

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.

As an educational force religion is indispensable, for it constitutes the healthful development and the giving of proper direction to man's spiritual nature, as contrasted with his intellectual and social side. It is morally multiplied by emotion and enlightened by experience. It is ethics, plus feeling, warmth and imagination. It bestows the glamor of poetry on the dull prose of existence. It gives life and reality to abstractions and endows the cardinal virtues with the vital spark.

Humanity consists, in the main, of beings constituted of flesh and blood, who know naught of psychology and rejoice in their ignorance of philosophy. To them that which is abstruse is repellent; the concrete, which can make an appeal to their emotional nature, is alone attractive.

This is especially true of the young, to whom imagination continues to be a sixth sense, as it were, and who still dream dreams and see visions; whose better nature still lies nearer the surface, and whose optimism has not been chilled by that materialism from which all emotion has been absorbed.

The history of the human race, in every land and in every clime, affords a perpetual illustration of the truth that religion is the most potent influence in the development of character and the incarnation of virtue that has thus far been discerned. In the Bible days, in ancient Greece and Rome, in China and Japan, in India and among the savage tribes of this continent piety, obedience and reverence, without which no government, no society, no community can exist, were inculcated through its commanding influence.

The cold complacency of all the atheists who ever lived, however admirable their principles of morality, has been feeble as a civilizing and humanizing agency compared with even the most primitive of religions. The finest types of manhood and womanhood—those who have been productive of the most abiding influence on the world, and who have most strongly impressed themselves on their contemporaries and on succeeding generations—are those in whose veins the spiritual force of religious fervor surged most strongly.

To those who would bring up children on the Gradgrind plan, who would keep from them fable and myth and fairy tale, who would seek to impress them from their infancy with the material

aspects of life and to convert them into little prigs or mere calculating machines, and who believe that religion should not enter their minds until they shall reach such an age of maturity as to enable them to choose for themselves their own road to salvation—these views will appear as sentimental, and, as a consequence, absurd.

But I venture to assert that the careful observer, the man of experience, the student of mankind, will recognize their soundness. For generations they have been acted upon in the daily life of the world's inhabitants. They have constituted the foundation of great educational systems in the older advanced nations of the earth and even in this country, where the state recognizes no religious body, the establishment of denominational orphan asylums and homes for dependent and delinquent children has been encouraged. In many states a large proportion of the expense of the maintenance of such institutions has been supplied out of the public treasury. In New York it has been expressly provided in the Penal Code that when a child under sixteen years of age has been committed for a misdemeanor, it must be to some reformatory, charitable or other institution authorized by law to receive or take charge of minors, "and when any such child is committed to an institution it shall, when practicable, be committed to an institution governed by persons of the same religious faith as the parents of such child."

This declaration of public policy was the result of painstaking study and of scientific observation. It was found that the best results were attainable, even in the case of delinquent children, by means of religious training and that the best results from a religious training were produced, where such delinquent children were reared in the faith of their fathers.

Speaking from personal observation, I can endorse, without the slightest hesitation, the correctness of these conclusions; and my observation has extended to institutions conducted not only under Jewish auspices, but also to those managed by the Catholic and the Protestant churches.

Moral regeneration is possible, in an infinitely greater proportion of cases, where children are subjected to religious influences, than in the cases where they are of necessity confined in reformatories in which religious instruction is lacking.

It is equally true that those children whose home influences are religious, who dwell from infancy in a spiritual atmosphere, are more apt to develop into good men and women than those who live Godless lives, and who are devoid of religious emotion.

If religion is thus important as an educational factor, then it would seem to follow, as a corollary, that, in an institution conducted by Jews, that system of religion known as Judaism should pervade the entire institution. It must not be Judaism that is apologetic or mealy-mouthed; it must not be Judaism in name only, bereft of all of its individuality, strength and vigor; it must not be Judaism of the sterilized or pasteurized variety, or like that of a certain institution that has come under my observation, which has written the word "Hebrew" upon its door-posts, in huge, brazen letters, coupled with the explanation that it is non-sectarian.

Non-sectarian Judaism is the most contemptible, the most cowardly, the most ignoble of monstrosities. Nobody has ever heard of non-sectarian Catholicism or non-sectarian Presbyterianism. As well conceive of the antipodes occupying the same space; of positive and negative being identical; of free trade and protection as being consistent. It is the sad truth, however, that what, in the case instanced, constitutes the mezuzah of the institution, in many other instances constitutes the insidiously evil policy secretly harbored by boards of managers in charge of so-called Jewish institutions.

I have known intelligent men to be so eager to bring about the so-called Americanization of those who come within the influence of their institutions that they virtually shudder at every suggestion in favor of positive Judaism. Their conception of Americanization is to destroy all individuality, to create a dead-level of uniformity, to fit all comers to that Procrustean bed, to make all look alike, talk alike, think alike; to fashion them according to the same artificial model.

The product of this system is the fluent reader of yellow journalism, the glib talker of half-baked socialism, the servile imitator of an imperfectly understood social organization, an agnostic, a materialist and a being devoid of piety, obedience and reverence, unwilling to understand his progenitors and misunderstood by them.

The true American, he who breathes the spirit of his country's institutions at every pore, who intuitively understands their underlying principles, has no need of constantly prating about his Americanism. It is the recent convert who is apt to take himself most seriously and to become a pronounced chauvinist. He who is to the manor born takes his patriotism and his religion for granted.

[Of course I am not to be understood as being otherwise than favorable to the thorough inculcation of the true spirit of American citizenship, but what I deplore is the existence of a spirit which ignores the grandeur, and the power, and the beneficent influence of Judaism, and fails to recognize it as the most potent agency to be employed in the development of good citizenship.

The newcomers to our shores, especially those who have not attained maturity, are speedily assimilated to certain types of American life, unfortunately, in many cases, not those which are most admirable. They speak the vernacular of the country, slang and all; they adopt the garb of their associates, with all of its flashiness; they manifest the spirit of independence and of disregard to parental control; they lightly regard the ties of faith and religion and, in consequence, within a very few years the juvenile offender of Jewish parentage, a creature practically unknown in the olden days, has become a familiar spectacle. He is in the very vanguard of the assimilated, while those of his brethren, who have continued under the salutary influence of Judaism, develop into men and women, who are, at the same time, good Jews and good American citizens.

Let us not make the mistake of losing our individuality. Let us not trouble our minds concerning social disabilities to the extent of degenerating into mere apes. The Jewish people have been miraculously preserved for the purpose of giving to civilization the advantages flowing from a conscientious application to everyday life and conduct of the exalted principles of Judaism, which, even in the dark days of persecution, made of every Jewish home a sanctuary, and the head of every Jewish house a prince.

Let us not be too conscious of those qualities which differentiate us from our fellow-citizens, or follow the advice of the fox in the fable, of attempting to assimilate by cutting off our tails. We

must not become de-Judaized, but rather re-Judaized. We require something positive. The accursed spirit of negation, of doubt, of agnosticism can only scorch, blast and wither. It is not conducive to wholesome growth.

