FIFTH BIENNIAL SESSION

THE

NATIONAL CONFERENCE

OF

JEWISH CHARITIES

in the United States

HELD IN THE CITY OF RICHMOND

May 4th to 6th, 1908

BALTIMORE
PRESS OF KOHN & POLLOCK, INC.
1909

Digitized by Project Zikaron
Touro University-NY Libraries
www.zikaron.tourolib.org
2026

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

OFFICERS, 1906–1908 5

OFFICERS, 1908–1910 6

CONSTITUTION 7

MEMBERSHIP OF THE CONFERENCE 9

REGISTER OF DELEGATES 18

PROGRAMME 22

PROCEEDINGS 25

OPENING SESSION 25

TUESDAY MORNING SESSION 25

Presidential Address:
President Nathan Bijur 25

Jewish Charitable Activities in Russia:
H. L. Sabsovich, Dr. D. Blaustein, B. G. Richards, E. Lewin-Epstein 31

The Unification of Jewish Communal Activities:
Professor J. H. Hollander 49

Discussion: Dr. J. L. Magnes 57
Milton E. Marcuse 61
Leon Kamaiky 62
Dr. A. Guttman 63
Cyrus L. Sulzberger 63
Dr. M. Landsberg 65
Bernard Ginsburg 67
Louis H. Levin 68

TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION 69

Intermunicipal Co-operation in Charitable Activities:
Rabbi George Zepin 69

Discussion: Jacob Furth 77

What Municipal Co-operation Means From the Standpoint of the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives at Denver:
Samuel Grabfelder 81

Discussion of Rabbi Zepin's paper: Judge Julian W. Mack 87

The Function of the Conference of Jewish Charities:
Dr. Stephen S. Wise 91

Discussion: Dr. Lee K. Frankel 109

PAGE.

WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION 112

The Need of a Distinctly Jewish Tendency in the Conduct of Jewish Educational Institutions:

Louis Marshall 112

Discussion: Dr. D. Blaustein 122

Charles Hutzler 127

Judge Philip Rubenstein 130

Abraham Nelson 134

Mrs. Hugo Rosenberg 138

Dr. A. Guttman 140

Cyrus L. Sulzberger 142

Dr. Boris D. Bogen 143

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION 145

Should the Conference Undertake the Work of Organizing Jewish Charitable Effort in the Smaller Communities:

V. H. Kriegshaber 145

Should the Conference, at Its Biennial Sessions, Devote Itself Entirely to the Consideration of Specifically Jewish Questions?

Dr. E. N. Calisch 149

Discussion: Dr. H. G. Enelow 151

Dr. M. M. Feuerlicht 158

Discussion of Dr Wise's paper: Solomon Lowenstein 161

Dr. M. Collins 165

Cyrus L. Sulzberger 166

Abraham Nelson 168

Address by Commissioner Robert Hebbard 171

Address by Bernard Greensfelder .....

Resolutions 174

Report of Membership Committee 174

BUSINESS SESSION 178

Election of Officers 178

Action on Resolutions 180

Field Secretary 181

Address by Vice-President Marks 182

Report of Treasurer 183

INDEX 188

OFFICERS 1906-08

President.

NATHAN BIJUR, NEW YORK.

Vice-Presidents.

BERNARD GINSBURG, DETROIT, MICH.
MRS. EMMA ECKHOUSE, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Secretary.

SOLOMON LOWENSTEIN, NEW YORK,
137th Street and Amsterdam Avenue.

Treasurer.

BERNARD GREENSFELDER, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Executive Committee.

MAX SENIOR, CINCINNATI, OHIO.
MAX HERZBERG, PHILADELPHIA, PA.
JULIAN W. MACK, CHICAGO, ILL.
MRS. JULIUS ANDREWS, BOSTON, MASS.
SAMUEL S. FLEISHER, PHILADELPHIA, PA.
PROF. JACOB H. HOLLANDER, BALTIMORE, MD.
VICTOR H. KRIEGSHABER, ATLANTA, GA.
MARTIN A. MARKS, CLEVELAND, O.

OFFICERS 1908-10

President.

PROFESSOR JACOB H. HOLLANDER.

Vice-Presidents.

MARTIN A. MARKS, CLEVELAND, O.
MRS. MAX LANDSBERG, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

Secretary.

LOUIS H. LEVIN, BALTIMORE, MD.,
411 West Fayette Street.

Treasurer.

BERNARD GREENSFELDER, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Executive Committee.

MAX SENIOR, CINCINNATI, O.
MAX HERZBERG, PHILADELPHIA, PA.
JUDGE JULIAN W. MACK, CHICAGO, ILL.
NATHAN BIJUR, NEW YORK, N. Y.
JOSEPH H. COHEN, NEW YORK, N. Y.
SAMUEL S. FLEISHER, PHILADELPHIA, PA.
DR. LEE K. FRANKEL, NEW YORK, N. Y.
JULIUS ROSENWALD, CHICAGO, ILL..
LUCIUS L. SOLOMONS, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National Conference of Jewish Charities

IN THE UNITED STATES

ARTICLE I.—NAME.

This association shall be known as the National Conference of Jewish Charities in the United States.

ARTICLE II.—OBJECTS.

The objects of this association are to discuss the problems of charities and to promote reforms in their administration; to provide uniformity of action and co-operation in all matters pertaining to the relief and betterment of the Jewish poor of the United States, without, however, interfering in any manner with the local work of any constituent society.

ARTICLE III.—MEMBERSHIP AND DUES.

SEC. 1. Any regularly organized Jewish Society of the United States having charitable and philanthropic purposes may become a member of the association on application made to the Secretary and on payment of the membership dues.

SEC. 2. The annual membership dues for each society shall be one-tenth of one per cent. of the amount expended by it for its corporate purposes during the preceding year, not less, however, than $5.00 nor more than $50.00. Such dues shall be payable February 1st of each year.

SEC. 3. Each constituent society shall be entitled to one delegate, but may appoint as many as it sees fit to attend the biennial meeting. All such delegates shall be entitled to participate in said meeting, but each society shall have but one vote.

SEC. 4. Each constituent society shall certify to the Secretary on or before January 1st of each year the amount of its expenditures for its corporate purposes during the preceding fiscal year.

ARTICLE IV.—Officers.

Sec. 1. The officers of the Conference shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Treasurer and a Secretary, who with five other elective members and all ex-presidents *ex officio,* shall constitute the Executive Committee. Officers shall be elected by ballot at the biennial meeting, and shall hold office two years and until their successors are elected and inducted.

Sec. 2. Vacancies in any of the offices provided in Section 1 of this Article may be filled for the unexpired portion of the term of office at any meeting of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE V.—Duties of Officers.

Sec. 1. The officers of this Conference shall perform the duties usually incumbent upon such officers, and shall submit a report at the biennial meeting.

Sec. 2. The Executive Committee shall transact the business of the Conference in the interim between the biennial meetings. It shall arrange for the biennial meeting, and have the power to appoint regular and special committees.

Sec. 3. The Executive Committee shall meet at the call of the President, or at the request of three members. Four members shall constitute a quorum.

Sec. 4. When the Executive Committee is not in session it may, by majority vote of its members acting individually, authorize any action first submitted in writing to each of them.

ARTICLE VI.—Meetings.

Sec. 1. This Conference shall meet biennially at such place and time as the Executive Committee shall designate.

Sec. 2. Delegates representing fifteen constituent societies shall constitute a quorum at such biennial meetings.

ARTICLE VII.—Amendments.

This constitution may be amended at any biennial meeting by a majority vote of the societies represented, provided notice of the proposed amendment shall have been mailed to all the constituent societies at least sixty days prior to such meeting; or it may be amended at any time by a majority vote of all the constituent societies. It shall be the duty of the Executive Committee to submit all proposed amendments.

MEMBERSHIP

National Conference of Jewish Charities

IN THE UNITED STATES

	NAME OF SOCIETY
Albany, N. Y.	Hebrew Benevolent Society, Dr. M. Schlesinger, Secty., 334 Hudson Ave.
Albany, N. Y.	Jewish Home Society, Albert Hessberg, Esq., President, 57 State St.
Alexandria, Va.	Hebrew Benevolent Society, Mr. N. Wollberg, Secty.
Atlanta, Ga.	Federation of Jewish Charities, V. H. Kriegshaber, President, 8 N. Forsyth St.
Atlanta, Ga.	Hebrew Orphan Home, Max Cohen, Secty. and Treas., 509 7th St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Baltimore, Md.	The Federated Jewish Charities, Eli Frank, Pres.; Louis H. Levin, Secty., 411 W. Fayette St.
Baltimore, Md.	Hebrew Benevolent Society, Pres., Prof. J. H. Hollander; Supt., S. Baroway, 411 W. Fayette St.
Baltimore, Md.	United Hebrew Charities, Solomon Ginsberg, Pres.; Samuel Silberman, Secty., 111-113 Aisquith St.
Birmingham, Ala.	United Hebrew Charities, Mr. E. Lesser, Pres.
Bloomington, Ill.	The Jewish Ladies' Aid Society, Mrs. Oscar Mandel, Secty., E. Washington St.
Boston, Mass.	United Hebrew Benevolent Society, Max Mitchell, Supt., Chardon St.

Boston, Mass.....Hebrew Women's Sewing Society, Mrs. Ely Feibelman, Clerk, 15 Montague St., Dorchester, Mass.

Braddock, Pa.....Braddock Lodge, No. 516, I. O. B. B., Morris Adler, Secty., 8th St. and Braddock Ave.

Buffalo, N. Y.....Federated Jewish Charities, Miss Cecil B. Wiener, Rec. Secty., 830 Prudential Bldg.

Butte, Mont.....Hebrew Benevolent Society, A. Wehl, Secty., P. O. Box 452.

Charleston, S. C.....Hebrew Benevolent Society, M. H. Nathan, Secty. and Treas., 168 E. Bay.

Chicago, Ill.....Associated Jewish Charities, Abraham Hirschberg, Secty., 108 La Salle St.

Chicago, Ill.....Bureau of Personal Service, Miss Minnie F. Low, Supt., 468 S. Halsted St.

Chicago, Ill.....Chicago Women's Aid, Mrs. Benj. Rosenberg, Secty., 3358 Calumet Ave.

