "For truly this healing is only possible by means of justice; no love, no faith, no hope will do it; men will be unwisely fond, vainly faithful, unless primarily they are just." John Stuart Mill voiced what is becoming the fundamental conviction of every social seer: "We have had the morality of submission, and the morality of chivalry and of generosity; the time is now come for the morality of justice." Yet another daring but rejected teacher of England points out that justice and honesty have got themselves melted away into a miowling and watery philanthropy. "If the human masses at large had anything like their rights, they would not stand in need of so many philanthropists and benefactors! It is not patronage and kindly condescension which are required, but mere justice." We may yet have to choose between preventive justice and unremedial charity.

Thoren wir, auf Lind'rung zu hoffen
Wo einzig Heilung lindert.

It may be that Amos beheld a vision of such a gathering as this when, with prophetic fervor, he declared: Let justice flow like waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.

DISCUSSION.

DR. LEE K. FRANKEL: There are so many things which Dr. Wise has said with which I am so absolutely in accord that I feel it necessary to rise here today, to supplement in a measure the

very remarkable address which he has made, the somewhat new thoughts which he has presented to this Conference, and, at the same time, to call his attention in the name of the Conference to its past work, its past efficiency and certain discrepancies in his statements.

I wish to emphasize first of all the fact that we Jews have laid such emphasis on the question of material relief that we have largely lost sight of the greater problems which confront Jewry. We have made a fetish of the mere act of doing that which, in ordinary civilized communities, is, and should be accepted as a matter of fact, and should not require discussion even at a conference of this kind. That an individual needs food; that he needs shelter; that he needs clothing, are trivial matters in comparison with the causes which brought him into such conditions.

We Jews must begin to realize, and here I differ with Dr. Wise, that it has been left to non-Jews to bring to our notice—to us, the people with the wonderful Mosaic legislation back of us—our duties along the line of that brighter, nobler, higher philanthropy, which means care of your neighbor; which means prevention of disease; which means protection against vice, and the prevention of the exploitation of labor. We Jews have had to be taught during the last twenty-five years by our Christian neighbors how to proceed along the lines of modern advanced philanthropy. If there have been improvements in tenement-house legislation (I speak of New York), it has not come from the Jewish landlord on the East Side. If there has been legislation forbidding the working of children and women in factories, it has not come through the initiative of the Jewish employer of labor. In all these constructive activities the Jew has followed in the wake, and has not been the leader which his training and heredity should have taught him to be.

If this Conference stands for anything, it should bring home to each and every one of us here and to every Jew in the United States the consciousness that they have duties to the poor other than the mere granting of material relief. These duties arise perforce because of the treatment that we, as individuals, have accorded to the poor, by compelling them to live in horrid rookeries, and by not giving them the opportunities for main-

taining a decent standard of living. Unless we learn this lesson, unless we act along the lines of this thought as man to man and as brother to brother, unless we face this problem resolutely the Conference might as well die and pass away.

As Dr. Wise stated, there is business before this Conference I take it that this business in the main is to teach the community at large by preaching the eternal idea of justice. I do not wish to encroach upon Dr. Wise's territory, but I preach the idea of justice myself so frequently that I emphasize it again at this time. Justice must teach us, and it is the business of this Conference to bring this fact home, that many of our dependent poor are dependent not through fault of their own, but by reason of the fact that they are exploited in miserable workshops, and are compelled to live under horrible sanitary conditions. If these fathers and mothers die of tuberculosis; if the daughters become prostitutes; if the sons are sent to penal institutions, justice must show us that the fault is not altogether theirs, but that we, too, are responsible for permitting these conditions to continue. Instead of patting ourselves on the shoulder and living in an atmosphere of smug complacency, satisfied that we are doing all that is possible for the amelioration of the condition of our Jewish poor, we must bring home to ourselves the firm belief that only a part of our duty is done when we give the sop that temporarily palliates distress.