Unless, therefore, our educational institutions shall create for themselves a Jewish atmosphere, and a distinctly Jewish tendency, they have no reason whatever for existing. It is only the presence of such a tendency, which makes them Jewish; not the fact that they are constructed with funds contributed by Jews, that they are officered by Jews, that Jews alone support them, and that Jews alone are their beneficiaries. Unless the Jewish spirit pervades the institution, it might as well be managed by Laplanders, or Chinese, Indians or South Sea Islanders.

To be Jewish, these institutions must be the equivalent, in every sense, of that ideal Jewish home, which appeals to even such a scoffer as Heine was, and which impressed so remarkable a thinker as George Eliot. It must be a home in which God dwells; one in which the religion of our fathers flourishes in all of its grandeur, poetry, beauty, and purity; one in which the Bible is the cornerstone, and where its precepts are taught and practised; one which does not treat as the subjects of ridicule, time-honored forms and ceremonies, which serve as connecting links between the past and the present, and are the legitimate means for stimulating beneficent emotions and wholesome sentiment.

A Jewish orphan asylum should, above all, afford to its inmates, that religious training which their parents, as faithful, observing Jews, would have given to them had they been spared.

A home for delinquent children should give to its inmates that religious training which their parents should and would have given to them, if they had been capable of imparting the teachings of Judaism.

Managers of an institution of this kind, who fail to perform this function, who are unwilling to impart religious instruction, and to create a religious entourage of this character, are derelict in the performance of their duties, and are deficient in a proper sense of moral obligation. If from lack of religious conviction, or for any other reason, they are unwilling to act in accordance with this theory, they have no right to hold office in a Jewish institution.

Children quickly respond to their surroundings. Their emotional nature makes them easily impressionable. The voices of their ancestors echo in their blood, and, by proper methods, may be so attuned, as to sing for all time a song of inspiration, as, by improper methods, they may be deadened beyond revival. The only proper method, is that which conforms to the tests which it has been sought here briefly to suggest.

[To their honor be it said, that, whatever may have been the tendency some years ago, at the present time the managers of our Jewish educational institutions, recognize the need of a distinctly Jewish tendency in their conduct. Religious instruction has become an important part of the curriculum. Forms and ceremonies which had well-nigh become obsolete, have been restored, and the indifference to the religious spirit, which formerly prevailed, is rapidly disappearing.

In the recently organized Jewish Protectory, religious instruction receives more than ordinary attention. Its inmates visit the synagogue twice daily. They are made familiar with the Bible. They receive instruction in the tenets of the faith, and in Jewish history. They are taught Hebrew. So far as it is practicable, the food which they receive conforms to the Jewish dietary laws. Wherever it is possible to secure them, the house-fathers and house-mothers are Jews. The Sabbath and the holidays are strictly observed. No secular work, which it is possible to avoid, is permitted on those days. Every endeavor is made to give to the inmates, that religious environment which they have lacked, and to the lack of which, in great measure, their misfortune is attributable.

[Other institutions might be instanced, as illustrating this recent tendency. The Young Men's Hebrew Association of New York is rapidly developing on these lines. It conducts religious services, rally meetings, and religious classes, with growing success. The Young Women's Hebrew Association is strictly religious in its outlook. In the Educational Alliance, there has been a marked trend in the same direction. Its Religious Classes, its Children's Synagogue, its People's Synagogue, its Popular Lecture Courses on religious topics, are among its most satisfactory activities.

Of the orphan asylums, I can only speak as an interested observer, and, as such, have been gratified with existing tendencies, which are in the right direction.

In all these institutions, however, it is all important, that what some term reactionary measures be pursued. The effort should be, not to strive for a minimum, but for a maximum of Jewishness. It does not suffice to teach the catechism, or to impart a smattering of Jewish history; or, with superior air, to vaunt the present and ridicule the past. The treasure-house of Judaism is so replete with spiritual gems, which are freely bestowed upon him who seeks them, that it seems utter folly to content one's self with mere tinsel and pinchbeck adornment.

The religious courses in all of these institutions, should be made more thorough, and more extensive, and should not be confined to a modicum of time, on convenient occasions. Unprogressive as it may seem to some, I am also of the opinion, that, in all of the Jewish educational institutions, Hebrew should be taught, to the extent, at least, of enabling all of the inmates to read their prayers in the language of the Bible understandingly.

It will doubtless be asserted, by way of criticism, that, however desirable it may be to impart to our educational institutions these tendencies, it is difficult to find superintendents and instructors, who are sufficiently imbued with the Jewish spirit, to carry out such a program successfully. It is but too true, that this difficulty is not imaginary. I know of several important Jewish institutions, whose managers, though ardently desiring Jewish principals to conduct their work, have found it impossible, in spite of the most diligent efforts, to secure Jews suitable for the requirements of the positions.

Such experiences, however, should not lead to despair, on the contrary, they should bring about the creation of a remedy. In other words, it should be one of the tasks of American Jewry, to educate and train for these important callings, men and women who are adapted for them, and who will find in such a vocation, the best means of giving expression to their spiritual and intellectual aspirations.

Recognizing this necessity, the two Jewish seminaries of this country, that of New York and that of Cincinnati, have both

added as a subject for study and observation, philanthropic work, in the hope that students who might be found to possess a bent in the direction of communal work, rather than for strictly rabbinical pursuits, might be enabled, by their training, to impart a Jewish atmosphere to the charitable or educational institution to which they may be called. One of these seminaries, has recently decided to require of its students, that they familiarize themselves with the work of the leading Jewish communal organizations, and, to that end, to do actual work in such of them as afford an opportunity therefor. They will thus receive both theoretical and practical training, which will prove useful, whatever the vocation may be which they shall ultimately pursue. A number of important Jewish educational institutions have already been greatly benefited by the fact, that gentlemen who have been trained as rabbis, are in charge of them or of some of their departments.

It is equally important, that Jewish teachers be trained, capable of imparting religious instruction, not only in the religious classes of our educational institutions, but also in schools connected with our synagogues, and in schools intended for the instruction of Jewish children who are not connected with a synagogal organization.

No work of philanthropy, of greater practical importance than that to which I have just referred, exists at the present day. It belongs to the most essential of all the divisions of charitable endeavor—the preventive. The time has come for the establishment of a school for teachers, and all that is needed is the generous foresight to endow it adequately.

This paper is sufficiently discursive to admit of one further departure from the strict letter of the title which has been assigned to it. I wish briefly to refer to what I consider to be, a serious fault in the management of most of our Jewish hospitals.