Chicago, Ill.....Home of Jewish Friendless Working Girls, Elias Mayer, Rec. Secty., 810 Clark St.

Chicago, Ill.....Jewish Aid Society, Louis M. Cohen, Secty., Tribune Bldg.

Cincinnati, Ohio.....United Jewish Charities, Mr. Max Senior, Pres.; Dr. Boris D. Bogen, Supt., 730 Carlisle St.

Cleveland, Ohio.....The Federation of Jewish Charities, E. M. Baker, Secty., 513 Citizens' Bldg.

Cleveland, Ohio.....Jewish Orphan Asylum, Dr. S. Wolfenstein, Supt.

Colorado Springs, Col.Hebrew Benevolent Society, N. Laupheimer, Sect., P. O. Box 445.

Columbus, Ohio.....Jewish Charities, Mr. Paul Karger, Secty., 333 Columbus Savings and Trust Building.

Dallas, Texas.....Congregation Emanu El, Mr. D. A. Eldridge, Secty.

Dallas, Texas.....Hebrew Benevolent Society.

Dayton, Ohio.....Dayton Provident Union, Sol Flatau, Secty., Reibold Building.

Dayton, Ohio.....Hebrew Ladies' Relief Society, Mrs. J. Haas, Secty., 228 Maple St.

Denver, Col.....Jewish Relief Society, Miss Adelaide Kaichen, Supt., 30 Pioneer Building.

Des Moines, Ia.....Federated Jewish Charities, Mrs. S. Levinson, Secty., 1031 Sixth Ave.

Detroit, Mich.....Detroit Ladies' Society for Support of Widows and Orphans, Flora B. Margmont, Secty.

Detroit, Mich.....United Jewish Charities, A. Benjamin, Secty., 239 E. High St.

Duluth, Minn.....Temple Aid Society, Mrs. M. Cornfield, Secty., care of Hotel Spalding.

El Paso, Texas.....Mt. Sinai Congregation, A. S. Jacobs, Secty., 620 Stewart St.

Evansville, Ind.....Hebrew Benevolent Society, Mrs. M. Oberdofer, President, 1245 Upper First St.

Fort Wayne, Ind.....Hebrew Relief Union, Joseph Freiburger, President.

Gainesville, Texas....United Hebrew Congregation, I. Cohen, Secty., Church and Red River Sts.

Galveston, Texas.....The Hebrew Benevolent Society, I. Predecki, Secty.

Hot Springs, Ark....Hot Springs Relief Society, Rabbi A. B. Rhine, Secty.

Houston, Texas.....Beth Israel Benevolent Society, S. Freundlich, Secty., 1612 Bell Ave.

Houston, Texas.....Jewish Women's Benevolent Asso., Miss A. Westheimer, Secty., 1612 Hadley Ave.

Indianapolis, Ind.....The Jewish Federation, 821 S. Meridian St., S. B. Kaufman, Supt.

Ithaca, N. Y.....Jacob Rotschild.

Kalamazoo, Mich.....Congregation B'nai Israel, Samuel Folz, Main and Portage Sts.

Kansas City, Mo.....Hebrew Ladies' Relief Association, Mrs. H. Levite, Pres., 1413 E. 13th St.

Kansas City, Mo.....United Jewish Charities, Jacob Billikopf, Supt., 1702 Locust St.

Lancaster, Pa.....United Hebrew Charity Association, Jonas Fox, Secty., 123 E. King St.

Lincoln, Neb.....The Jewish Ladies' Aid Society, Mrs. Wm. Gold, Secty., 1712 E. Fifth St.

Little Rock, Ark.....Hebrew Relief Society, Rabbi Louis Witt, Fifth and Broadway.

Los Angeles, Cal.....Hebrew Benevolent Society, N. Zeisler, Secty., 110 New Hellman Block.

Louisville, Ky.....Congregation Adath Israel, Mr. M. Strauss, Secty., 746 N. Main St.

Louisville, Ky.....United Hebrew Relief Association, Garfield A. Berlinsky, Secty., 531 S. 1st St.

Mattapan, Mass.....Leopold Morse Home and Orphanage.

Memphis, Tenn.....United Hebrew Relief Association, 218 Adams Street, Dr. M. Samfield, Pres.

Meridian, Miss.....Meridian Jewish Orphans' Home and Benevolent Association, Rabbi Max Raisin, Secty.

Milwaukee, Wis.....Hebrew Relief Association, Louis Lachman, Secty., 806 Wall St.

Milwaukee, Wis.....Independent Jewish Charities, Louis Cohen, Secty., 441 Seventh St.

Milwaukee, Wis.....Ladies' Relief Sewing Society, Mrs. Wm. Baum, Secty., 1816 State St.

Milwaukee, Wis.....Mt. Sinai Hospital, Leopold Hammel, Secty.

Milwaukee, Wis.....Ladies' Sanitary and Benevolent Society, Mrs. J. W. Primakow, Secty., 1024 Eighth Street.

Minneapolis, Minn...Hebrew Ladies' Benevolent Society, Mrs. Charles Moss, Secty., 2104 Portland Ave.

Mobile, Ala.....United Hebrew Charities, Henry Hess, Pres.

Montgomery, Ala.....United Hebrew Charities, Jacques Loeb, Secty., 101 Talapoosa St.

Muncie, Ind.....Congregation Beth El., Mr. Charles Isidorf, Secty.

Nashville, Tenn.....Hebrew Relief Society, Mr. D. Cline, Secty., 128 N. Market St.

Newark, N. J.....Hebrew Orphan Asylum and Benevolent Society, Mr. G. J. Kempe, Secty., 530 Clinton Ave.

New Haven, Conn....Hebrew Benevolent Society, F. M. Adler, Secty., care of Strause, Adler & Co.

New Orleans, La.....Assoc. Relief of Jewish Widows and Orphans, F. S. Weis, Secty., P. O. Box 966.

New Orleans, La.....Touro Infirmary and Hebrew Benevolent Association, Charles Rosen, Secty., 3516 Prytania St.

New York, N. Y.....Baron De Hirsch Fund., Prof. H. L. Sabsovich, General Agent, 43 Exchange Place.

New York, N. Y.....Council of Jewish Women, Miss Sadie American, Secty., 448 Central Park, W.

New York, N. Y.....The Free Synagogue, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, 46 E. Sixty-eighth St.

New York, N. Y.....Hebrew Free Loan Association, 108 Second Ave.

New York, N. Y.....Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, Max Meyerson, Pres., 234 E. Broadway.

New York, N. Y.....Montefiore Home, Arthur D. Wolf, Hon. Secty., Broadway and One Hundred and Thirty-eighth St.

New York, N. Y.....United Hebrew Charities, Mr. Cyrus L. Sulzberger, Pres.; Mr. Morris D. Waldman, Manager, 356 Second Ave.

New York, N. Y.....Young Men's Hebrew Association, Mr. Wm. Mitchell, Supt., Ninety-second St. and Lexington Ave.

Niagara Falls, N. Y..Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Miss Theresa Garsman, Secty. 826 Willow Ave.

Norfolk, Va.....Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Mrs. Charles Meyers, Secty., 244 Holt St.

Oakland, Cal.....Daughters of Israel Relief Society, Filbert St., Mrs. M. Jonas, Treas.

Paducah, Ky.....Congregation Temple Israel, I. Nauheim, Secty.

Pensacola, Fla.....Congregation Beth El., Mr. Julius Menko, Secty.

Peoria, Ill.....Hebrew Relief Association, Wm. F. Woolner, Pres., 437 Moss Ave.

Philadelphia, Pa.....Home for Hebrew Orphans, Meyer C. Posner, Secty., Tenth and Bainbridge Sts.

Philadelphia, Pa.....The Jewish Foster Home and Orphan Asylum, 16th and Reed Sts.

Philadelphia, Pa.....Jewish Hospital, Henry N. Wessel, Secty., 1112 Chestnut St.

Philadelphia, Pa.....The Orphans' Guardians, M. M. Getz, Secty., Northwest corner Fifteenth and York Sts.

Philadelphia, Pa.....United Hebrew Charities, Max Herzberg, Pres.; Moses Klein, Supt., 336 N. Sixth St.

Philadelphia, Pa.....Young Women's Union, Alice E. Jastrow, Cor. Secty.; Leah Abeles, Treas., 806 N. Ninth St.

Pine Bluff, Ark..... Hebrew Relief Association, Rabbi E. Frisch, Secty.

Pittsburg, Pa.....Council of Jewish Women, Miss Pauline Block, Secty., 330 Stratford Ave.

Pittsburg, Pa.....United Hebrew Relief Association, Mr. M. Himmelrich, Treas., 314 Fifth Ave.

Portland, Ore.....First Hebrew Benevolent Association, Solomon Blumauer, Secty., 108 Fourth St.

Portland, Ore.....Jewish Women's Benevolent Society, Mrs. Tillie Selling, Secty., 434 Main St.

Portsmouth, O.....Ladies' Aid Society, Mrs. Ben Davis, Secty., Turley Building.

Reading, Pa.....Ladies' Hebrew Aid Society, Celie Cohn, Secty., 18 Penn Ave.

Richmond, Va.....Congregation Beth Ahabah of Richmond, Henry S. Hutzler, Secty.

Richmond, Va.....Hebrew Home for Aged and Infirm, Henry S. Hutzler, Pres.

Richmond, Va.....Hebrew Ladies' Benevolent Society, Mrs. Moses May, Treas., 607 E. Broad St.

Rochester, N. Y.....Jewish Orphan Asylum Association of Western New York, Dr. Max Landsberg, Secty., 420 Main St. East.

Rochester, N. Y.....United Jewish Charities, Dr. Max Landsberg, Sect., 420 Main St. East.

Salt Lake City, Utah.Jewish Relief Society, Becky Fulop, Secty., P. O. Box 546.

San Antonio, Texas...Montefiore Benevolent Society, Mr. G. A. C. Halff, Pres., care of D. & A. Oppenheim.

San Francisco, Cal...Emanuel Sisterhood, Mrs. C. R. Walters, Secty., Menlo Park, Cal.

San Francisco, Cal...Hebrew Board of Relief, M. H. Levy, Secty., 1768 O'Farrel St.