On the other hand, let me say to Dr. Wise, since he is, as it were, a newcomer in the Conference that this Conference, from its inception, has advocated the doctrine of placing dependent children where possible with their own mothers. Recommendations to this effect have been made by practically every committee of the Conference that has dealt with this subject. The reports of the committee show their belief that it is unwise, and in many instances cruel, to compel a mother to break up her family and to separate herself from her children by reason of her poverty. It is true, this thought has not always been well received by individual members of the Conference, nor has it always been possible to make managers and directors of institutions see the force of the argument.

*Reveal the distribution
embodied in a conference
empire, progress, and
how to give a still smaller
part of an available*

The same may be said of the question of desertion. Dr. Wise has taken occasion to refer to the work of the United Hebrew Charities of the City of New York, and of the awful example that has been shown by this society. I need not tell Dr. Wise, since he knows it only too well, that if the society in that city has done nothing else, it has used every dollar that it could beg or borrow to do the very things that he has spoken of—namely, to keep children at home with their mothers, and to break up the desertion evil by following the deserter and bringing him to justice. If I may be personal for a moment, Mr. Chairman, and may be permitted to address Dr. Wise directly, I would suggest that a re-reading of the society's reports—

DR. WISE: They have been one of the elements of my charity education.

DR. FRANKEL: I said re-read them, Dr. Wise. If you do I think you will find that, after all you have said in disparagement of this Conference (this is a privilege allowed to the Jew to criticise his fellow Jews, and I think it usually does good), I think you will find that, since the inception of this Conference, there has been a strong, determined, enthusiastic and willing effort on the part at least of those who come here, and who have been faithful attendants and adherents, to try and develop this organization along typical Jewish lines.

The Convention here adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, May 6, 1908.

MORNING SESSION.

Conference was called to order at 10 o'clock A. M. by President Bijur, who invited Vice-President Ginsberg to preside.

MR. GINSBERG: Mr. Lowenstein will please read Mr. Marshall's paper.

THE NEED OF A DISTINCTLY JEWISH TENDENCY IN THE CONDUCT OF JEWISH EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. Lowenstein read as follows:

Nothing is more difficult than to discuss the obvious. An axiom requires no demonstration. An attempt to analyze a proposition which is universally recognized ordinarily leads to confusion.

The topic which has been assigned to me for discussion partakes of these characteristics. The National Conference of Jewish Charities is, presumably, organized on the assumption that there is such a thing as Jewish charity, as contradistinguished from charity as an abstraction. A Jewish educational institution must be one which is, presumably, organized for the purpose of functionalizing Jewish conceptions and of promoting Jewish tendencies, otherwise there would be no reason for establishing Jewish educational institutions or for conducting orphan asylums, institutions for dependent or delinquent children, settlements or even hospitals under Jewish auspices. The state can provide all charitable and educational institutions, under secular administration, where Jew and non-Jew might be cared for or instructed on a common footing; where the same influences would be equally conferred on all beneficiaries, the same lessons taught, the same physical and mental food administered, irrespective of race or creed.

There are those who, approaching the subject from an abstractly ethical point of view, would approve of such a policy, and would carry their antagonism to religion and religious sentiment to the point of disapproval of all religious tendencies in educational institutions. With radicalism of this pronounced type it would be as difficult to argue as with bigotry or intolerance of any other species. In fact, the radical is ordinarily the least amenable to reason, and is generally the least tolerant of the convictions of mankind, based on the experience of all the ages. To him emotion and sentiment count for naught. Facts and statistics are his fetiches. The microscope and the dynamometer are his implements. Science, however shifting its foundations and however changeable its processes, is his sole authority. Yet theories of this sort have grown gray, whilst the golden tree of life continues in its verdure; the scientific formulae of yesterday are treated as a jest in the laboratory of today, whilst the investigator of tomorrow is preparing to discard the cock-sure pronouncements of today. Meanwhile the great majority of mankind persists in clinging to its spiritual possessions; continues to recognize in them a constant source of power and of moral development; finds in them the springs of comfort, solace and consolation, and a philosophy of life perennial in its youth and undying in its virility.