The great majority of those who avail of their facilities, conscientiously adhere to the Jewish dietary laws. A transgression of them is regarded as sinful. When necessity compels a violation, as it must constantly, it adds to the physical pain of the patient, moral suffering, frequently more intense than that of the body. The managers of these hospitals, who persist in the inflic-

tion of such wounds, are straining the quality of mercy, and neutralizing it by the sting of cruelty. No fancied argument of inconvenience, or of difficulty, can meet such a situation. The dictates of humanity must rise superior to such considerations.

I have heard well-intentioned men, burst forth in angry denunciation of what they deemed the moral blindness of the poor unfortunates who sought relief in a Jewish hospital, because it was suggested, that true charity required ministering to the soul as well as to the body diseased; and yet, these gentlemen take pride in calling their hospitals Jewish, in pointing out the perfection of their arrangements and the elaborateness of their construction. To my mind, the only thing Jewish about such an organization, is its name. So far as its patients are concerned, beyond the medical treatment, the treatment afforded is anti-Jewish. Until the managers recognize the necessity of giving, even to these institutions, a Jewish tendency, they have not attained that high degree of philanthropy, which regards as of prime importance, the feelings of the beneficiary of philanthropic endeavor.

To conclude, let me again repeat, that a Jewish educational institution has no reason for existence, unless it is the hand-maid of the Jewish religion; unless the spiritual teachings of Judaism are there imparted; unless there is conferred by it, something more than material advantages, something greater than the possibility of attaining worldly success—the education of the heart, the refinement of the emotions, the stimulation of wholesome sentiment, the spirit of piety, reverence, and obedience, which constitute Judaism.

LOUIS MARSHALL.

DISCUSSION.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Blaustein will open the discussion.

[DR. BLAUSTEIN:] I agree with everything that Mr. Marshall has said—even with his premises and conclusions. However, Mr. Marshall has dealt mostly with the institutions; that is the orphan asylums, homes for the aged and infirm, hospitals, and schools for delinquent children. I shall dwell upon a different phase of this social work, which I think should play a very prom-

inent part. I will only say about institutional religious work, that it should be of such a kind that after the child is reclaimed, and when it is returned to the parental home, it should not then find itself a stranger at home as far as religious life is concerned. If in the orphan asylum the child is taught religion in the so-called progressive way, then when it returns to its parents or relatives there is a religious war at home; and therefore, I claim that religious instruction in schools and in the orphan asylums, should be as nearly as possible the religion of the home from which the children go.

But the most important social question among the work of the Jews today is, I think, social settlement among the immigrants. We have today no other settlements but in the quarters where there are immigrants. About ten years ago, when I came to live in New York, I visited a Jewish settlement, and I found a club of young girls studying the religion of Zoroaster, and I asked them whether they had ever studied the religion of Moses. They were horrified. Horrified, because they were given to understand that anything that is Jewish did not belong to settlements, for were they not to become Americanized? Were they not to become cultured? And to be cultured meant to them not to be Jewish.

[I also had a similar experience during the Kishineff massacres.] I don't know, ladies and gentlemen, whether you followed up the New York Jewish press during the time when the sad news from Kishineff came. [The whole of the East Side was in tears, in mourning and in sack cloth.] A play was at that time produced in one of the Jewish theatres, entitled the "Destruction of Kishineff." The theatre was then the Mecca of the East Side. Not that people went there to be entertained, but to give vent to their feelings. Thousands of dollars were realized for the victims in Kishineff, from these performances, [and yet during that very same period a settlement on the East Side had arranged for a reception—that settlement was not in touch with the neighborhood.]

It has been said that the Jew, for one reason or another has neglected physical culture, and I shall not enter into the explanation here, but it is a fact. The Jew comes from Eastern

Europe where they have an idea that physical weakness is a virtue; he has, so to say, developed his heart and his mind at the expense of his body; for this reason it becomes essential to encourage athletics among immigrant Jews. But one must be careful in teaching Jewish children athletics, for you know who were the ones who massacred the Jews? It was the one physically strong—the brute. It is therefore dangerous to hold out at once to the immigrants the ideal of athletics. He must hear first of George Washington, and not of John L. Sullivan or Fitzsimmons. It is a very delicate question to inculcate the idea of athletics among the children of immigrants. Imagine when a director of athletics calls the boys of the settlements on the East Side to meet him on the field a certain Sabbath morning, which happened to be *Yom Kippur*. Or when a council of civic clubs on the East Side called a meeting on the first night of the Passover. Fortunately I received such notices, and I stopped the meetings in time. Now this is the way some of the settlement workers carry on their good and noble work among the Jewish people.

What should really be done. The first thing I would say is, that Jewish settlements should have young people's services. A great deal is being done for the religious instruction of the youth. We have Sabbath Schools, and mission schools. As far as the religious instruction of the children is concerned, I think it is done fairly well—though not always in accordance with the needs of the environment. The old people take care of their own religious needs. The great question is the connecting link. It is the young man and young woman, just at the critical age who should be given the impetus of religious teachings, that is the time they should be administered to—the services should be orthodox in spirit and modern in form and not, as attempts were made, to give the first generation in America services that might be well for those whose ancestors for three and four generations had lived in America. It was my pleasant task to introduce a young people's service on the East Side. It was a kind by which the parents were not offended, and yet the young people were attracted. There was no instrumental music, but there was congregational singing. The sexes were separated, but the young women were not sent to the gallery. The young men had their heads covered, but there

order and decorum prevailed. There was no English read, as far as the prayers were concerned. But there was an address in English. I have had parents come and visit the services. Certain parts of the Hebrew were omitted, but it was merely a sin of omission and not of commission. This is the kind of religious service among the young people that those interested in social welfare should institute.

It is not enough merely to give religious instruction, teach the Bible or Hebrew, or hold services, if outside of it there is nothing Jewish done. To come back to what I said before, when the whole of the East Side was mourning, the settlement workers were, so to say, dancing; and on the other hand, when the news came from Russia that a constitution was granted to the people in Russia, and the whole of the East Side was celebrating for what that might mean to the five million Jews suffering in Russia, the settlements were indifferent to it. They simply didn't know what it meant.

We have clubs in Jewish settlements that discuss all topics under the sun. They resolve on everything—but very seldom do the clubs resolve on things Jewish. They do not for instance resolve that the study of Hebrew is essential! They do not discuss Zionism. Why should Jewish clubs always discuss whether the United States Senators should be appointed by the legislature, or elected directly by the people? That is a common topic in the clubs; but why not have such a question as: "Resolved, That Nationalism is good"—or not good? As to literature! Let them read Jewish, not necessarily Yiddish papers; then they will be in touch with Jewish life. Let us encourage them to read the publications of the Jewish Publication Society, and such other books. Then they will become interested in matters Jewish. Social work among the Jews is after all a question of the immigrant Jew. We should not be so impatient about the Americanization of the foreigner. He will become Americanized. You heard what Mr. Marshall said—about pugilism, vice, and so on. Americanization should really be not so much for the younger as for the older generation. If you can prove to the old Jew that by the law of Moses and the rabbis it is a duty to vote, and a duty to complain to the authorities if things are not right, you will

Americanize the old man and the old woman—the father and the mother. The child will be Americanized in school. The child should be Judaized—instead of as is the case in the settlements, celebrating Christmas.] I was at a settlement Kindergarten, where all the children without exception were Jewish, on a Friday afternoon—the Jewish mothers were there too, with their *Shabbus* clothes on, at a Christmas celebration. It was a ridiculous sight, Jewish children, Jewish mothers, all orthodox, on Friday afternoon celebrating Christmas. I only remarked, “God forgive them, for they know not what they do.” The mothers did not know the meaning of that celebration. All that would have been necessary would have been to say “*Yolka*” the Russian word for Christmas tree—and they would have known what it meant. But they didn’t know, and enjoyed seeing the children dance, sing and receive presents.

