

JEWISH CHARITIES

CLEVELAND'S SUMMER WORK

Walter Leo Solomon

Summer activities in Cleveland are largely determined by the opportunities which summer in Cleveland presents for a delightful out-of-door life. The chief social center during July and August is the ever-popular Camp Wise. Here 150 people, mothers and babies, boys and girls, men and women, spend a happy fortnight amid delightful surroundings. The charm of the camp has been considerably enhanced this year by the erection of a splendid new recreation hall 45 by 60 feet in dimension, open to the breezes all about and with a fine floor for dancing. This splendid shelter provides an admirable playroom in bad weather, a stage for dramatic performances and, of course, a place for the ever-popular dancing. Visitors and friends of campers are always welcome on the camp grounds, and on Sundays the camp presents the appearance of a picnic park with basket parties enjoying a day at the lake.

At the Council Educational Alliance the summer activities are likewise largely out-door in character. The playground is a very busy place indeed. Two trained workers are in charge morning, afternoon and evening. A program of craft work, indoor baseball, volley ball, games and athletic events fills every moment of the time. The basketry is particularly popular this year, and it is not at all unusual for residents to be besieged with "What time will the 'weaving school' be opened?"

Three times a week parties of children and mothers are taken for an all-day outing to one of the parks by a resident with volunteer helpers. A permit for the use of one of the municipal bathing beaches has been obtained, and the little ones are enabled to enjoy a swim as well as the kite flying, doll dressing and games that make these picnics a popular neighborhood institution.

A boon to the children of the neighborhood in the warm weather is the swimming pool which is alive with arms and legs and eager shouts on every possible occasion. Two sessions a week are set aside for girls, while boys and young men utilize the other afternoons and evenings.

A new important activity at the Alliance this season has been the establishment of the cent-a-drink milk station. A small booth was erected on the Alliance grounds, and by arrangement with the leading local dairymen it has been made possible to offer pasteurized milk of excellent quality for a cent a drink. The milk is bottled at the dairy in four-ounce bottles and is delivered at the Alliance iced in galvanized iron cans. By the use of these little bottles not only is the utmost cleanliness preserved, but the usual difficulties with glasses or cups avoided; since the comfortable proportions of the bottle permit it to be used likewise as a glass, and the process of serving consists merely in removing the bottle caps. Crackers wrapped in a sanitary package may likewise be obtained for one cent. And as the small boys speedily discovered, they can get "a whole meal for two cents." The instant success of the milk station has been striking and from 200 bottles disposed of on the first day, the sale jumped to 1200 in less than a week. Much interest has been manifested throughout the city in the experiment and some of the other settlements and the city parks are seriously considering an extension of the movement. Its practicability for settlements is apparent when it is observed that with the possible exception of the erection of the booth, not very expensive at best, the milk station will no doubt be quite self-supporting.

Government for the People

Prof. Thomas H. Reed of the University of California has published a volume "Government for the People" (New York: B. W. Huebsch, \$1.50 net). An important contention of Professor Reed is the value of the expert in American government. He hopes that we will gradually educate ourselves away from thinking that an untrained man who has favor of politicians will become an efficient public servant as an administrator. He therefore urges that in our state and city affairs we look forward to the employment of specially trained men, such as has already been evidenced by the action of some cities in securing the services of a city manager.

JEWISH CHARITIES

WHAT SHOULD BE THE ATTITUDE OF A JEWISH SETTLEMENT TOWARD NATIONALISM AND ALLIED JEWISH QUESTIONS?

I. Edwin Goldwasser

Chief of Board of Experts, National Council, Y. M. H. A. and Kindred Organizations

[Owing to the fact that there was no stenographic report of the Baltimore Conference of Jewish Social Workers, it will be possible to reprint only the prepared papers at that Conference. Unless all of those who read papers do what seems unlikely—keep their promise to send me their papers—it will be possible to reprint only a certain portion of the proceedings.

(Signed) BERTRAM BENEDICT,
Chairman Editorial Committee.]