the fold. Judge Mack yesterday made an exception, by mentioning the delinquent and the dependent. We have, it is true, been exclusive in that. But, if that were the only question, then if I may be permitted a local reference, I will say that so far as we Jews of Indianapolis are concerned, we have even solved that problem. If you don't know it, I trust I may be pardoned that reference, because we at home are very proud of it. We have a juvenile court and a probationary system, about which you may not have read in your magazines or weekly journals, but which we claim, and which expert opinion both in this country and abroad has confirmed, to be the model institution of the kind in all the world; and we at least, without intending to explain in detail how it is done, have solved the problem of the Jewish delinquent in our own community, simply because of the advantages which that juvenile court has afforded us. But, friends, what shall we do in the communities where there is no such system? What shall we do where there are other problems, besides the delinquent? What shall we do to satisfy the normal, human cravings of the Jewish unfortunate and the Jewish defective, in our public institutions? What shall we do with the poor Jew who may be deaf or blind, but who may have the same Jewish aspirations, the same Jewish longings as we ourselves—as Jews, may have? What shall we do, as the eloquent speaker upon this topic has said—what shall we do, besides sermonizing with the Jewish prisoners who (tell it not in Gath), exist outside of New York, and even Virginia, which, we were just told, has only three among nineteen hundred. What shall we do with the hybrid Myra Kelly type of boy or girl who may have become delinquent? What shall we do with the anarchist who happens to bear the name of Jew? What shall we do to supply the need which Dr. Blaustein suggested this morning, of Jewish workers in Jewish settlements?

[Now, these, it seems to me, are specifically Jewish questions. They are problems which are general enough to invite the consideration of a National Conference of Charities and Corrections, yet specific enough to demand the attention of the Jewish conference. As for the general problems, we would do well enough to let things stand as they are—to leave them

to the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, and so unite with our fellows in bringing about a union of charity and the state—yes, if you will, in paternalizing or socializing it, at least in its charities; and if we are to insist, as I am glad was done this morning upon more Jewishness in our conferences—if, as was objected, we have not learned anything practical from these conferences, at least we have learned one thing from this Conference, and that is, the Jewishness of it, which has been impressed upon us and which we shall carry away with us; and by Jewish, I mean a Jewish charity—whose inspiration and source is not racial nor nationalistic, but religious.

And there is need of that today. We hear much about Christian charity. I dare say there is not one among us who has not heard ad nauseam that we are enjoying the benefits of Christian charity—that charity was not known until Jesus came into the world. It is for this Conference, not in any spirit of bigotry, nor in any spirit of racial pride, to insist, from a scientific and historic view-point, that there be rendered unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God, the things that are God's; and to demand that the Jew have recognition likewise.

DISCUSSION OF DR. WISE'S PAPER.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Wise asked me specifically not to consider his absence in discussing his paper. The floor is now open.

MR. S. LOWENSTEIN, New York: I think Dr. Enelow stated very clearly, in his quotation from Lessing, what was in the minds of many of us, as we listened to the very persuasive and fervid talk of yesterday. A member of the Conference indicated to me what seems to be the only fair way of answering the address, particularly in the absence of the speaker. He said, "If you claim that the statements made by Dr. Wise are not true, the best way to reply is to pick out a misstatement and show its falsity." Now I happen to be connected with an institution that cares for children, and inasmuch as Dr. Wise made, what I believe to be an erroneous statement with regard to the method of caring for children in New York City, I think I may take it upon my-

self to be personal to the extent of answering that one item. It is very easy to erect a man of straw and then to knock it down. Dr. Wise, in discussing the question of the care of children outside of their own homes (whether deprived of their natural protectors by death, desertion or disease), illustrated his point by means of a hypothetical case. He said that a woman having, let us say, four children might lose her husband; that the course that would follow would probably be something like this: one child would be committed to either the one or the other of the two large orphan asylums; that the second child (assuming that it was under five years of age), would be committed to the Infant Asylum, if it were a lucky child, since the Infant Asylum is not doing its duty (we who come from New York know that its facilities are inadequate, but we do not say that the asylum is not doing its duty because we know that it is trying to do the best it can—this, by the way); the other two children, he stated, would be given to some other woman to care for, because she is not their mother and because the institution might be able to spend in that way money received from the city for the care of those children which it would not be allowed by the city to grant to the mother. Now this statement of the case is decidedly untrue; it is, in fact, so palpably untrue, that if I might assume that the majority of those present at the address were acquainted with facts as they exist in New York, I would not deem it worthy of answer. In the first place, it must not be supposed for a moment that a widowed mother would be relieved of the care of all her children, unless she were absolutely incapable, physically or morally, of caring for them herself. If her own mother-love did not impel her to retain some of them, the city and the institutions would assume that she had sufficient resources to maintain at least one child by her own efforts. This would be insisted on as good public policy, and as best for the welfare of both mother and children. This disposes of one-fourth of the case. So far as the infant is concerned, I must admit as I did a moment ago that there may be some portion of truth in the statement as made. The Hebrew Infant Asylum is at present unfortunately situated. I need not tell you that, under most favorable surroundings, little children occasionally become ill and orphan