Savannah, Ga.....Congregation Mickva Israel, Benj. J. Apple, Secty.

Savannah, Ga.....Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Mrs. A. Vetsburg, Secty., 1611 Abercorn St.

Scranton, Pa.....Jewish Ladies' Relief Society, Mrs. Louis H. Isaacs, Secty., 717 Quincy Ave.

Seattle, Wash.....Hebrew Ladies' Benevolent Society, Mrs. I. Cooper, Secty., 1104 Minor Ave.

Sioux City, Ia.....Jewish Ladies' Aid Society, Mrs. Benj. Schulein, Secty.

St. Joseph, Mo.....Jewish Ladies' Benevolent Society, Mrs. Julius Rosenblatt, Secty., 410 N. Sixth St.

St. Louis, Mo.....Jewish Charitable and Educational Union, Bernard Greensfelder, Secty., Ninth and Carr Sts.

St. Paul, Minn.....Bicker Cholem Society, Mrs. B. Mark, Pres., 589 Pine St.

St. Paul, Minn.....The Jewish Relief Society, Mrs. J. Westheimer, Secty., 846 Summit Ave.

St. Paul, Minn.....Sisters of Peace Relief Society, 216 E. Summit Ave.

Stockholm, Cal.....Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Belle Rosenthal, Secty., 128 E. Minor Ave.

Syracuse, N. Y.....United Jewish Charities, Sol Ferguson, Secty., 102 Walnut Place.

Terre Haute, Ind....Jewish Aid Society, Rabbi Emil W. Leipziger, Secty., 706 S. Fifth St.

Toledo, Ohio.....Hebrew Ladies' Benevolent Society, Mrs. I. Hubert, Treas., 14 Seventeenth St.

Troy, N. Y.....Ladies' Society B'rith Shalom Congregation, E. Kaufman, Treas., 211 Scotwood Ave.

Vicksburg, Miss.....Associated Jewish Charities, Sol L. Kory, Supt.

Vicksburg, Miss.....Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Mrs. Bettie Gusdorfer, Pres., S. Cherry St.

Waco, Texas.....The Hebrew Benevolent Society, B. Kaplan, Secty., 307 Austin Ave.

Washington, D. C....The United Hebrew Charities, Columbian Building, A. D. Prince, Treas., 400 Seventh St.

Wheeling, W. Va....United Hebrew Charities, Jos. Raduziner, Secty., 1103 Main St.

Wilkes-Barre, Pa.....Ladies' Auxiliary, Y. M. H. A., Miss Pamelia Constine, Secty., 275 S. River St.

Wilmington, Del.....Hebrew Charity Association, Harry Gordon, Secty., 231 Market St.

Youngstown, Ohio....The Federated Jewish Charities, Mr. E. Hartzell, care of Hartzell Bros. Co., Pres.

Register of Delegates*

V. H. Kriegshaber, Federation of Jewish Charities, At lanta, Ga.

Mrs. V. H. Kriegshaber, Federation of Jewish Charities, Atlanta, Ga.

Louis H. Levin, Federated Jewish Charities, Baltimore, Md. more, Md.

Mrs. Aaron Straus, Baltimore, Md.

Mrs. Hiram Weisenfeld, Federated Jewish Charities, Baltimore, Md.

Miss Rosa Fried, Baltimore, Md.

Jacob H. Hollander, Federated Jewish Charities, Baltimore, Md.

Miss M. S. Hanaw, Baltimore, Md.

Julius H. Wyman, Hebrew Benevolent Society, Baltimore, Md.

Miss Mary Caplan, United Hebrew Charities, Baltimore, Md.

Philip Rubenstein, Federation of Jewish Charities, Boston, Mass.

Sidney S. Conrad, Mt. Sinai Hospital, Boston, Mass.

Dr. J. Sernoffsky, Federated Jewish Charities, Buffalo, N. Y.

Boris D. Bogen, United Jewish Charities, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Julian W. Mack, Associated Jewish Charities, Chicago, Ill.

George Zepin, Jewish Aid Society, Chicago, Ill.

Martin A. Marks, Jewish Orphan Asylum, Cleveland, Ohio.

Miss Florence Marks, Jewish Orphan Asylum, Cleveland, Ohio.

Charles Eiseman, Federated Jewish Charities, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mrs. Charles Eiseman, Federated Jewish Charities, Cleveland, Ohio.

Miss Minnie T. Baldauf, Juvenile Court, Cleveland, Ohio.

Dr. M. Collins, National Jewish Hospital, Denver, Col.

Bernard Ginsburg, United Jewish Charities, Detroit, Mich.

* The Register of Delegates is arranged alphabetically according to city

John Kline, Jewish Protection and Aid Society, Hawthorne, N. Y.

Mrs. John Kline, Jewish Protection and Aid Society, Hawthorne, N. Y.

Mrs. Emma Eckhouse, Indianapolis Section of the Council of Jewish Women, Indianapolis, Ind.

Morris M. Feuerleicht, Jewish Federation, Indianapolis, Ind.

Samuel J. Levinson, Jewish Federation, Indianapolis, Ind.

Jacob Billikopf, Jewish Charities, Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. Grauman, Louisville, Ky.

H. G. Enelow, United Hebrew Charities, Louisville, Ky.

Mrs. A. Loveman, Nashville, Tenn.

Solomon Lowenstein, Hebrew Orphan Asylum, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. Solomon Lowenstein, Hebrew Orphan Asylum, New York, N. Y.

Cyd Bettelheim, Emanuel Sisterhood, New York, N. Y.

Cyrus Sulzberger, United Hebrew Charities, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. Cyrus Sulzberger, United Hebrew Charities, New York, N. Y.

Dr. Bertha F. Lubitz, Recreation Room, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. N. P. Schwerin, Bloomingdale Guild, New York, N. Y.

Mr. Nathan Bijur, National Conference of Jewish Charities, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. Nathan Bijur, National Conference of Jewish Charities, New York, N. Y.

Abraham Nelson, Beth Israel Hospital, New York, N. Y.

Lee K. Frankel, New York, N. Y.

David Blaustein, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, New York, N. Y.

H. L. Sabsovich, Baron De Hirsch Association, New York, N. Y.

Ludwig B. Bernstein, Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Orphan Asylum, New York, N. Y.

Leon Kamaiky, Hebrew Sheltering House, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. Stephen S. Wise, Social Service, Free Synagogue, New York, N. Y.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise, The Free Synagogue, New York, N. Y.
Mrs Alexander Kohut, Emanuel Sisterhood, New York, N. Y.
Mrs. J. W. Spagat, Norfolk, Va.
Mrs. D. E. Levy, Norfolk, Va.
Mrs. Sam Bendhiem, Norfolk, Va.
Samuel S. Fleisher, Jewish Foster House, Philadelphia, Pa.
Max Herzberg, United Hebrew Charities, Philadelphia, Pa.
Jacob Gimbel, United Hebrew Charities, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rabbi David Klein, Petersburg, Va.
Mrs. Hugo Rosenberg, Council of Jewish Women, Pittsburg, Pa.
Miss Nannie Oppenheimer, Juvenile Court, Pittsburg, Pa.
Miss Addie Weihl, Columbian School Settlement, Pittsburg, Pa.
Miss S. W. Ettenheimer, Jewish Orphan Asylum, Rochester, N. Y.
Miss J. E. Kirstein, Federated Jewish Charities, Rochester, N. Y.
Mrs. W. H. Asher, Council of Jewish Women, Richmond, Va.
Miss Helen F. Block, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. Henry Block, Richmond, Va.
Miss Lillie H. Block, Richmond, Va.
Miss Hattie Bottighimer, Richmond, Va.
Miss Miriam E. Bowman, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. Sam Cohen, Richmond, Va.
Edward N. Calisch, Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. R. Fleishman, Richmond, Va.
Clarice Gunst, Richmond, Va.
Max Gunst, Richmond, Va.
Miss Nina L. Gans, Richmond, Va.
Edwin M. Heller, Richmond, Va.
Charles Hutzler, Congregation Beth Ahabah, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. J. K. Judah, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. Joseph L. Levy, Richmond, Va.
Milton E. Marcuse, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. Miriam Michelbacher, Richmond, Va.

Mrs. Wm. Reinheimer, Richmond, Va.

Miss Florence Sternheimer, Richmond, Va.

Mrs. A. L. Straus, Richmond, Va.

Mrs. Lawrence Sycle, Richmond, Va.

Jacob Furth, St. Louis I. O. B. B., St. Louis, Mo.

Philip L. Seman, Jewish Educational Alliance, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. Bernard Greensfelder, Jewish Charitable and Educational Union, St. Louis, Mo.

Mrs. Bernard Greensfelder, Jewish Charitable and Educational Union, St. Louis, Mo.

Rev. Dr. A. Guttman, United Jewish Charities, Syracuse, N. Y.

Morris Levy, Hebrew Charitable Association, Wilmington, Del.

B. A. Palitz, Baron De Hirsch Home, Woodbine, N. J.

Lydia Cantor, Baron De Hirsch Agricultural School, Woodbine, N. J.

Programme

Tuesday Morning, May 5th.

JEWISH CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES IN RUSSIA.

An abstract of this paper will be read as introduction to the general topic of the morning. The paper itself will be printed and distributed at the meeting of Monday evening to all members of the Conference, so that they may acquaint themselves with its contents. The paper will be prepared under the auspices of a committee consisting of Mr. E. W. Lewin-Epstein, Mr. Bernard G. Richards, Prof. H. L. Sabsovich and Dr. David Blaustein.

THE UNIFICATION OF JEWISH COMMUNAL ACTIVITIES.

Paper—Dr. Jacob H. Hollander, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., President of the Federated Jewish Charities, of Baltimore.

Discussion—Dr. Emil G. Hirsch, Rabbi, Sinai Congregation, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. J. L. Magnes, Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El, New York City; Mr. Leon Zolotkoff, Chicago, Ill; Mr. Henry Butzel, United Hebrew Charities, Detroit, Mich.; Mr. Milton E. Marcuse, President Penitentiary Board, Richmond, Va.; Mr. Max Mitchell, Federated Jewish Charities, Boston, Mass.; Mr. Leon Kamaiky, New York City.

Tuesday Afternoon, May 5th.

INTERMUNICIPAL CO-OPERATION IN CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES.