[We should have celebrations of Jewish holidays. Every Jewish season should be celebrated.

Finally, settlements afford the young people of the neighborhood social opportunities. In the tenement quarters especially, as we have them in New York, there is no opportunity for social life. The social problem of the immigrant is different from the problem of the American Jew. The so-called American Jew is always worried about not being able to get into hotels or clubs. This is not a problem as far as the people of the lower East Side for instance are concerned. I am afraid they are mingling too much. Let us assimilate or become Americanized in speech, in dress and in politics, in fact in every respect, but when it comes to the question of social life we should, I think, remain our own-selves.

I am going to make a bold statement, which may be surprising to some. Inter-marriage among the children of the immigrants or better the poor classes is surprisingly large. They work in the factories together, and they come more in contact with non-Jews than even the Americanized Jews. It is a social problem—a racial problem—a religious problem, and I claim that social life should, therefore, be in the settlements with the end in view of the preservation of the Jew.]

[In conclusion you will permit me to say a word about the Educational Alliance in New York. When the Educational Alliance was instituted about fifteen years ago, it was called a Hebrew Institute. Some of our Jewish people who were asked to give their moral support stated they would not have any dealings with an institution that is Hebrew. They wanted to have the word “Hebrew” removed. There was a struggle for several years, and the word “Hebrew” was taken off; it is now called the Educational Alliance. As far as the East Side is concerned, they don’t know it as Educational Alliance; they still call it Hebrew Institute. As the Educational Alliance it is a strange building to them—they say it doesn’t belong to them and have no use for it; but I am happy to say that during the time it was called the Hebrew Institute very little work of a Jewish character was carried on there, but now that it is called Educational Alliance a great deal of Jewish work is done down there, as you have heard from Mr. Marshall.]

[MR CHARLES HUTZLER, Richmond, Va.:]When a speaker is called on to address an audience, about the worst thing he can do, is to start out with an apology for what he is going to say; and the next worst thing is to present a complaint. Now, I am not going to make any apology, but I shall assume the risk of saying just this much by way of complaint: That I cannot perceive how a man can intelligently discuss a prepared paper, or even speak acceptably on a formal subject in the presence of a critical audience, when he has been given no opportunity to read the paper which is the basis of discussion.

A worse difficulty, still, for me, is, that having listened attentively to the reading of this splendid production, by the able author, I have been impressed, as all of you have no doubt likewise been, with the apparent fact that there are no weak features in its composition to which I can make objection.

Dwelling upon the supposition that I was expected to say something upon this subject: “The need of a distinctly Jewish tendency in the conduct of Jewish educational institutions,” I have decided that this being a field which has not heretofore received much cultivation, I would devote the few words I shall have to say to those phases only which should not be disputed.

Asking ourselves first: What is a distinctly Jewish tendency? Next: How are you going to direct instruction to this end? And, lastly: At what point will you discontinue this distinctive instruction? We find ourselves facing a problem which becomes lighter by simplifying the questions. Thus, we might substitute with some advantage this form: What are you going to teach, how are you going to teach it, and when will you stop teaching it? I admit, that, with my slight preparation, these last two phases are too difficult, and so I am going to confine myself to the reading of a few simple remarks applicable to the first phase: "What are you going to teach?"

When the question is asked whether there is the need of a distinctly Jewish tendency in the conduct of Jewish educational institutions (?), the first thought that presents itself to my mind is this: "How am I to distinguish the line of difference between what is distinctively Jewish, and the wider embodiment of religion in general," as applied to educational work. I fear I should be deemed unwise by some, and reckless by others, were I, in this assemblage, to attempt such a definition.

At the risk of being charged with either ignorance or timidity, I shall side-step a little—just a little—to say that I believe it to be the function of religion:

- I. To teach man his duty to his God and to his fellow-man.
- II. To sympathize with his brethren when in distress.
- III. To aid the poor and needy.
- IV. To uplift and encourage the downtrodden.
- V. To educate the ignorant.
- VI. And to open the windows of every dark place, so that the rays of the noon-day sun may enter, and supplant sadness with joy.

Now, if this be the function of religion, then, in my opinion, it follows, as night the day, that no *Jewish* institution, either educational or otherwise, can claim the right of continued existence without applying the practical features of this conception. But, again, the interrogation point rises to the surface of thought, and we ask: "Can the Judaism which now prevails come into the life of institutional work and perform this function?"

I shall find a reply which I deem sufficient by simply quoting this sentiment from a sermon recently delivered by our eloquent Rabbi Calisch, a sentiment which to me appears to be the equivalent of half the sermons the average man hears in a life-time: The words are these: "Moral knowledge is moral obligation." "To know the right, demands the practice of right."

This Conference possesses the moral knowledge, is burdened with this moral obligation.

I care not whether you teach orthodoxy or reform.

The basis of both is the same.

The history of both is the same.

The ethics of both is the same.

And the truth of both is the same.

But the *foundation*, and the *history*, and the *ethics* and the *truth* must be taught.

I say must be taught. Perhaps this is too strong a term to be used where a man wishes to carry conviction to a Jewish audience. Our people can be led sometimes; they can be persuaded occasionally; they can be coerced at rare intervals; but they cannot be driven unless, indeed, they be willing to go. Therefore, lest I be taken to task for using an expression which almost denies the privilege of mental resistance, I shall explain that the term is used metaphorically only.

In presenting reasons which are not so fundamental, but merely argumentative in the case, I lay down the broad axiom:

"That the ignorant Jew is never a happy Jew."

When the finger of scorn is pointed at him, it is his acquaintance with the sufferings of former generations which yield him consolation.

When he is denied privileges of social life accorded to others, it is the satisfaction of knowing that his religion teaches patience in adversity which must relieve him of resentment.

When disappointment and distress come, as they do, and must come to all of us in time, it is his belief in God's wisdom and mercy which must enable him to rise from his affliction and perceive the silver lining to the lowering cloud.

Were he ignorant of the history of the past, unidentified with the activities of the present, and unacquainted with the promise of

Israel's future, then indeed there would be no place from which he could obtain relief, unless *indifference* can supply the place of *elevated thought*.