children do not differ in this respect from those living at home with their parents. When a child in the Infant Asylum becomes sick with any contagious disease, because of the construction of the building, the entire institution is likely to be put in quarantine, which prevents the admission of new children in order that they may not be subject to the danger of taking the disease. This is not an infrequent occurrence, on account of which the institution is unable to receive children from time to time. Moreover, the present building cannot contain any larger number of children than is at present being cared for, so that it is true that a great many children under five years of age are not provided for by the existing institutions.

But, with regard to the other two Jewish child-caring institutions, the statement made is absolutely untrue. They stand ready, I believe, to care for every Jewish child of the classes of children coming within their regulations, that may be committed to them and I can speak for both of them in saying that they do not do things in the way that you have been told. One of these institutions has, at present, within its walls over 1,200 children, and the other over 750, and both are taxed to the limit of their capacity. Yet I do not believe that anyone can truthfully say that either institution has yet refused to care for a needy child, solely because of this overcrowding. Some children are placed in board, and of 175 children at present so placed by the Hebrew Orphan Asylum, over 80 are kept by their own mothers in their own homes, and their board is paid by the Orphan Asylum from its own treasury; and until these children can be admitted to the institution, if that course be deemed advisable, they will be continued to be cared for in this way. I would say that this method will be increasingly used in the future, and that whenever it is impossible or unnecessary to admit the children to the institution and the mother seems to be worthy of this sort of assistance, it will unhesitatingly be granted. There are, however, cases where family conditions are such that the children cannot with wisdom be left in their own homes. This, of course, is obviously true in those cases in which the mother has died or is incapacitated through illness or other reason for caring for her children. I do not believe that Dr. Wise himself would maintain that the

ordinary Jewish father is capable of both being at work earning money to support his family, and at the same time, at home, to wash and dress and feed the children, to send them to school and care for those at home who are not of school age. Such cases furnish excellent material for boarding in private homes.

One other fact showing another side of the question ought not to go unmentioned in this connection.

Dr. Wise pleaded very eloquently for keeping the children with their mothers, and as I have indicated I quite agree with him in this, but the mothers frequently are of another mind. Many of them vastly prefer that with conditions as they are now in New York, the children should go to institutions after the death of the father rather than remain at home; they fear that with the strong hand of the father removed they will be unable to maintain control over the boys in particular, and that the children may be led astray by the temptations of their surroundings, and become depraved. They constantly talk, too, of the superior educational advantages offered by the institution. Of course, I have no sympathy with this point of view, but mention it simply to show that it is not always easy to induce the mother to co-operate with our efforts to prevent the breaking up of the family.

To sum up, I would observe only one thing, I have noticed with satisfaction during the discussions, and in the course of the papers read at these meetings, that the words "scientific charity" have been frequently used, but always by laymen, and not once by the professional worker. I believe that all of us engaged actively in social work realize that the factors with which we deal do not constitute a science. We know that many of them are matters of human psychology, human emotions which do not permit of scientific statement and formulation, but we do believe that we can handle these matters in a scientific spirit and with scientific method, that our work can be characterized by that unflinching seeking for the truth, that characterizes real scientific work; and I believe that I state the unanimous opinion of my professional colleagues, when I say that in attempting the solution of these social questions, we certainly prefer the scientific to the homiletic method of interpretation.