To be possessed of an attitude implies a certain degree of self-consciousness. An attitude, which is really a tendency to express a judgment, presupposes a formulation of principles such as an individual or an institution can arrive at only when it is sure of itself, of its potentialities, and of its purposes. Therefore, any attempt to define the attitude of a Jewish settlement toward nationalism and allied Jewish questions carries with it the need of considering many apparently unrelated phases of the entire problem of the settlement. Merely to describe that attitude without stating and explaining these phases would be to render this discussion so dogmatic as to be practically futile.

In its ideal state, a settlement is the formal expression of the desire of a community to fund its resources for the betterment of all. Viewed in this large way, settlements need not necessarily be restricted to poor sections of the city. The true settlement is a co-operative institution which seeks to benefit all by effecting an interchange and common use of the powers of each. The City Club of New York, for example, is as much a settlement as is the Alfred Corning Clark House, or the University Settlement, or the Chicago Hebrew Institute. It furnishes meeting places for discussions, such as no group of private individuals could secure save at almost prohibitive costs. It has its socializing fea-

tures. It extends facilities for entertainment to its members such as they could for the most part not secure for themselves. Through lectures on varied subjects, it provides for the uplift of those who participate in its benefits. It offers recreational features that broaden a man's life by filling his leisure with healthful amusement. When large questions of civic betterment call for decisive action, it justifies its existence as a social institution by exerting its influences for good on the public mind.

All these things a settlement should be and do, whether it be a rich man's settlement or a poor man's. If this view is accepted, a settlement must inevitably be non-sectarian. Religion, which should be the great binding force in human relations, has done more to divide the world than any other concept which a developing civilization has formed. A settlement is essentially a socializing institution. It is the clearing-house of human differences. It is the equalizing, the leveling force in a community. Whatever separates, whatever divides man from his fellows must be denied admission to its precincts.

The ideals of a settlement must therefore continue independent of any consideration of religion. Its attitude, while not unreligious, must always be non-religious. How far this is possible in an organization of people who are almost altogether of one faith, may well be considered a moot question. You may not agree that this separation is desirable even were it possible. I ask you only to consider this: If the settlement becomes largely religious in its work or in its general organization is it truly a settlement? Is it not then essentially a Jewish institution, or a Protestant institution, or what not? Has it not lost somewhat of its universal appeal because of the delimiting effect of the injection of re-

ligion? To say that its civic and social work is but a phase of religious work, is only to beg the question; a mere quibble on words. We know the usual connotation of the term "religion," and it is that connotation which must dominate our discussion.

The settlement then is a co-operative institution intended to help the individual to fuller self-realization through completer interaction with his fellows. It should be universal in its appeal, and should courageously reject all attempts, however insidious, to restrict its usefulness by narrowing its outlook.

What I have said here applies to all settlements. But the settlement of the poor man must be considered in the light of certain factors which serve to distinguish it from that of the rich, while not altering its essential similarity. For example, the support of such a settlement must come from people not actively participating in its benefits. The success of the institution, however, may well be measured by the small ratio which this support bears to that derived from the beneficiaries themselves. Again, the direction of such a settlement, both in the large and in the smaller fields, must usually be entrusted to paid officials, so that intelligent action may be facilitated by an economical adjustment of time and effort.

The factor of outside support is only accidental. The settlement is a growth from a community. No philanthropically inclined set of supporters, however generous in donations, has a right to impose its point of view upon those who wish to secure a better realization of self through fuller self-expression. External imposition of ideals, even though it were not futile, would be criminal. You cannot subsidize self-respecting men and women into thinking as you think, feeling as you feel, acting as you would have them act.

The director, or head worker, or superintendent—call him what you will—must be possessed of a purpose, but he must not be an evangelist. He must convert through self-development, not through conscious proselytizing. He may counsel with the wisdom of the serpent, and lead with the mildness of the dove; further he may not go. His point of view may be worthy of respectful consideration because of his

equipment or his broader outlook, but it must not shut out the vision of those whose mouthpiece he is. In the true sense, he must be the head worker, his colleagues being those who make the settlement their intellectual and recreational home.

The attitude of the settlement should be that of the broadest tolerance, not because of good-natured indifference, but because such tolerance is the only possible attitude for a settlement to adopt and still to remain true to its ideals.