(Including a consideration of National Institutions, such as the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives and the Jewish Consumptives' Relief Society. Intermunicipal co-operation to be discussed with relation to the care of the juvenile delinquent, the insane, the chronic invalid, the blind and other defectives.)

Paper—Rabbi George Zepin, Chicago, Ill., Superintendent United

Hebrew Charities, Chicago, Ill.

With Relation to Institutions maintained by the B'nai Brith, Mr. Jacob Furth, St. Louis, Mo.

With Relation to the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives, Mr. S. Grabfelder, Philadelphia; Mr. Marx Gunst, Richmond, Va.

Wednesday Morning, May 6th.

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

(Settlements, Orphan Asylums, Institutions for Delinquent Children, etc.)

Paper—Mr. Louis Marshall, Director of the Educational Alliance and the Jewish Protectory, New York City.

Discussion—Dr. David Blaustein, formerly Superintendent of the Educational Alliance, New York City; Mr. Charles Hutzler, Virginia Prison Association, Richmond, Va.; Judge Philip Rubenstein, Judge of the Juvenile Court, Boston, Mass.; Mr. Meyer Bloomfield, Head Worker, Civic Service House, Boston, Mass.; Mr. Michel Heyman, Superintendent, Jewish Orphan Asylum, New Orleans, La.; Mr. Abraham Nelson, New York City.

Wednesday Afternoon, May 6th.

General Topic—THE FUNCTIONS OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF JEWISH CHARITIES.

A. Should the Conference at its biennial sessions devote itself entirely to the consideration of specially Jewish questions, or should the program include the consideration of questions not specifically Jewish, but of interest to Jews in common with the rest of the population of their respective communities (for example, industrial education, agricultural education, treatment of the consumptive, the juvenile delinquent, etc.)?

Paper—Dr. Stephen S. Wise, Rabbi, The Free Synagogue, New York City, former member State Board of Charities of Oregon.

Discussion—Dr. Henry Berkowitz, Rabbi, Rodef Sholom Congregation, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Samuel Sale, Rabbi, Congregation Shaare Emeth, St. Louis, Mo.; Rabbi Edward N. Calisch, Congregation Beth Ahabah, Richmond, Va.; Dr. H. G. Enelow, Rabbi, Congregation Adath Israel, Louisville, Ky.; Rabbi Morris Feuerlicht, Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation, Indianapolis, Ind.

B. Should the Conference undertake the work of organizing Jewish charitable effort in the smaller communities (by the appointment of a field secretary, etc.) ?

Paper—Mr. V. H. Kriegshaber, Federation Jewish Charities, Atlanta, Ga.

Discussion—Mr. Bernard Ginsburg, United Jewish Charities, Detroit, Mich.; Mr. Leon Nelson, Richmond, Va.; Mr. Max Harzberg, United Jewish Charities, Philadelphia, Pa.; Judge Julian W. Mack, Associated Jewish Charities, Chicago, Ill.

The sessions of May 5th and 6th were held at Temple Beth Ahabah, Franklin street.

Proceedings

Monday, May 4.

The delegates to the Fifth Biennial Session of the National Conference of Jewish Charities were tendered a dinner by the members of the Richmond Community, on Monday evening, May 4th, at the Jefferson Hotel.

Mr. Henry S. Hutzler acted as Toastmaster and speeches were made by Hon. Claude A. Swanson, Governor of Virginia; Hon. Carlton McCarthy, Mayor of Richmond; Rabbi Edward N. Calisch, of Richmond, Va.; Mrs. Hugo Rosenberg, of Pittsburg, Pa.; Judge Julian W. Mack, of Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Cyrus Sulzberger, of New York; Mr. Charles Hutzler, of Richmond; Dr. Edward T. Devine, of New York, and Nathan Bijur, Esq., of New York, President of the National Conference of Jewish Charities.

Tuesday Morning, May 5.

The Conference met in the assembly room of the Sabbath School of Beth Ahabah Temple, Richmond, Virginia, Tuesday morning, May 5th, 1908, and was called to order at 10.30 o'clock by President Nathan Bijur, of New York..

THE PRESIDENT: When we assembled in Philadelphia two years ago we had before us the appeal for help from our colleagues in stricken San Francisco. It may be recalled that Dr. Lee K. Frankel and Rev. Dr. J. L. Magnes, the latter a native of the Western metropolis, volunteered, on behalf of the Conference, to visit San Francisco to confer with our distracted friends there, and to report and advise what action, if any, need be taken by us in the premises. Within 24 hours our representatives had started on their mission. It is now a matter of history that the result of their visit was the conclusion, on the part of the San Francisco community, that it required no aid, other than that which it received from the great general relief fund, to enable it to care for its dependent charges.

Let me here say that within the last few days America has lost, in Dr. Jacob Voorsanger, of San Francisco, one of the men who contributed a very large part toward the rehabilitation of that city. He was, as you know, a member of the local relief committee—one of seven, I believe—and did honor not only to the Jews of San Francisco and of America, but to all of us as American citizens.

It is strange that we meet tonight only a few weeks after a disastrous conflagration has visited Boston, the metropolis of the East, and rendered well-nigh helpless many thousands of our brethren there. Accident so arranged it that Dr. Frankel was in Chelsea the day after the fire, and again he has brought back to us the encouraging message of self-help and independence. Of course, the calamity in Chelsea was insignificant compared with the one which overwhelmed San Francisco; but it is a source of great satisfaction and encouragement to know that, by reason of the thorough organization for philanthropic purposes which exists in Boston, the situation was well in hand—and in capable hands—clothed with adequate authority and directed by intelligent minds—almost before the ashes of the burnt district had begun to cool.

It had been virtually my daily custom, while connected with the United Hebrew Charities of New York, to call up our manager each morning and ask him "How is business?" If he said "Good," I replied "That is bad;" if he said "Bad," I replied "That's good." I am glad to be able to report to the Conference that our business has been bad during the past two years. Partly, no doubt, by reason of the great industrial revival which had prevailed during that period and partly, perhaps, because our immigrant brethren have, by their years of toil and industry, acquired a firmer foothold in their new home, the pressing demands upon the Jewish communities of the United States have been somewhat relaxed. Poverty and misery there have been in plenty, and suffering, too; but the dark crisis which faced us at our meeting in Detroit in 1902, and the echoes of which still sounded at our session in New York in 1904, has gradually assumed a slightly brighter hue. Nor, I am thankful to say, have there

been any repetitions of those wholesale outrageous butcheries which disgraced Russia in 1905. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the years 1906-8 have been characterized, in the United States, less by emergent and striking philanthropic movement than by gradual, almost imperceptible, improvement of existing institutions and organizations, by the recruiting of additional cities into the ranks of federated communities, and by the establishment of works of constructive philanthropy which aim at solving problems below the mere surface.

As some examples of this general movement I may mention the following:

The completion of the superb new Michael Reese Hospital in Chicago, distinguished particularly for the absence of a floating debt.

The establishment, in Baltimore, of a new hospital and of an institution for the care of the tuberculous, the former, I understand, rendered possible by the generosity of a lady whose interest in the poor, as evidenced by her substantial contributions, has given her a national reputation.

The National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives, at Denver, has made important additions to its accommodations.

In Cincinnati a new settlement has been established, largely through the instrumentality of one of the important members of our Conference.

Boston has instituted a Greater Federation, designed to include within its scope the philanthropic activities of every portion of the community.

Philadelphia has erected a number of new homes for many of its older institutions.

In New York City it is significant that the new institutions opened or in progress are, to use a paradox, not in the city.

The new Protectory, the first of its kind in this country, with present accommodations for 180 boys, is now in operation at Hawthorne, in Westchester county, and consists of an initial plant based strictly on the cottage plan.

The Solomon and Betty Loeb Memorial Home for Convalescents, in the same vicinity, has pointed the way for the proper care of

this class of unfortunates, to whom insufficient attention had hitherto been paid.

The Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society has acquired property near Pleasantville, in the same region, and is making plans for the erection thereon of an orphan asylum, also on the cottage plan.

I may say, in passing, that I understand that the Cleveland Orphan Asylum is giving its immediate attention to a new institution on the same lines.

In New York City, also, movements have been inaugurated for the care of the Jewish blind and for the deaf and dumb, subjects hitherto comparatively, if not wholly, neglected.

Nor must I omit to mention the recent revision of the Directory of Jewish Organization of the United States, both national and local, contained in the "American Jewish Year-Book for 1907-8," which forms a valuable reference work for all those who are interested in our philanthropic activities. It may not, by the way, be amiss for this Conference during one of its sessions to consider why, out of the hundreds of charitable institutions shown to exist, only about one hundred and twenty-five have become members of the Conference.

The American Jewish Committee has also brought to the attention of our public matters of international charitable interest, as, for example, the unfortunate plight of the Jews of Morocco, the distress attendant upon uprisings in Roumania, and the loss and suffering caused by the fire in Constantinople.

The organization of what is known as the Galveston Movement, inaugurated by the liberality of one of our well-known citizens, and designed to divert, in part at least, the stream of immigration from the Northwestern Atlantic seaboard, is another activity on which I should like to dwell; but time forbids even the mention of more than a few of the more striking developments of the past two years.

Since the beginning of the current year we have been confronted almost in every part of the country with the problem of the unemployed, the result of the recent acute financial and industrial depression. The safety valve of emigration which is open to the unemployed Italian, especially the unmarried male worker or the

one who is present in this country without his family, is not open to the Russian and Roumanian Jew who has adopted the country covered by the Stars and Stripes as his own home, his native land being too unkind to be regarded even as a step-country.

This situation has put a special strain upon the relief organizations, particularly in all the larger cities, and it is gratifying to learn, from an investigation made by the "American Review," the results of which were published in a recent number, that the demand has been met with reasonable success, although it cannot be claimed that the problem has been solved. Indeed, it is scarcely to be expected that anything other than an industrial revival will afford radical relief for this misfortune.