DR. M. COLLINS, Denver Col.: I desire to refer to a statement made in Dr. Wise's paper. I do not know how familiar Dr. Wise is with medical matters, or conditions that pertain to the modern hospital of today, but he made a statement in his address which I am afraid left a very wrong impression on his audience, and while I will not say it is incorrect, it certainly did not, in my mind, describe the true hospital condition that exists today. I refer to the "social work" that is now being done by all the hospitals in the United States—large or small. Bellevue Hospital, in New York, is not the only hospital, as stated by Dr. Wise, that does social work, not even in New York City. This work, which is comparatively new along social lines, was started only a few years ago in Boston, Mass., by one of the leading physicians in America. This social department exists at present in nearly every hospital in the country. I know that Dr. Goldwater, who is superintendent of Mount Sinai Hospital, and President of the National Hospital Association, has advocated in a paper written a number of years ago social work in connection with the hospital and outlined the plan which is now being carried out. I know also that in almost every hospital convalescent patients are carried to convalescent homes which have been in existence for many years; that we have had for many years visiting nurses' associations in connection with the charity work in every city. You have them in New York—we have them in Denver. I know they have sixty odd visiting nurses in Chicago and there are a number of Jewish trained nurses who are doing this work. I know that there are a number of Jewish women on the various boards connected with the hospitals throughout the country, and that they are doing their work voluntarily.

Now with this correction of the statement of Dr. Wise—and I am sorry I did not hear some New Yorker get up here and correct it—I want to take his part, and I believe it apropos here to advocate, as a part of the future duty of the National Conference of Charities that more attention be paid to the "social" department of hospital work. In your own great hospital, the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives, the social side is a large part of the work of that hospital. The mere cure of the disease—the mere arresting of the disease—is really only a minor

part of the work; it is the social work which comes after, which is the most important. We have found in every hospital of whatever kind, that it is necessary for us to follow the patient with a protecting and helping hand after the patient is convalescent and leaves the hospital; and I want to advocate here as a part of the future work of our conference that we give more support to the visiting nurses' association, and to the agencies and departments which are now established directly in the hospital for these purposes.

MR. CYRUS L. SULZBERGER: In one statement made yesterday by Dr. Wise, he directly by name challenged the representative of the United Hebrew Charities of New York, as to the correctness of what he said, and I must take up the gauge. First let me tell you a true story. Some years ago we had a District Attorney in New York, Col. Fellows, a man as eloquent—as eloquent as Dr. Wise—and on one occasion he was outlining with one of his assistants his method of treating a case which was to come up in court the following day. His assistant said to him, "But, Colonel Fellows, the facts are thus and so." Whereupon the eloquent Colonel replied, "Oh, damn the facts; they hamper the imagination." Dr. Wise did not permit his imagination to be hampered; and the point upon which he challenged the representative of the United Hebrew Charities was, if I remember correctly, the utter lack of volunteer workers. We have been working in the United Hebrew Charities in New York some thirty-five years. We have worked entirely with volunteer workers a part of that time, and partially with volunteer workers a part of that time, and I think I do no injustice to the good-hearted ladies who do the volunteer work when I say that the work that is done by those who were rather contemptuously called "hired charity workers," is better work than that which is done by the volunteer workers, because intelligent men and women who do that thing which they do for a livelihood, and do it with all their heart, necessarily do it better than those who do it from a mere impulse; and the very fact that we are striving in this Conference, by the establishment of scholarships in charity, and striving in every way to raise to a higher and higher dignity the profession of charity worker, shows

a general confession on the part, not alone of New York, but of the entire community—not alone of the Jewish community, but of the whole community—that not the volunteer worker, but the paid worker is the efficient instrument in the dispensing of charity. I want to say that it was a good pun to twist the words "higher charity" into "hire charity," but I do not think it was a worthy pun that would cast a slur upon the very class whom we regard as being next to the clergy, the most effective instrument for good in the entire community—that very class whose work is more akin to the work of the clergy, than any other that is being done in the community, and I say that so far as we in New York are concerned, we have always felt it a privilege to be associated with our "hired" charity workers, as we esteem it a privilege to be associated with our rabbi.