With this understanding of what a settlement should stand for, it is easy to indicate what should be its attitude toward the great questions which may agitate the minds of its clientele. The "Jewish" settlement, so-called, is a misnomer if the word Jewish is used to characterize its spirit. It is a proper appellation if it is meant to describe the constituency. If any settlement draws largely or exclusively on a Jewish population, it is inevitable that the problems of Jewry should become living issues within its walls. What stand shall the settlement take on these issues?

If they are the natural expression of the people's thinking, they should be given full opportunity for expression at the settlement. Clubs may be formed, lectures given, forums organized, debates held, and the like. But the fairest treatment should be accorded to all. Those who are on each side of the question should be given an equal opportunity to express their views. Clarification of notions is dependent on fullest opportunity to express one's self. The settlement aims to develop the individual. It rests calmly confident in the thought that the fullest development of the self brings with it the realization that social interaction is essential to the highest individualism. It employs socializing agencies, even as it attempts to evolve the perfect individual. But over and above all it holds sacred the right of the individual to express himself, to realize his greatest possibilities, and to make himself known unto himself through the formulation of his ideals.

When a large moral or civic principle is at stake those who direct the destinies of the settlement may well attempt to lead it to express itself in no undecided way, either in words or in acts. There are no two

sides to certain great formulae of personal or civic righteousness. One must stand either with Baal or with Jehovah. But few indeed are such principles. In most human affairs the real uplift comes from wholesome interchange, not from definite acceptance or rejection.

Where the questions discussed are such as grow out of the myriad phases of so great a topic as nationalism, for example, there can be no gain by attempting a Mohammedan conversion: "The Koran or the Sword!" "With me or you are no Jew!" There may well be a difference of opinion, or even a difference of conviction, but there is no eternal principle of right or wrong that can even by the subtlest sophistry be made to apply here. Encourage the freest discussion and let come what will.

Personally I am not in sympathy with the nationalist movement. Yet I should be blind were I to fail to see what miracles it has effected. It is the practical idealism of the dreamer, the concrete expression of

a yearning desire to help the downtrodden; it is the romanticism of modern Jewry. It has made the lives of thousands of young people more serious, more earnest. It has created a need for self-definition. It has demanded of its supporters a fuller knowledge of Jewish history and traditions. It has been a binding force in our disintegrated, transplanted Judaism.

How ridiculous then to fail to evaluate it properly. The settlement aims to unite. It must be spiritual in its appeal. Here, ready at hand, is a superb spirituality, built on gossamer-like ideals yet bearing the verisimilitude of a solid structure. Let the settlement use this as it must use any other influence that brings together men and women with their eyes on the beyond and their thoughts for their fellows. To be true to its ideals it must give fullest opportunity to its members to express themselves. Here is an ardent self-consciousness that demands recognition. Give it the welcome that is its due.

TUBERCULOSIS AND DEPENDENCY

Dr. Maurice Fishberg

New York

When the president of this Conference invited me to speak to you on the problems presented by tuberculous dependent, I accepted reluctantly because I doubted my qualifications for the task. It appears that during the past fifteen years tuberculosis has been taken out of the province of physicians, and handed over to the social workers. In fact, it seems to me that the only ones at present who know the causes of consumption—I say consumption, not tuberculosis—and the surest methods of its prevention—are the social workers, while the scientific workers have of late become somewhat skeptical and are not as cocksure as they were in the past.

But my friend, Mr. Bressler, assured me that this body of men and women are intensely interested in everything presented by the problems of tuberculosis and will be gratified to listen with open minds to one who has anything new to tell them. In fact, he assured me that even if my views are heretical you will listen to me with patience and forbearance; though he could

not promise me leniency on the part of those who will partake in the discussion, because their experience with tuberculous dependent has been very vast, and they have settled opinions on the problem.

I shall begin with the problems presented by the causes of consumption in the light of recent investigations, and hope that you will not be shocked when I tell you that at present we know less about the evolution of this disease than we knew three decades ago. When thirty-three years ago Robert Koch announced his great discovery of the tubercle bacillus, and incontrovertibly proved its association with all cases of the disease, we thought we knew all about the causes of tuberculosis. When further studies were made of the life history, habits and ways of the tubercle bacillus we knew that there was but one thing to do to banish the disease: to kill all the bacilli wherever found. Inasmuch as there are but two main sources of these bacilli, tuberculous human beings and cattle, it was thought that by isolating the former and destroying the