New York still remains the exception to all the Jewish communities of the country in that it has rejected federation, the movement having that end in view, organized in the fall of 1906, having been abandoned in the early part of 1907 for reasons which are probably familiar to all of you. The interesting experiment is now being tried of a Council composed of delegates from all the principal institutions. The purpose of this Council as stated in its constitution is "To further the cause of charitable and philanthropic endeavor by the Jewish community of the City of New York, with the view that organized agencies engaged in such work may, by discusssion and upon the advice of this body, co-operate for mutual betterment in methods and economies of administration, and that ways and means may, from time to time, be considered and devised to cope with such conditions and exigencies affecting the well being of the Jewish community as are not cognizable by existing organizations."

This brings us to the present day and to this Conference, on the eve of which we are welcomed by the hospitality of our friends in Richmond and by the friendly greetings of the representatives of State and City, who have honored us by their presence.

From the program, which you will all have seen, it will be evident that your Executive Committee has determined to open up a comparatively new line of discussion, more pertinent, we think, at the present time to the general purposes of this Conference. Our previous sessions have enabled ample consideration

of the more technical questions connected with our institutions and relief movements. We have, as we think for the present at least, graduated from the school of technique and physical development into the university, where we propose to consider adequately the special features which should distinguish the management and conduct of Jewish philanthropic organizations.

It gives me pleasure to find that our brethren of Russian and Roumanian extraction have shown great interest in this Conference and have attested this interest by the largest attendance in our history. It is significant of the awakening of our lately immigrant friends to their responsibilities and abilities that, in addition to founding and taking an active part in the work of many local institutions, they should so promptly have evidenced their appreciation of the value of a national movement as well.

Among the subjects which we hope to discuss it will be noticed that we have included the function of this Conference. It must be evident to those who attend our sessions, and who take an active and interested part in the sessions of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, that the Jewish Conference, if it can do no more than cover the same ground, has no warrant for existence. It is quite apparent that, so long as we have, in part, at least, a considerable body of immigrants to deal with, we shall have to solve questions connected with their individual characteristics as distinguished from other applicants. Nor may we fail to take into account the complication arising from the need of providing for our Jewish poor with due consideration for their adherence to the dietary laws and their desire to observe the Sabbath. These two factors alone, however, scarcely seem to make a differentiation so acute, so complete or so radical as to require their perennial discussion in a separate Conference. We have, therefore, thought it wise to invite a free discussion of the question, What special problems should properly be dealt with by this Conference, and to what extent?

I beg also to call to your attention the report on Jewish Charitable Activities in Russia which has been prepared by a committee of gentlemen, selected because of their ability to secure information on this subject. In view of the comparatively short time

at its disposal, this Committee is entitled to our especial thanks for the excellent results attained. It is thought that this paper will be valuable, not merely for the facts of which it contains a narrative, but also as an indication of the training, experience and point of view of an element in our population from which, no doubt, the ranks of the social workers of the future will be largely recruited.

We have endeavored to make our program homogeneous and complete in itself. It must not, however, be assumed that we anticipate that the discussions shall be limited to those whose names appear upon our printed list. It is earnestly hoped that all those who attend our sessions will take an active part in the consideration of the questions presented. The social intercourse, the meeting of the minds, and the general awakening to information of what is current in philanthropic circles throughout the country, all of which form characteristic features of our meetings, are well supplemented by the formal expression of individual opinion at the separate sessions.

Dr. David Blaustein, one of the committee of four who prepared the paper on "Jewish Charitable Activities in Russia," will now read a very short abstract of the paper.

Dr. Blaustein, of New York, here read an abstract of the paper printed in full below:

JEWISH CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES IN RUSSIA.

INTRODUCTION.

THE SPIRIT OF ZEDAKAH.

That Charity has ever been one of the elemental principles and practices of the Jewish people is as well known as that the care for the poor, the weak and the fallen is among the distinguishing foundations of Judaism. The Jew has ever stood near to his God, and as the life of no other people has been so closely bound up with its religion as that of Israel, so no other people has been so thoroughly imbued with the spirit of "Zedakah." As it has on various occasions been pointed out the original meaning of this Hebrew word is "justice," and it has thus been shown how closely the idea of charity has been linked with the thought of duty. Throughout the darkness and cold of the long exile

have the Jews carried along with them their precepts and practices of charity, and though the modes of giving to the poor and of helping the unfortunate have in the different lands been shaped by different circumstances, Jewish charity has ever remained instinct with true faith and devotion to our fellow-beings and characterized by that feeling of generosity which brings the human so close to the divine.

In Russia Jewish charitable activities during the 19th Century were largely shaped by the organization of the Jewish communities by the Government, and more recently many of the charities have been influenced by the operations of large philanthropies created either by prominent individuals within the country or promoted by some of the noted Jewish institutions of other lands; but under all circumstances and through all changes every Jewish center, large or small, has ever harbored a surprising number of Jewish charities, each one endeavoring to meet a different need, each one carried on by the work of volunteer officers and by the donations and gifts of almost all members of the community—for, indeed, everyone gives to charity, and it has become a saying that he who is incapable of giving "Zedakah" must be so poor that he should be receiving alms. It is "Give or take," and indeed that was the saying of Simon Kaftan of Wilna, one of a number of picturesque charity workers who have arisen in the Russian ghetto and have devoted their lives toward alleviating the lot of the poor and distressed. Entering a Jewish home while on his continuous mission of mercy he would place his tin collection-box behind him and say, "Put in as much as you can—or take whatever you need!" Simon Kaftan was only one of a number of striking figures who have been brought into existence by the need and the willingness to help the needy in the Jewish communities. But to describe these at length would be entering into either the province of the biographer or the novelist who takes his heroes in real life. It is at any rate necessary to deal first with the charitable activities themselves. Springing out of the faith of the people, being closely bound up with its customs and ceremonies, and giving spontaneous expression of true human feeling, the various old-time charitable activities, no

matter how scattered or sporadic they be, which have come down from the earliest periods would have come first in the order of time for our consideration; but for the comprehensiveness of this report it may be well first to outline the part which the Government has played in the organization of the Jewish community and to sketch the later influences of the formation of larger charities and of philanthropists.

THE ROLE OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Formation of the Kahal.—The Jewish community in Russia was organized by the Government for fiscal purposes and in order to facilitate the collection of taxes and other obligations toward the State from the Jewish people. As early as the 18th Century, the Jews of each community were organized into a "Kahal;" they were registered and supplied with passports to enable them to go from place to place without the Government losing track of either their whereabouts or their identity. It is to be noted that the Government actuated by its desire to make sure of its tribute and to be protected against any possible burden of helping either the poor or the distressed that may be placed upon it, has never recognized the Jew as an individual and has only treated him as part of the community. According to G. O. Orshensky, a writer on the subject, "the law recognizes the independent and separate existence of the Jewish community in regard to its charitable institutions, and it demands that the Jews take care of their aged, sick and helpless, and for this purpose they are permitted to establish separate hospitals and poor-houses."

Introduction of Korobka. — The main and almost exclusive source of funds to meet the demands of the State made upon the Jews and also the communal needs is the "box tax" or "Korobka," which was established by the Government in 1840. This tax is either (a) a duty on kosher meat, or (b) a duty on Sabbath candles lighted every Friday evening in the homes of the pious, or (c) a tax on rentals collected by Jewish owners of houses, stores, mills and factories, as well as the income from the sale of cattle and sheep, and (d) an inheritance tax on cash

left by deceased Jews. The last two subdivisions of the special tax soon fell into disuse.

The "Candle Tax" was established during the time of Nicholas I, who entertained various plans for educating and modernizing the Jews, and the income from this tax was to defray the expenses of schools and Rabbinical seminaries. This was in the time of the noted Minister of Education Uvarov, and it was then that the late Dr. Max Lillienthal, who afterwards became known in this country, was commissioned by the Russian Government to tour throughout the land and to induce the "fanatical" parents to send their children to the newly established schools. At first the candle tax was literally a duty exacted from every candle lighted on the Sabbath in every Jewish home, and during the reign of Nicholas the harshest measures were employed in collecting this tax. Besides being a means of raising money for the education of the Jews this tax had the additional purpose of discouraging the "fanaticism" of the Jews which made them light the candles on the Sabbath eve. Later this duty was taken off the individual Jew and instead placed upon the community. In 1873, the Rabbinical seminaries were closed and the expenses of the other educational activities were greatly lessened, but the Svetsni Sbor (candle tax) continued to go on. Only recently another change was reported from Wilna in connection with this tax, and it was stated that hereafter this payment would be demanded only from Jewish merchants of the first guild and of owners of real estate.

The Meat Tax.—The main burden of the "Korobka," however, falls upon the great masses of the Jews, who would not, of course, use anything but kosher meat. In Odessa, for instance, this tax amounts to 3 kopeks per pound, and from 5 to 12 kopeks for each fowl, which is a prohibitive tax in the cases of the poor. This tax, per capita, often amounts to about 20 ruble per year. That this tax is exceedingly oppressive and unjust has long been felt by the great masses of the Jews and the burden of it has weighed exceedingly heavy upon the large numbers of the poor.

The object of the tax is given by such authorities as M. G. Margulis, O. M. Lerner and G. O. Orshensky, as:

(1) To pay the Communal debt in the Polish provinces to the Catholic Clergy, which was contracted by the Jews in the 18th Century as a ransom for protecting the Jews against the mobs.

(2) To make up for delinquency of individual members of the Jewish community in meeting their payment of taxes, and also to make good any default in this regard on the part of other communities.

(3) To pay taxes assessed against the whole community by the State.

(4) To support communal institutions, such as the Rabbinate, Talmud Torahs and other educational institutions, and all charities of the community, and even to support the Jewish agricultural colonies scattered through the Southern part of Russia, though since 1866, this tax has but rarely been devoted to the latter purpose.

The raising of the "Korobka," or Meat Tax, concerning which some information is furnished by the Budget Commission of the Duma, is farmed out by the Municipal authorities and as a rule a moderate grant out of the tax is allowed for the immediate needs of the community, but this grant must always be confirmed by the Governor of the Province. Each Jewish community must submit annually to the authorities an estimate of expenditures. The money collected on the meat tax usually outbalances the grant, and the unexpended balance, which during the past few years has amounted to millions of rubles, is reverted to the various Municipal treasuries. According to the Law this balance is to be devoted, with the express sanction of the Minister of the Interior, to the extraordinary needs of the Jewish communities; but instead it is used for alien purposes, such as the building of roads, etc., and even for the erection of Greek Orthodox churches, as well as for the increasing of the police force, to enable the latter the better to hound down Jews who have not the right to live outside of the Pale of Jewish Settlement, and to expel them.