Only just one word more, because I have spoken entirely too much at this Conference. Dr. Wise yesterday said in substance, that we have taken up the abandoned shibboleths of the general charity workers, about the time they were ready to abandon them, and have done nothing constructive in our work, and were in every respect second rate people. I am not going to give you the long list of things that have been initiated in the hands of the Jewish charity workers. It does not really make any difference whether they were initiated on the one hand or the other; the fact is that there has been at all times the closest co-operation between the Charity Organization Society and the United Hebrew Charities in New York, and if the one was first, or the other was first, it made no difference as each was always ready to co-operate with the other. Probably the most effective piece of work that has been done in constructive charity in the past several years was done under the auspices of the State Conference of Charities of the State of New York, by the Committee on Standard of Living, and the chairman of that committee was our friend Dr. Frankel. It was generally admitted that this work, done by Dr. Frankel, was a master-piece; and I want to say (and I am sure you will agree with me, and I am sure the gentleman I am about to name, if he is present, will also agree with me), that when Dr. Devine, the other evening at the dinner, spoke about Dr. Frankel as his "associate," it was in no mere terms of

flattery that he said it, but in terms of truth. Dr. Devine and Dr. Frankel stand on a plane as charity workers, and I say it is allowing the imagination to run away with the facts when the statement is made here, as it was made, that we are doing nothing constructive.

Dr. Wise said "don't let us flinch." Well, I think it will be admitted that I have not flinched, at this Conference. I have not even flinched in my criticism of Dr. Wise; in fact, before he left, I told him I was going to make it, and that I was sorry he would not be here. The fact that I come from New York does not imply that I must approve of everything that is being done there. But I will tell you of three things that have been done since this Conference last met. There has been raised for the Protectors half a million dollars; there has been raised for the Home of the Sheltering Guardian Society, \$400,000; there has been appropriated by one man for the Galveston movement, \$500,000, and in addition to that we raise annually one million dollars a year as membership dues, with perhaps a million dollars a year additional that goes to other—to unorganized charities, of which we have no record. This does not look as though we have done nothing.

MR. ABRAHAM NELSON: Unless one starts out with the idea of attacking Dr. Wise, in this discussion he has no topic to discuss. Dr. Wise may have been carried away somewhat by his enthusiasm for the particular work in which he and his congregation are engaged, and that is social service—personal service—the most noble of all charity; and yet, everything that Dr. Wise said was not, to put it mildly, untrue. He did utter one or two truths, especially with respect to the lack of a probation officer in the criminal courts of the City of New York; and other things that I haven't time to dwell upon, because of the time-limit for this discussion. While everybody has been attacking Dr. Wise—except myself; while we have been accused of having held a religious revival this morning; while listening to the eloquent addresses of the graduates of the Theological Seminary, I for the moment was transplanted to their commencement exercises in New York or Cincinnati, and thought that one or two things that these learned gentlemen said were also subject to attack from one who comes

from abnormal New York; the abnormal conditions in New York, existing not from any fault of our own, but due to the terrible state of affairs that had existed, and still exists in Russia and Roumania. Those are the conditions that confront us, and those are the problems that we from abnormal New York have to deal with, and which are entirely different from the problems that you from the West, you from the South, and you from the East have to deal with. You can hardly realize the situation in the City of New York when I tell you there are almost one million Jews in the Greater City of New York. Of these 87½ per cent. are so-called Russian Jews (and when I say "so-called," I mean the Russian, the Roumanian and the Galician Jew), the last two forming a very, very small portion of the great number of Russian Jews in the City of New York, and they are the people we have to deal with today in our hospitals—not the people we had to deal with ten, fifteen, twenty, twenty-five, or thirty or forty years ago—in our old Mount Sinai Hospital—in our Home for the Aged and Infirm—in our Hebrew Orphan Asylum. The conditions since then have changed; so much so that I don't think anybody but a native of New York can appreciate the conditions of today.