I am trying not to forget that I am down for a *discussion* and not for a *document*. I shall, therefore, hurry to a close of what seems to me to be a subject of such vast proportions that it demands far more time, thought, and expression than I can, or would dare to give.

As many of our institutions are both educational and restraining; in fact, without exercising over the pupil some degree of restraint, there can be no thoroughly effective education, it may be well to be reminded that ever since the time of the Great Lawgiver there has been a constant struggle for *Freedom*.

Freedom, the incentive of action, the slogan of all the centuries, the God-given right of every man; *yet*, a heritage which should be withheld until by education, by preparation, and by disciplinary training he realizes what President Eliot of Harvard has so well expressed in a single sentence:

"That the Hebrew race demonstrates that the great principle of Freedom began in Religion."

JUDGE PHILIP RUBENSTEIN, Boston, Mass: At the outset I would like to express a word of appreciation for the splendid work that this Conference is doing. I cannot but feel that the delegates will return to their respective cities enthusiastic over the work done, and will endeavor to create in their own communities, a deep interest in the large problems which have been considered. Indeed, many of these problems are being now dealt with in the different communities, but there is much of inter-municipal interest, as was so clearly shown in the paper yesterday, and such topics should receive the joint consideration of all the communities.

The question for discussion this morning is two-fold. In the first instance, a simple one, and in the other, complex. As Mr. Marshall has pointed out, the question is, the need of an emphasis of things Jewish in our Jewish educational institutions, and secondly, if there is such need, how much emphasis should be adopted. If we need Jewish institutions, it would seem clear that we need to emphasize Jewishness in them, otherwise, where-

fore Jewish institutions? Judge Mack made a good point yesterday, I thought, when he doubted the need of Jewish institutions for the care of delinquent children, urging that the correction and care of such children, of all denominations, could be more effectively done by the State. He pointed out that Jewish children, particularly, would have greater awe for State authority. The institution in New York, he said, was an exception, in that the State failed to adequately care for delinquent children. Whether or not we agree with that point, it ought to be self-evident that these institutions, founded and conducted by Jews for their own people, should be distinctively Jewish. We know that the modern development of institutions for delinquent children is towards the change from institutional living into the creation of homes. Indeed, the Jewish Protectory of New York conducts its work on the cottage plan, dividing the children into groups, each having its own little home. It seems clear that such homes, if they are for Jewish children, should be Jewish homes.

Mr. Marshall goes on to point out the great value of religion in the correction and care of delinquent children. This scarcely needs discussion. All denominations feel the same way about it. People interested in Juvenile Court work know that the school, the home, and the church are essential forces in the care and correction of delinquent children. They recognize the church at the outset as a fundamental aid in the care of these children.

Mr. Marshall then makes short work of the need of Jewish emphasis, and proceeds to show how that need should be met, and here it seems to me that there may well be a difference of opinion. The complex question to which I have referred is, how much emphasis should be placed upon Jewishness in Jewish institutions, and what form should that emphasis take? It seems to me that this question involves the degree and method of the emphasis upon Jewishness in our lives. Thus stated, the magnitude of the question is apparent. There are many conscientious and highly intelligent men and women who feel that in order that we may properly take our places in the community, with our neighbors, and live with them in a fitting and neighborly manner, we should not emphasize our Jewishness in the way in which we have been doing.

I feel that the question, large as it is, has been answered by these meetings—by this Conference. A manner of emphasizing Jewishness has been indicated, which can be objectionable to no one, and which will not cause us to relinquish one bit the essentials of our faith. This manner of emphasis is one which comes into the minds of young men of today, who are growing up among us, born and educated among their non-Jewish neighbors. It is a vital matter to arouse these young people to display the spirit of the members of this Conference, and to do like work. To take the position that an emphasis upon strict forms of Judaism is essential in order to be truly Jewish, will antagonize a large number of these young people, and in my opinion it would be all wrong. There are those among our young men and women who, although born and brought up under the influence of these strict orthodox forms of belief, cannot honestly and rationally observe them, however much their parents would like them to do so. To them, these observances in a large part are but forms, symbolic, if you will, but not substance, and they can conceive of Judaism none the less truly, upon larger and broader lines. My own earliest interest in things Jewish arose after leaving college, when my attention was called to the Jewish children at the truant or, as we call it, Parental School. On Sunday mornings the children of other denominations attended the particular church to which their parents belonged, and arrangements were made so that someone met the Jewish boys each week, giving them a little of Jewish history and religion, in an endeavor to interest them in their race and people. I believe that such a condition of affairs presented to young people would tend to arouse their interest in Jewish communal activities, and an appreciation of things Jewish. This Conference shows how much we need the active interest of our young people in things Jewish, in communal affairs, for they are needed to assist in the conduct of the different charitable and philanthropic institutions.

In this connection Dr. Blaustein made a point with which I must take issue. He said, referring perhaps, to the mass of our poor, who are generally of the orthodox persuasion, and who constitute so largely the inmates of our institutions, and our delinquent children, that efforts should not be made to have

these people mingle with their neighbors; that their interests are best served by growing and developing in their own environment, and that an attempt to mingle would be disastrous. I cannot help feeling that our efforts, after all, must be directed mainly towards becoming broadly and intelligently Jewish—Jewish without sacrificing refinement in our conduct. We should seek to eliminate the loud type of Jew, who is so objectionable, and rightly so, to his neighbors, Jews and non-Jews. His vulgarity is not a characteristic of the Jew as such, but rather the penalty of his ignorance. Unfortunately, however, we are so much in the limelight that we cannot indulge in the failings of other races; we must insist upon the gradual elimination of these failings which in others are not emphasized as much as when observed in us.

Accordingly, my difficulty with Mr. Marshall's view is that he seems to insist upon an emphasis of Judaism with which I do not sympathize, in the conduct of our institutions, and particularly from my point of view, institutions for the care of delinquent children. I feel it a mistake to say that the children who are sent to institutions for delinquency have been truly instructed in the observance of religious forms, such as Mr. Marshall would like to teach them there. These boys of the street, although born and bred in an environment most conducive to orthodox belief and practices, have no sympathy for them, indeed, are apt to scoff at them. Clearly their religion has had no tendency to preserve them from delinquency. As a matter of fact, they are entirely divorced from their homes. They run around the streets with non-Jewish boys, and though at home they hear about Hebrew and attend the synagogue, no definite impression is made upon their minds. They understand it little, and sympathize still less. To insist upon instructing them in the institution to observe the details of their faith, may be hollow, and a mere mockery. They will not follow these things up on their release, even though they have been properly affected by the corrective influences of the institution. The breach between them and their parents still continues. They cannot appreciate the symbolic significance of the details which they have been taught, and when they have sense enough to understand them, they are unsympathetic.