THE PROBLEM OF EDUCATION.

One of the greatest needs of the Jewish communities in Russia, partly satisfied by the "Korobka," is the education of the children, not only of the poor, but also of the middle classes, especially since the doors of the Governmental schools are practically closed to the Jews.

Primary Education.—In accordance with some facts and figures given by the Jewish Deputy, Herr Friedman, at a recent sitting of the third Duma, the number of Jewish school children throughout the whole Empire is about 700,000 and in accordance with the information given by the Society for the Promotion of Education among the Jews, there are in the Pale of Jewish Settlement about 500,000 children of school age. In the Pale the number of official or "Kazionnyje" communal and private Jewish elementary schools is scarcely 800, and the pupils attending them amount to about one-tenth of the entire number of Jewish children. There are about 3½% more attending the Crown, or Government Schools. The balance of the children attend about 25,000 "chedarim," regulated somehow by peculiar laws, by virtue of which in Russia proper the teaching of the Russian language is prohibited, while in Poland it is compulsory. It is self-evident, therefore, that the problem of primary education became of the greatest importance, and since the Jewish schools are not supported from State funds, but from the proceeds of the "Korobka," the allowance of which is always small, it devolved upon the Jewish community to provide additional funds for developing primary education.

Educational Agencies.—The most important organization which for the past twenty years has taken up the direction of primary education of the Jews is the Society for the Promotion of Education among the Jews, which has been in existence since 1863. The primary aim of this Society is to promote general education, Jewish literature, to establish libraries, and to assist Jewish students in the higher educational institutions; but most of its efforts have recently been directed towards primary education. The income of this Society is derived from membership dues of 10, 25 and 100 rubles per annum, from donations and from

the sale of publications. In addition to this Society, in the Nineties of the last Century a special society was formed to assist students of all schools, a Society of Mutual Aid and for pensioning teachers, and for assisting them in cases of destitution and old age.

INDUSTRIAL AND AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION.

Next to primary education, considerable attention is given to the promotion of industrial agricultural education among the Jewish youth in Russia.

According to L. M. Bramson, the first trade school for Russian Jews was established in Zhitomir in 1862. Here instruction was given in blacksmithing, carpentry, turning, furniture making, copper and tinsmithing. A Society for the Promotion of Trade Education and Agriculture was founded in 1880, with the object of establishing trade schools, trade classes, agricutural and horticultural schools, model farms, and also with the object of assisting students in the higher agricultural and technical schools. One of the objects in view was also to assist graduates of lower schools to improve their education and to enable them to purchase tools and to establish shops. This Society has a membership list of about 13,000 in over 400 cities and towns in Russia. During the first fifteen years of the existence of this Society it established 3 trade schools, 1 model shop, trade classes in 15 schools and 20 girls' industrial schools. All of these schools are supported partly by the "Korobka."

The Almanac issued by the Society for the Promotion of Education among the Jews states that in 1899 there were in Russia 23 schools which had trade classes, where locksmithing, tinsmithing and carving, etc., were taught; 11 trade schools; 14 Talmud Torahs with trade classes, 20 girls' industrial schools, having classes in dressmaking and kindred industries; 5 farm schools and 10 school gardens.

Odessa leads other cities in Russia in all educational activities, and particularly in industrial education. It has a secondary trade school, "Trood," established in 1864, where boys are taught carpentry, furniture making, electrical and metal work. There

are trade classes in three boys' schools wherein carpentry and carving are taught in the one instance, tailoring, shoemaking, painting, carpentry and locksmithing in the second, and bookbinding and shoemaking in the third. There are also trade classes in four girls' schools where the girls are taught white goods sewing, millinery and dressmaking. All these schools are supported partly by the Korobka and partly by private subscriptions and donations.

JEWISH COLONIZATION ASSOCIATION.

In discussing the work that is being done for the promotion of agriculture and trades, the activities of the ICA in Russia must receive consideration. Prominent among the activities of this organization in Russia has been the assistance extended to Jewish farmers in the colonies of Southern Russia, namely, Kherson, Podolia and Bessarabia, and in the six Northwestern Provinces of Wilna, Kovna, Grodno, Minsk, Mohilev and Vitebsk; this assistance has been given either in cases of crop failures, or has taken the form of advances of money to introduce various improvements, or for the purchase of live stock and machinery, and in some cases to improve the methods of cultivation. For the last named purpose the ICA employs agricultural experts who are stationed in the neighborhood of every farming colony to demonstrate the advantages of improved seeds, stock and machinery; to introduce trucking, market gardening, fruit raising; to establish experimental fields and generally to point out the advantages of modern methods of cultivation.

The ICA has been particularly active since 1902, and in the course of its work in Russia since 1899 it has expended and advanced for agricultural purposes about 350,000 rubles. It has also established in 13 South Russian Colonies five loan and savings banks, and among the Minsk farmers a Co-operative Credit Association. It has also been active in distributing plants and trees. It has subsidized agricultural schools, five in number, and industrial schools for boys and girls. During 1906 it subsidized 21 industrial boys' schools, having about 1600 pupils, and 19 girls' schools, with 900 pupils. On account of the lack of teachers

competent to conduct such schools, the organization has assisted teachers to specialize in the manual training and trade branches. The ICA has also subsidized evening trade classes, and, finally, 46 common schools for boys and 35 schools for girls, as well as 22 evening schools.

The activity of the ICA has also extended to the amelioration of the condition of the working elements of the population by encouraging the establishments of loan and savings institutions in the various large industrial centers, and also in small villages and market towns. The ICA has also built model tenement houses for the poor in Wilna.

AGENCIES OF SELF-HELP AND MUTUAL AID ORGANIZATIONS.

There are at present in Russia 35 savings and loan institutions which offer small credits at legitimate rates of interest to small merchants, tradesmen and mechanics. The maximum loan allowed is 100 ruble. The form of organization of the loan institution is described as follows: (1) The funds are raised by small contributions of from 10 to 15 ruble payable in instalments at the convenience of the contributors so as to enable people of the most moderate means to become members of these institutions. In 1906 there were about 30,000 members in these institutions, of which number about 22,000 were borrowers. (2) A reserve fund is provided to cover the deficit which may be caused by bad debts. These institutions also receive money on deposit and some of them receive advances from the ICA. Reports of 1906 show that the capital raised through contributions to these institutions was about 400,000 ruble, and the total deposits amounted to 800,000 ruble. The total amount of loans granted during 1906 was about 2,500,000 ruble, of which amount about 2,000,000 was paid back.

To these savings and loans institutions, which are of recent origin, we must add two types of credit institutions of ancient origin, namely, the so-called "Gemilath Chasodim," which loan money without interest on securities, and "Somech Noflim" (lifting the fallen), which assist business men who have met with difficulties to rise again to their former position. Loans made

by the "Somech Noflim" are secured by notes endorsed by members only. Both institutions are financed by membership dues and voluntary contributions and gifts, and the work is carried on with the utmost privacy.

There have recently been formed co-operate societies for producing and selling.

THE PROBLEMS OF RELIEF.

The actual problem of aiding those who are in dire distress as well as those who are subjected to lesser troubles in every big Jewish center is met by a number of charitable and benevolent societies, many of which, as has been hinted above, are closely allied with the religious promptings and special requirements of Jewish life, and which carry on their work just as spontaneously and naturally as they spring into existence. This work has been carried on for generations and help has been given to thousands upon thousands of persons without any thought on the part of the charity workers—and almost every Jew of some means is a charity worker or volunteer of some kind—of preserving records of these activities. Indeed, how could there be any records, for instance, of such work as is being done by that committee to be found in every community which is known as "Matan besseiser," or "giving in secret," as these Hebrew words imply. Funds are gathered, but the giver knows not for whom he gives and the receiver knows not whence it comes. There are other committees and societies which carry on their work with equal quiet and privacy. Indeed, almost all the Jewish charities in Russia are imbued with the spirit of the Talmudic injunction, which says: "Let the left hand not know what the right hand is giving." So all the work is carried on quietly and with utter lack of ostentation. It is owing to this and to the absence of modern methods of organization that systematized data in regard to these activities is well-nigh unobtainable.

In the "Jüdische Statistik" for 1902 some figures are given in regard to the charitable activities in Odessa. There is a fund of 26,000 ruble carefully distributed by a board of ten prominent men; one-half of this fund is raised by the "Korobka" and

the other half by donations. This fund is devoted to supplying the poor Jews of Odessa with fuel during the winter and with matzoths for the Passover. Out of a total population of 150,000, 8,500 families, representing 48,500 souls, or 32.36 per cent., were assisted by this fund. It is estimated that at least 30,000 persons who were in need of assistance were prevented by pride from applying for it. It would seem from this that at least 53 per cent. of the total Jewish population in Odessa are in need of charity. In 1901 63 per cent. of the dead were buried free of charge and 20 per cent. more for a nominal fee charged.

There are among the other institutions of Odessa a home for the aged and infirm, an orphan asylum and a hospital. A society similar in scope to that which is generally known as the "Malbish Arumim" is attached to the "Beth Hammedrash Hagodol" and supplies the poor with clothing. There are also in that city several professional organizations, such as an association of teachers, an association of clerks, each of which has a synagogue of its own, and a library. These societies provide for members stricken by poverty, and, in case of death, for the orphans and widows of members. Very recently day nurseries for the benefit of children of working women have been opened under the patronage and personal supervision of wealthy women. There is also a free soup kitchen, which is supported by voluntary contributions.

These and other institutions which are to be found in Odessa are typical of every large Jewish center in Russia, with the exception of Warsaw and other Polish cities, where the Jews were among the first to organize into communities many generations ago in order to meet their communal needs, and where the influence of the Government has been different from that which it has been in Russia proper.

In the creation of some of the more modern institutions an important role was played by prominent and wealthy Jews of several cities, who both initiated and gave large sums of money to many important public undertakings. Mention might be made of Brodsky and Perlzweig in Odessa; Bregman in Grodno; Wolkowizky in Bialostock.