Now these people from Russia and Roumania who have been persecuted for ages, these people, driven to what was to them a foreign shore, came under different conditions than the Germans who emigrated here twenty-five or thirty or more years ago. In looking over statistics I find that the German Jewish immigration during the last few years has been almost infinitesimal. There is no such thing in this country any more (and when I say in "this country" I mean in the City of New York), as German immigration. It is all Russian immigration. And that is the problem that we have to deal with, and that problem is different and variant from the problems that you from the East, and from the West and from the South have to deal with. When these people, persecuted and down-trodden, come to us we are duty-bound to welcome them, because we are all brethren, and believe in the fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of man. They come here naturally suspicious, and when sickness overtakes them, they are afraid to go to a hospital, other than one that is conducted strictly on Jewish lines. I speak from experience—I speak

advisedly. The great congested district in the City of New York is on the East Side—as I have learned since attending this conference; and all congested districts are down-town or on the East Side, whether it be in New York or in Richmond, whether it be in Louisville or in Indianapolis; it is always on the East Side and downtown. And in our downtown district, where our hospital, always crowded (I am speaking of hospital work), is located, there is a public institution maintained by the state, which, as Judge Mack and the preceding eloquent rabbis from the West have said, it is the duty—not only moral duty, but also legal duty—of the state to maintain, an institution that has been built several years, and equipped with all modern appliances—where the beds are always empty, because it is situated in a district where the population is composed exclusively of Russian—or, if you will, Orthodox Jews—whose suffering, I think I am right in saying it is our duty to ameliorate, whose condition it is our duty to better—who will, under no circumstances, while they are still young in the country, go to any other institution than one that is conducted on strictly Jewish lines. We have never had any difficulty, for instance, in forcing down their throats a strictly kosher diet! No, no, they wouldn't eat anything else—they crave for that, and it may be that our institution (if I may be egotistic), is scientifically run; never such a thing as Rev. Dr. Feuerlicht mentioned has ever happened in that institution—a patient being offered “gefillte” fish. It seems that they thrive on a Kosher diet, and it is owing to the Kosher diet and the Jewish surroundings that the Jewish patient recovers speedily.

And as I said this morning (I am afraid I am taking up too much of your time), the death rate in this institution is as low as any in the City of New York.

As far as the institution for delinquent children is concerned, the conditions in the City of New York are also different from those existing elsewhere in this country. It was an absolute necessity to establish a Jewish Protectory in the City of New York; and I will tell you why. Heretofore, before the establishment of the Jewish Protectory in the City of New York, many Jewish delinquent boys and girls were committed to the Catholic Protectory, where the non-Jewish children received instruction in Catholicism

every day of the week; and where the Jewish children were allowed, once a month, I believe, the privilege of listening to an itinerant preacher. These children should have been on the same footing as the Catholic children in religious instruction, and if for no other reason, for that alone the Jewish Protectory will prove a blessing to the Jewish community.

THE CHAIRMAN:—If I may be permitted to take the liberty, I am going to ask Mr. Hebbard, the Commissioner of Charities of New York, to say a word or two.

MR. ROBERT HEBBARD, New York. It is a great pleasure for me to be here at this enthusiastic meeting, composed largely of ladies, as I see, and I am sorry that your Chairman didn't allow me to sit quietly in that corner over there and listen to the other speakers. I am also very sorry that I was not here yesterday to hear Dr. Wise, because it seems to me from what I have heard this afternoon that what he said here yesterday must have been a regular “rip-snorter.” In fact, I don't believe that on the subject of charity the Doctor is considered by this audience to be really “kosher,” but that his position is exemplified rather by that new word, which I heard for the first time this afternoon—“trafir,” if I caught it correctly.

Now I have charge in New York of the public charitable institutions, and fortunately we have in those institutions comparatively few Jews—I won't say “Hebrews,” as I used to say, because I find that word is distasteful to you. We do have some; we have got a few consumptives from the East Side; comparatively few from that great Jewish district, Brownsville, where the Jews live out in the country—and that really is a wonderful village to see, as I saw it last Saturday afternoon, stretching for miles away on the outskirts of the city. We have a few Jews in all our institutions, and the question has occurred to me how shall we treat them, especially with regard to the food question. I have been in touch with the Jewish people who visited the institutions, and have been trying to arrange that question in a practical manner, that will be satisfactory to the Jewish community and satisfactory also to the Department. I won't agree to go quite so far