I cannot help feeling there is a larger, broader spirit that can be inculcated into the minds of these children—a strong love for their race. Let them not read the different prayers, which they do not understand; let them not study or read their Hebrew or their dogma, which they will never observe; but, as will be simpler and more enduring, teach them to acquire a strong feeling for our people—for our race. Let them know in simple language of our history and our great works of charity and philanthropy for our people. By such teachings can you interest them, in that you tell them something of value, which they can understand, and with which they can sympathize. It seems to me that to inculcate a spirit of that kind is going to prepare them for usefulness among Jews in a Jewish community. Let them understand the splendid heritage which is theirs. Let them be taught not to be ashamed of the fact that they are Jews. Instruct them so that they may not regret the accident by which they were born Jews.

I believe that there is a lasting value in the emphasis of Jewishness on the part of all of us. I cannot but feel that the true kind of emphasis in the particular manner I have suggested, will not merely be best for us, but will earn for us the respect and good will of our neighbors. Although we have much to improve upon, by the adoption of broad principles we can most truly take our places among the peoples of the earth.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bloomfield, of Boston, and Mr. Heyman, of New Orleans, being absent, the next speaker will be Mr. Nelson, who is a director of the Beth Israel Hospital of the City of New York.

[MR. ABRAHAM NELSON, New York: I think that after listening to the able paper of Mr. Marshall, who stands pre-eminent in the profession of the law in the City of New York, we are all agreed that there is a need of a distinctly Jewish tendency in the conduct of Jewish educational institutions; and, if it were possible, more so must we be convinced of that fact after listening to the discussion by the speakers who have preceded me, all of whom have spoken pro, and none con. So also agreeing with what has been said by Mr. Marshall and by the preceding speakers, I only want to supplement the title of the discussion. We are also

agreed that there is a need of a distinctly Jewish tendency in the conduct of Jewish social functions, especially after our experience of hospitality at the hands of the Virginians on Monday and Tuesday evenings; and I think if nothing else, our Christian friends can profit by the experience of the Jews, as far as a Jewish tendency in social functions is concerned.

I have been introduced as a stranger! Were Mr. Bijur on the platform I presume I would have been introduced as "Exhibit B." Mr. Kamaiky was presented as "Exhibit A" to show the absolute lack of any feeling existing between the German and the Russian Jew, Mr. Kamaiky as a Russian having been taken into the fold of the German Jews by the United Hebrew Charities. I would be "Exhibit B" because I, as a German, have been taken into the fold of the Russian Jews, in an institution of which not only I, a citizen of New York, but of which every Jew must feel justly proud.

I was brought here under false pretenses. When I met the genial Mr. Bijur in our nether world in the City of New York, which to some is known as the "sub-way," I was given distinctly to understand that the delegates at this Conference of Jewish Charities consisted of two classes—the teachers and the pupils—and that I was to be a pupil; that I was to come here to be taught, to be shown what institutions in other cities are doing. To my great surprise, when I met Dr. Blaustein on the boat coming down here to Richmond, he flashed out a typewritten circular and said, "Brother, I see you are down for a discussion"—and that was the first intimation I had that I was to be exhibited to this audience.

I believe that the child that receives religious instruction will naturally grow up to be a better man—a better woman—a better Jew, a better Jewess—and a better citizen; and nothing impressed that fact upon me as forcibly as a story that was told to me by one of the ladies of Richmond last evening—a lady who is prominent in communal and synagogue work. She told me that as soon as her children are old enough—as soon as they have left the toddling stage—she takes them to the synagogue. Her boy, five years old, was taken to hear Doctor Calisch (who has charmed all of the visiting delegates), and after the services Dr. Calisch said

to him: "My boy, what did you like most that I said?" The boy, without a moment's hesitation, answered: "What struck me most, and what told me that I was going to be a good man, and a help to father and mother was the 'Shama Yisroel'—'Hear O Israel the Lord our God is one—Eternal. Blessed be his holy name.'"

I tell you that was the most magnificent object lesson to me of what good the teaching of religious principles will do with the young child.

Now there is no doubt that the Jewish child is capable of receiving and retaining religion of almost any kind, be it the Hebrew, the Catholic or the Protestant, and as an illustration of that I will repeat what was told to me only yesterday afternoon by the Prefect of the Catholic Protectory in New York; Brother Henry, with whom I came down on the boat, and had quite a lengthy conversation. I took the responsibility of inviting him to this Conference—whether he is here or not, I don't know; if he is, he will bear me out in this statement: Up to a very short time ago there were over 350 Jewish boys in the Catholic Protectory in the city of New York—I believe the total number of boys in that institution is around 2,500, and something like 400 or 500 girls; but for the purpose of this illustration we can eliminate the girls—although as far as this Conference is concerned we can never eliminate the girls—the older girls; we always want them with us. There is a competitive examination at the Protectory each month in different subjects; for instance, this month it will be in History. At the particular time of which I am speaking it was in the Catholic Catechism—and the class that stands the test best is given a holiday for the day. Brother Henry selected three companies of fifteen boys each, out of three different classes—naturally all Catholic boys. In one of the classes there were six Jewish boys, who said, "Brother, we want to get a holiday for our class, and we think you ought to let us compete"—take part in this so-called "catechism bee"—they used to have "spelling bees" in my day. The result was this—and it is the absolute truth. The six Jewish boys were taken into one of the classes of fifteen. Brother Henry went around the three different classes and asked questions in the Catholic Cate-

chism. In classes one and two, six remained standing; in class three, in which there were the six Jewish boys, the fifteen boys remained standing; that is, they answered all the questions correctly; and due to the aptness of the Jewish boys, in the Catholic Catechism, this class was awarded its holiday.

Now, if the Jewish boys can do so well in Catholic theology, what may we not expect of them, if we teach them from the start Judaism, continuing the work in the Talmud; the theologians of the past will not be in it with the present Jewish boys. I was impressed, representing as I do (not being a delegate here) a Jewish hospital, with a statement in the paper of Mr. Marshall that the Jewish tendency should be extended to hospitals; and I, for one, can say that the institution that I represent is one of the very few Jewish institutions in the United States in which the Jewish dietary laws are strictly observed. We have three large Jewish hospitals in the City of New York—Mount Sinai, Lebanon and Beth Israel, and only in Lebanon and Beth Israel are the Jewish dietary laws observed. And what is the result—due also to the doctors connected with the institution—our institution has as low a death rate as any hospital in the City of New York, or in the State of New York. Now, if in nothing else it seems to me the other Jewish hospitals should follow our lead in the observance of the Jewish dietary laws.

I am glad that I came here. I have learned a great deal. Much has been said about the distinction—the line of demarcation that was at one time drawn between the so-called Russian and the so-called German Jew. The difference, as I heard it explained by a down-town preacher was this; the forefathers of the German Jew peddled in this country fifty years ago; while the Russian Jew only peddled in this country ten years ago. But we are here for a common purpose, without regard to geographical distinction. We are here for an interchange of views, and no matter how we may differ, let us remember that

(209 151)
 "In Faith and Hope the world will disagree,
 But all mankind's concern is charity:
 And all must be false that thwart this one great end,
 And all of God, that bless mankind, or mend."