As a rule, personal service plays the most important part in all charity work, be it large or small. There are innumerable instances where people of the most moderate means devote their lives to succoring the needy and alleviating the suffering of all degrees. Typical in each community is the so-called Gabaite, usually an elderly woman who has taken it upon herself to minister to those in want and the needy of the Jewish community. The Gabaite would form some kind of a Chevra and give all her time to the collecting of donations, either in the way of money, or articles of food or clothing, and she would stimulate and supervise the work of other women associated with her. A remarkable type of such a woman was Deborah Esther of Wilna, known by every man, woman and child in that city. Almost all her life was devoted to one particular charity, and by her own tireless and ceaseless activity she built up the loan association of the "Gemilath Chasodim" to an imposing institution that at present carries on work to the extent of hundreds of thousands of ruble. This institution in Wilna is referred to as "Deborah Esther's Gemilath Chasodim." Going about hurriedly from morning to night with her box in her hand, sitting in front of the passer-by on the market place in the rain, in the cold and in the storm, and collecting kopek by kopek, this frail, aged little woman would gather the sum of 300 ruble every week. This amount would be loaned out to the struggling small traders, poor men and poor women in the town, and before the days when her loan society was organized into a systematic institution she would carry on her accounts of hundreds and thousands of ruble in her memory—for she knew not how to write; yet she never made the slightest mistake. She learned, however, how to write when she was seventy years of age and she carried on her remarkable work, her institution growing and growing, until she died at the age of ninety, when the whole of the Jewish population of Wilna followed her remains in a great procession to the House of Eternity. It is not possible here to dwell upon the many remarkable types of charity workers who have arisen in Russia, and we can only mention here, besides the names of Deborah Esther, and of Simon Kaften of Wilna; those of "Meyer the shoemaker"

of Pinsk; Rabbi Mottel of Schavel; Nochem Shamus of Grodno; Zhviv of Odessa, surnamed the modern Diogenes, all men of the masses who have simply given up their lives in the service of those who were poorer than themselves.

To the initiative of another individual, namely, Dr. Chazanowitch, of Bialostock, a society known as "Linas Hazedek" owes its existence. This is composed of members who take turns in visiting and caring for the sick. In Wilna there is a society known as "Mishmoaeth Cholim," which distributes medicine free of charge. Societies like these are in existence in many Jewish towns, such as the "Bichur Cholim," which means "visiting the sick," and Chevra Yeldos, which looks after the needs of poor women in confinement.

There are everywhere the Talmud Torahs, which give tuition free of charge, and everywhere students of the Law, who study either at the Yeshibath, or at other Talmudic schools, are boarded by different families on different days of the week. This institution has become known under the quaint name of "Essen teg," but they are not always the sons of the poor who avail themselves of this custom. It is customary to send boys away to study in some other city, and even those whose parents could afford to pay for their board avail themselves of this system of "Essen teg" all the more readily since there are families who are only too glad to have a student of the Torah at their table. In this connection there are also exchanges made, and the family which boards a stranger will at the same time send their own son to study in the native town of the "Orem bachur," who eats at their table, and their son gets either one or two "days" a week from the parents of the young man whom they are boarding.

There is also the quaint institution of giving a stranger "A Plet auf Shabbas," or, assigning him to the home of some householder as a guest for the Sabbath. The word Plet is evidently a corruption of Billet, and probably has its origin in the time when this assignment would be made through the means of a ticket handed to the stranger by the Parnes of the Synagogue. There is the "kosher kessel" for Jewish soldiers in the Russian army kept up in the various cities for every camping district, and

special provisions are made for these soldiers for the Sabbath and the holidays.

There is in every city of any considerable size the Hachnosath Orchim, for the housing and entertaining of strangers and the poor; the "Moshav Skenim," or the home for the aged. The hospitals and others of the more important institutions are only to be found in the large cities. Outside of large cities the hospital is usually maintained by a certain district covering a number of towns, and in addition to the funds that are appropriated for its support from the proceeds of the Korobka, there are also membership dues, donations and gifts.

The actual cases of the poverty stricken who are in need of immediate monetary help, or whose maintenance calls for a regular stipend, are relieved from a fund which is known as the Kitzvah (a set sum) which is controlled by a special committee. Contributions to this fund come in various forms of donations as well as in varying amounts. The help is given freely and indiscriminately, whenever a case of distress is called to the attention of the committee. Difficulty is often experienced in finding out who are the persons who are in need. The information is usually brought to the committee by either a friend or an acquaintance of the family in need, and most frequently is brought forward without the knowledge of those concerned. There is always to be met the pride which prevents the poor from making known their want until they are actually on the verge of starvation. It must be understood that in a settled, old-time Jewish community, where the same families have lived for generations, and where the people, if not of the whole town, at least of different parts of the town, are thoroughly acquainted with each other, there is ever that great sensitiveness, shame and shrinking at the possibility of receiving alms. This sensitiveness is peculiarly characteristic of the Jewish people; the very thought of taking charity is repugnant, and the horror of the situation has been embodied in the Yiddisch expression which bespeaks the fear of "Onkumen zu Menschen," or depending upon human beings.

To merely enumerate the many other small charities, there are the collection boxes placed in the synagogues and homes for

the benefit of Yeshibath, Talmud Torahs, orphan asylums, hospitals, etc. There are the collection boxes of Reb Meyer B'al Hanes, a Rabbi of old, in whose honor funds are gathered through these boxes for the charities in the Holy Land. Stipends are supplied to students of the Talmud, who, in addition to being supplied with "eating days" or board, are frequently also allowed weekly sums of money. There is the Porusch who lives apart from his wife in a city, away from his home, and devotes himself to the study of the Talmud, and who is supplied with board and a weekly stipend. The "Meshulochim," the traveling collectors, who gather funds for charities at home and in the Holy Land, come and make their claims on every Jewish community. There are also the Maggidim, or the itinerary preachers, who go about from place to place and ask for support from every community before which they preach.

There are those other unique charities as that of "Hachnosath kallah," the object of which is to furnish dowries for poor girls; there is the custom of giving "Regel Geld," holiday gifts to the Rabbi, Chazan, Shamas and the respectable poor.

"Moath Chitim" is a tax which the elders of the community place on the baking of the Matzoth, the proceeds of which enables the poor to observe the Passover. The fund which is known as the "Pidon Shevuin" is intended for the ransoming of captives, and this ancient Jewish charity concerns itself especially with such prisoners as are considered to be innocent or held as hostages. "Kvurah Geld" is a fee exacted by the Chevra Kadisha, or burial society for the burying of the dead. When the deceased was a man of means and during his life time failed to contribute sufficiently to charity, then his family is made to pay an unusually large sum towards the communal needs. The money which is collected at funerals by the Shamossim, who go about shouting "Zdakah tazil mimoves" (charity saves from death) is devoted to the burial of the destitute.

Centered about each synagogue are such charities as "Tikun sforim," which looks after repairing of the books belonging to the house of prayer and study. The "Bedek habias" concerns itself with the repairing of the Synagogue itself. To the income

of the Synagogue are added such sums as those which are paid by persons of means for the privilege of supplying the house of worship with wine for the kiddish and habdalah, and for the privilege also of supplying the oil for the "Ner Tomid" or perpetual light. The custom of pledging dontaions at the time of being called to the reading of the law during the synagogue service which is known as "schnodering" is a source of income to the synagogue itself as well as to many other religious and charitable institutions. A small committee gathering its own fund for its special charity that is worthy of mention is that which sees to it that poor people are enabled to fittingly observe the Sabbath and holidays. There are funds collected for the various charities on the festival of Purim by the "Purim Spieler," who are often among the most prominent men of the town, and who go about from house to house giving theatrical representations of scenes from the Bible, and singing songs appropriate to the festival which continue to remind the hearer that Purim is the time to remember the poor. The "Schalach-mones" really has its origin in the custom of sending "Mathonoth l'evyonim," gifts for the poor, which are sent under cover so that the messenger would not know what is being sent, and whether there is anything sent in return.

The lowest strata of the poor are those who have been reduced to beggars. These beggars that travel from city to city, and in each city, town and village, go from house to house for alms, constitute a class by itself amidst the Jewish population of Russia, which is an additional drain upon the means of every community. The peculiarities of this class, its unique beggar-language, its humors, the effrontery as well as the ingenuity of the "Areme leut," as they are called, have furnished Mendele Mocher Sphorim (S. J. Abramovitz), the greatest Yiddish writer, with the theme for one of the finest works in the language, namely, "Fischke der Krumer." These beggars have also been described by other writers, and in passing it might be stated that the numerous Jewish charitable activities and institutions in Russia figure very frequently in the works of many writers in Hebrew, Yiddish, as well as in the Russian language. The traveling beggar, as has

been said, places an additional care upon every community, but that duty is fulfilled with the same readiness with which relief is given to all classes of the indigent and poor.

For the shelter of the traveling beggar there is in every town a building known as "Heckdesh" which is maintained by a special fund raised in the community. It is a notable fact about the beggars who for the most part have become what they are owing to either a fire or a pogrom, in which they had lost all their belongings, or to an epidemic, or some other calamity, that as soon as they reach a town, they arrange for the religious instruction of their children at some Cheder, paying the regular fees for the instruction. Many of the "Areme Leut" do not permit their wives to go begging, and very few ever let their children go asking for alms. It should be understood that the Jew who is reduced to beggary will not begin begging in the town of his former home, but will immediately betake himself to another city, and through all his travels will always evade his native town. "Poverty is no disgrace," says the Yiddische proverb, "but neither is it an honor." While many of the beggars end their days as confirmed schnorrers, there are others who, after they accumulate a little money establish themselves again either as laborers or as traders, and then they themselves give to charity as of yore, for, as we have said before it is either "Give or take," and it is the boast of the Jew in Russia that no poor man has ever been allowed to go out of his house empty-handed.

So far as your committee could ascertain from the sources of information at hand such as the writings of G. O. Orshensky, M. G. Lerner, Bramson, even the supposedly organized charity such as educational, and child-caring institutions, institutions caring for the poor and sick, and even the distribution of relief, is not centered in the hands of one body. Thus the distribution of clothing to the poor of Odessa is in the hands of the Beth Hamidrash Hagodel, and the distribution of coal and matzoth in the hands of another society. The only seeming exception in Russia proper is the "Zdoko Gdolo" of Wilna. It seems that there all the charitable activities are federated in one body and relief is dispensed in a certain systematic way. The central institution,

the "Zdoko Gdolo" is controlled by a Board of "Gaboim," or supervisors. No case of the poor that is reported to the office is investigated, but the reports usually come through reliable sources, through men and women who are associated with the "Zdoko Gdolo," or employed workers who are thoroughly familiar with the section of the city from where the applicant comes.