[MRS. HUGO ROSENBERG, Pittsburg:] I have only a few words to say, but I want to echo the sentiments that have been expressed here. I think it a beautiful thing indeed, that this Conference has taken up the key-note of religion. I was glad to see it on the printed program, and am glad to hear it throughout the discussion. I want to speak not only as a member of this Conference, but to tell you that in my connection with a large national Jewish organization of women—an organization which has helped the Jewish women of America to find themselves, and to find their own Judaism; that having strengthened themselves in it they are now ready to go forth and help in this work of Judaizing, or retaining in the Jewish fold, those that need our help, physically, mentally and morally.

In listening to some of the speakers whose eloquence and sincerity gave us much pleasure this morning, I could not but think that certain phases of thought are indigenous to youth. There are stages through which all thoughtful beings pass before reaching the ultimate development which establishes them in their own beliefs and their attitude toward one another in the fundamental truths of society and religion. In other words, we must first find ourselves, and having done so must also establish our relation and responsibility to the Jewish community and to the community at large. But until we stand firmly upon our own Judaism and are well grounded in its teachings and precepts, and until we respect ourselves as Jews, we cannot expect the respect of others. We cannot make our own lives beautiful in and through our Judaism without affecting our surroundings, and by doing this we affect those with whom we come in contact in all our relations of life.

I am glad the children are being talked of in particular. On this subject, with which I have had no little experience, I can talk authoritatively. [The general growth of settlement work for which the Council of Jewish Women has been sponsor, through the co-operative efforts of its sixty some sections, was the outcome of classes for religious instruction of the Jewish children who were otherwise not provided for in this field. These classes were established invariably to counteract the numerous missions for proselyting the Jewish children. From these re-

ligious classes settlements were developed as the various needs arose. In this work we have done our best to maintain the relationship between the home and the settlement, not to entice the young people away from the home, but rather to strengthen the home ties, especially so for the Friday nights. The mothers' meetings—the drawing of the mothers and fathers on occasions into the settlements frequently, sitting side by side with their children, learning the English language and becoming adept in the customs of the country of their adoption by lectures, social entertainments and by the example of the resident workers—has done much to maintain the family unity and to prevent the younger members of the family from feeling that they have superior advantages to those of their parents. The settlement, therefore, is trying to do for the foreigners in this country what would have to be done for any of us were we transplanted into Russia, Roumania or any other foreign country of whose language and customs we were in ignorance.

In our Hebrew language we have a means of communication which should be used to foster the brotherhood of all Israel, so that it makes no difference from which part of the world any of us come we will have a common vehicle for exchange of thought. We of the Council advocate the study of Hebrew and hope to foster it still further. People are trying to learn Esperanto while we have Hebrew, a living language that has been sent down to us from past ages, the ages before the Greek culture was at its height. Greek culture has died out, leaving only an ideal of beauty behind it. With a living force representing a living thought, a living religion today, why should we not keep up our own Hebrew?

[We hear the constant cry for Jewish workers in Jewish communal institutions. One instance to prove the necessity of developing and training more such workers, or utilizing the efforts of those best fitted for their chosen fields entirely irrespective of sectarianism: In a settlement with which I am closely connected we did not succeed in finding the proper Jewish nurse for our visiting district work. We did, however, succeed in finding a Christian nurse with a Jewish heart; she has learned the dietary laws, has learned to understand the jargon, is inde-

fatigable in her efforts and her work is beautiful. She is accepted by Jew and non-Jew alike, and regarded as a beneficent angel in their troubles. The head-resident of this settlement is a good Jewess; she is with us this morning. The board of the settlement are Jewish women in the highest sense and not merely by accident of birth. The settlement home has a Jewish atmosphere without being obtrusive, since we have learned that the highest efficiency in social service is obtainable only by giving people what they want and need, and not by forcing upon them what we think they ought to want. We must make our Judaism conform, as far as can be done consistently, to ideas, habits and customs round about us so that it will remain attractive to all Jews; especially should we try to endear it to those foreigners who are floundering between atheism and religion as they know it. They are floundering because they do not know how to reconcile their religious habits to the customs of their new surroundings.

The little Italians and some of the little Irish who want to come in at night attracted by the games and other features are not excluded, and they know when they come into the building that it is a settlement run by Jewish people with mainly Jewish workers.

In answer to what Dr. Blaustein suggested about the entertainments in the Jewish settlements on our holy days, we cannot blame the Christian workers for not knowing of our holidays, and the nature of them, unless we ourselves know and observe them. I am perfectly willing to use the agency of the Council of Jewish Women, with its numerous sections, with its influence in communal work in every city in which it exists, in sending out, with our compliments, to every communal worker that we know of, whether in settlements or otherwise, an English translation of the Luach (Jewish calendar), with the holidays especially marked so that hereafter there can be no mistake as whether they are holy days or holidays for rejoicing.

DR. A. GUTTMAN, Syracuse: I say, "Friends," for you have won our hearts—at least my heart, and I said to myself, I have heard so much of Southern hospitality, but now I know that it is not a myth, nor a fable; it is a fact; a reality. I want to say just a few words. The paper that was read this morning and is now under

discussion is the product of a friend, a member of my congregation. Mr. Louis Marshall comes from Syracuse. He is a Syracusan by birth, a New Yorker by adoption.

For fifteen years he sat—I don't want to say at my feet and drank in my wisdom—yet it is no conceit when I say that he was somewhat influenced by my teachings, and since he cannot be with us here today I felt that a few words from one who knows him so well would be right and proper. It goes without saying that I was greatly interested in that paper. I expected something grand and beautiful, something elevating and uplifting, something practical and ideal, and I must say that Mr. Marshall has not been found wanting. Let me illustrate what I mean. I often try to teach by object lessons—I like to illustrate my thoughts by little stories. If people don't remember what has been said, they always remember the story and the moral it points. And so I am going to tell you a little story.

A tramp was coming along a country road and on reaching a house, where an old deacon was sitting on the porch, the tramp steps up to the deacon and says: "Sir, I am very hungry; give me something to eat," and the deacon, looking down on the dirty tramp, says to him: "Can you recite the Lord's prayer?" Says the tramp, "I never heard of that, but oh, sir! give me something to eat. I am starving; give me something to eat." Well, the deacon was somewhat touched, and he went in the house and presently came out again with a loaf of bread and began to cut off a very thin slice. The tramp wanted it so badly that he reached out to take hold of it. "Just wait a moment," says the deacon; "first, you must recite the Lord's prayer." "I will do anything," replied the tramp; "only give me something to eat." "Well," says the deacon, "you repeat after me: Our Father"—"Our Father," said the tramp. "Which art in heaven"—"stop," says the tramp; "what did you say, OUR Father?" "Yes," said the deacon, "our Father." "Your father and my father?" asked the tramp. "Yes," replied the deacon. "Then we are brothers?" "Of course we are," says the deacon. "Then," says the tramp, "brother, in the name of our father, cut the slice a little thicker and cut it quick."

That is to my mind the great lesson which Mr. Marshall's paper teaches. The appeal he makes to us is for thorough-going religiousness. Yes, we want religion; we want true Jewishness, and we want it thick, and we want it quick, and we want it in such a way that it shall be in accord with the old and the new, in harmony with American ideas, congenial to this twentieth century and to our modern culture. Let our institutions be pervaded by a religious atmosphere. Let us make of the boys and girls entrusted to our care true Jews, because without religion no man can lay claim to the title of man and least to the name of Jew. It has been stated that some travelers have found tribes that had no religion. Well, I believe it; but what does it show? Those tribes were savages. And why were they savages? Because they had no religion. I say that man must have religion, and when we find people with no religion they are not of the "house of Israel;" they are simply remnants of savage tribes.

[MR. CYRUS L. SULZBERGER: I so seldom differ from Dr. Guttman that I am compelled when I do differ from him to differ radically. The primary thing is not to impress upon these children our religion. The primary thing is to impress upon them the religion of their fathers.] May I quote Hebrew?

והשיב לב אבות על בנים ולב בנים על אבותם

"And he shall turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to the fathers." It makes no difference if I worship with an uncovered head; what right have I to take the child of an orthodox father, to whom such an act is impious, and teach that child to worship with an uncovered head? To my children I can teach my form of worship; but to those children I stand as a trustee before God. I must teach them the form of religion that their father, if he were there himself, would teach. It is nothing to anybody whether I eat *trefah* or *kosher*. That is my look out. It is much that the child of these parents to whom the eating of *trefah* is wrong shall not be brought back from the institution, whether it be orphan asylum, reformatory or settlement, to the parental home to look with contempt upon the practices of that home, and upon the father and mother who so practice. Unless we teach the child truly to honor its father

and its mother, what can we teach it? And how can we teach it to honor its father and its mother if we teach it to hold in contempt the things which that father and mother hold dearest? Now I am not afraid, like my friend from Boston, that anybody is going to be too Jewish, nor am I concerned lest some religious practice may not be refined and may, therefore, cost us the respect of our neighbors. I have seen in the cathedrals of Europe an old woman clad in her rags, with a basket on her arm, enter the church and drop on her knees before what, to me, was an idol. Was there any vulgarity in that? Is not rather the vulgarity in the mind that would see vulgarity? And to say that Judaism should be refined—refine refined gold! Says Carlyle: "No man ever consciously did a great thing without thereby doing a petty thing." Let me paraphrase that. No man ever consciously sought the respect of his neighbors without thereby justly forfeiting the respect of his own soul. Seek the respect of your own soul. You need do no more.

DR. BORIS D. BOGEN, Cincinnati: Here you have "Exhibit C"—a Russian in the employ of American and German Jews. I have come here not of my own volition. I came because my community thought that by sending me to the Conference I could learn something and bring home to them plans and schemes that would cost no money. When I came to the first Conference I learned something about federation, and we have succeeded not only in federating our charities, but in instilling the same spirit into other communities. At the second Conference I heard about removal work, and we succeeded in getting a number of our Jews from New York City to the different places in our large country, and I am sorry we did not take along a few more, leaving the rabbis alone.

It seems to me that when I return this time and present my bill for transportation and other expenses I will not be able to tell them much that has been accomplished, and it will be as if the money were thrown away, so far as constructive work is concerned. Formerly the Conference had three days and one day was very useful; it was the constructive day. We cut out that day this time and have no substitute for it. Yesterday we

learned that all the work for the past ten years done in New York city, and which the other communities have followed, has not been done the way it ought to have been done. Today I have come with the intention of learning whether we have any reason for existence—whether there is any reason for the existence of the Jewish charities, and I have made up my mind this way: I left Russia because I was a Jew; I came to this country because I am a Jew; I am willing to become a true American because I am a Jew; I am willing to devote my life to Jewish charity, but when there is no reason for Jewish charity I do not believe there is any reason to remain a Jew. Now today, instead of hearing a discussion of it, I was thrown into a revival meeting, which is a good thing by itself. The pride of American institutions is that they have divorced religion from education; just so is the pride of American Jews that they have divorced charity from religion.

I believe it is a mistake to think that there is only one single reason for Jewish existence—religion. There are other reasons for it. You need only to look at a Jewish audience to know that there are other reasons why Jews should stick together, and especially if you have come from Russia you would find it out very well. When I was of the age of twelve I did not want to follow the instructions of my father in religion because there it did not mean what it does here; there it was an unpleasant duty; we had no beautiful temples. The one duty you have here is to contribute to the salary of the rabbi, and so I grew up without what you would call religious training, and still when the decree was passed that the Russian Jews should leave Russia I left Russia because I was a Jew, aside from my religion.

It seems to me there is no necessity of injecting Jewish religion into charity. There is no reason why we cannot be kind to the poor without thinking whether or not they are saved. It makes no difference whether he be reformed or orthodox, the Jew must have money to pay rent, and I would like to pay my rent even if I had no volunteer officer to follow it up afterwards. The objection is not that the rent is paid; the trouble is that we cannot afford to do any more. Jewish charity has a very serious ground for existence. You know the saying is that the

poor will always be with us. I hope they will be without us, but as long as they are with us we need not apologize for doing something for them. When we come to the Conference—especially we, the paid workers—we want to know what progress has been made. We don't want to know that a social worker has resigned because he is disappointed. That is no encouragement to you or to me. What inspiration can he leave us after he departs for Europe? We want to do our work, and do it as honestly as we can, and we don't want anybody to come to us and say that we don't understand anything and that a paid worker should not be paid for doing charity.

THE CHAIRMAN: This closes the discussion.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Convention reassembled at 2.30 o'clock P. M., President Bijur in the chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: This afternoon's programme will open with a paper by Mr. Kriegshaber.

SHOULD THE CONFERENCE UNDERTAKE THE WORK OF ORGANIZING JEWISH CHARITABLE EFFORT IN THE SMALLER COMMUNITIES?

MR. V. H. KRIEGSHABER, Atlanta, Ga.: Why not? The question should really be reversed? Why have we not already undertaken the work of organizing Jewish charitable effort in the smaller cities of the country?

Is it because we have felt that the problems in the larger communities were so far from being satisfactorily adjusted that we did not desire to add new burdens to those beneath which we are now staggering, or is it because we have felt that the smaller communities needed no such organizing under our direction? If we have refrained from an extension of our work on account of the first reason, then we may at once admit that we will never reach the outlying districts. The problems with which organized charity has to deal are complex and manifold. We can never hope to solve them entirely. We are merely improving the conditions as we may find them in each locality. We can hardly