In Russo-Poland where the Jewish communities were formed long before Poland was conquered by Russia, and were therefore left free of the Korobka, the charitable activities are conducted differently from those in Russia. The Jews of every city elect a board of supervisors called "Dozor." It usually consists of five to thirteen members, according to the size of the city, who are chosen by electors from each Synagogue. The "Dozor" taxes each Jew according to his means for communal and charitable purposes. Cases of non-payment of this tax are reported to the Government which enforces the collection, there being therefore no escape from this obligation. There is however, a privileged class exempted from this tax—Jewish veterans who have served in the Russian army previous to 1874.

The City of Warsaw, the capital of Russo-Poland, is divided into eleven districts. To each district the "Dozor" assigns a Rabbi who is to preach and minister to the religious needs. The "Dozor" also looks after the cemetery and hospital and other large institutions. Special care is given to the religious education of children. The "Dozor" keeps track of all possible cases of distress by appointing volunteer workers for each street in the Jewish quarters from the residents of that street. Although the "Dozor" covers the ground of charity work pretty well, there are nevertheless the same forms of promiscuous giving of charity which exist in Russia.

H. L. SABSOVICH,
ELIAS LEWIN-EPSTEIN,
BERNARD G. RICHARDS,
DAVID BLAUSTEIN.

THE PRESIDENT: I call on Prof. Jacob H. Hollander to read his paper on "The Unification of Jewish Communal Activities."

THE UNIFICATION OF JEWISH COMMUNAL ACTIVITIES.

PROFESSOR HOLLANDER, Baltimore: The requisite of ideal terminology is that a title shall suggest everything that is designed, and exclude everything that is denied. By this standard the phrase, under cover of which I am to speak, is woefully at fault. Instead of "unification" a dozen other words might have been used. "Jewish" is a perennial challenge. Even "communal activities" seems to assume the very thing to be justified.

But vulnerable as the phrase may be to dialectical criticism, it will, at least, serve as a convenient peg upon which to hang a few simple propositions, and it is to the content of these, rather than to the literal accuracy of the label, that your attention is invited.

First, a brief, explanatory sentence. By "the unification of Jewish communal activities" I mean the responsible association, in some definite modus, of all the charitable activities of a normal Jewish community. Religious, educational and social efforts are excluded. The nature of the accord does not come under survey, and New York City is not a normal community.

Within these limitations I propose to consider the utility of such integration, the difficulties that retard it, and the practical methods for overcoming them.

The development of Jewish communal activity in the United States is the reflex of the growth of the Jewish communities themselves. The little groups who located in the cities of the seaboard and the middle West towards the close of the first quarter of the nineteenth century had barely attained numbers and permanence before the acquisition of a burial-place and the organization of a congregation were followed by the appearance of some manner of relief society, designed in part for the needs of the local destitute, in part for the demands of the itinerant dependent. The wave of philanthropic effort which swept over the United States in the forties, and led to the formation of societies for the improvement of the condition of the poor, crystalized these earlier benefactions into more ambitious organizations. In many of the larger cities Jewish beneficial associations were formed, and speedily became an integral part of Jewish communal life. With growth in numbers and

greater variety in economic conditions, the charitable requirements of the community increased, and these were met by the organization of independent bodies—hospitals, orphan asylums, free burial societies, homes for the aged.

The nature and conduct of such institutions are familiar to this company—a sustaining membership, an elective directorate, and a group of executive officers. The membership included the head of every substantial family in the community. The directorate, nominally elective, acquired a formal rigidity on the basis of generous contributions, quasi-tribal representation, and available leisure. The officers, either elected from or selected by the directorate, substituted for technical qualification an unmeasured devotion of time and effort, and developed a proprietary relation and a permanent tenure. When occasion existed for salaried secretarial or executive service, inadequate compensation was provided, and the office was filled by a highly respected valetudinarian come upon evil days, whom, once elected, nothing short of death or defalcation could remove.

Financial needs were met, as to operating expenses, by membership dues, income from a permanent sinking fund, contribution to which became an essential of right dying, State aid and periodic benefit performances. For the larger construction requirements, the community, in all its ramifications, was from time to time, in lieu of individual benefaction, afflicted with some wholesale money-getting device, a fair or bazaar, whose devastating effect upon the locality necessitated periodicity.

Yet, all said and done, the system worked, and worked not badly. The community was small and compact, cases of suffering and dependence were known or easily verified, the era of large giving had not yet dawned, and the general body was still too intent upon its economic development to regard charitable activity as anything more than a phase of conventionalized theology, or a form of emotional indulgence.

All this underwent change with the first wave of Russian refugee immigration that broke upon our shore in the early eighties. For such a cataclysm—manifest soon as no detached episode, but a progressive flood—probably any system of private relief would have

been unprepared. Certainly the Jewish charities of the country were able to meet it to the extent that it was met only by a display of large sympathy, lavish giving and tireless exertion—exceptional, if not unique, in the history of modern philanthropy.

But much of what was done then and in the decade following was emotional rather than rational. The larger social consciousness of the closing nineteenth century, unchecked and undisciplined, fanned the flame, and there was little disposition to attend to, or even to be conscious of, the essence of traditional Jewish charity.

New organizations were planned, fresh activities were projected, without either proper correlation to one another or to those which existed. Individual, and, too often, irresponsible initiative undertook weighty obligations, which, once assumed, became by reason of false communal pride, an inevitable public concern. In actual administration, volunteer agencies contrived to do that for which experts alone were qualified, and to the extent that salaried officers were unavoidable, the same type of highly estimable, but utterly inefficient, derelict was used.

The financial aspect became no less depressing. The older societies had increased barely, if at all, in membership, and the effort to meet the new needs with old resources resulted of necessity in strain and in inefficiency. The newer organizations, without the permanent funds of the older, and lacking their traditional hold upon the community, led a hand-to-mouth existence, by the aid of indirect demands, irritating in procedure and uneconomical in result. For every dollar put into their treasuries two were extracted from the community, with the accompaniment of friction and annoyance, and, most serious of all, an utterly exaggerated opinion in the mind of the ordinary donor as to the aggregate extent of his benefactions.

In philanthropy, as in civics, conditions must become visibly worse before betterment is practicable. In certain of the most progressive cities of the country, where conditions as I have summarized them had become very bad, indeed, the situation has, within the last few years, been appreciably relieved by the merger of the most important societies and institutions in some form of federation or union. The grounds on which such affiliation has been urged are threefold. First, the community would be relieved

from the irritation, strain and waste of indirect contribution, and the institutions put into receipt of larger incomes, commensurate with their greater needs and consequent upon a more adequate direct contribution from the community; secondly, relieved from the wearing strain of money-getting, the separate institutional directorates can devote their efforts and energies to the affairs of their respective institutions; and, thirdly, the unwise multiplication of charitable agencies can be prevented and a degree of correlation and betterment be introduced into the conduct of the existing bodies.

It was possible for the advocates of federation to present so logical and so convincing a brief that opposition thereto inevitably appeared as the obstinacy of the unconvertible, the ignorance of the benighted or the timidity of the fearful.

It would be too much, perhaps, to claim that every expectation entertained by the advocates of federation has been realized. Yet, I think I may say, in the most positive manner, that in no single city wherein it has been tried, whatever may have been the shortcomings or the present defects, would reversion to the old order of things be for a single moment entertained.

As to fiscal conditions, it has succeeded so unquestionably that argument is here no longer possible. Instead of less more has been forthcoming; giving has begotten giving. Sometimes there has been a reaction, but responsibility therefor probably rests as much with the administration as with the community, and, in the main, it is more than ever apparent that the rational charitable requirements of a community, rationally presented, will be fully met without the friction and waste of indirect money-getting.

In the nature of things, it is impossible to speak with the same positiveness of what might be called the co-ordinate effects of federation. If the directorate's release from financial anxieties has not brought more ability to the service of their charges, it can only be that a stage of perfection has already been reached, or that the custodians are derelict. Similarly, the substitution of some measure of centralized responsibility for individual irresponsibility in charitable initiative, will have been attended with greater or less good, according to the activity of the federation and the temper of the community. But, even under the least favorable conditions, it

is no longer possible for an energetic, but supersensitive, philanthropist to take his playthings home and to start an unnecessary or duplicate organization, of which he, in reluctant acceptance of the general will, becomes president, and the burden thereof devolves upon the community!

The federation movement thus marks a second period in the development of American Jewish philanthropy. We are still on the threshold of this phase, but the gospel is so sound, the working so successful, and the results so beneficent that I cannot but believe that the general introduction of the device is a matter of the near future.

It is not, however, to sound the excellencies of federation in this limited sense that I am detaining you this morning. The keynote of this conference must be vista, not retrospect. The difficulties that have beset us in the past possess a merely historical interest, although it must be admitted of no mean quality. Even those present concerns, whose solution is, in principle either assured or in need but of patient effort and practical activity, command minor interest. It is the urgent problem of the immediate future which invites and deserves attention if this Conference is to realize its maximum usefulness.

Taking broad survey of the field, both in extent and in time, that problem seems to me to loom up unmistakably as the paralleling and duplication of Jewish charitable activities as a direct consequence of the cleavage of the Jewish community itself.

The conditions which have brought this about are as patent as they are regrettable. Prior to 1882 the ordinary Jewish community was for all practical purposes homogeneous, made up of German immigrants and their descendants. The thin Portuguese strain was negligible, and the minor Russian and Polish elements were more or less merged in the larger body. Such differences as existed were economic, intellectual and social. In charitable affairs, benefactors and beneficiaries differed in degree rather than in kind. If we except the genial ne'er-do-well, whose shiftlessness was mellowed by the glamor of literature and tradition, there was, perhaps, less real difference between the beneficiary and the contributor than between large and small contributors. Relief, however mistaken in form, was at least in spirit accepted by the recipient as his due, and it

was extended as the obvious incident of self-respecting membership in the community.

Russian immigration and destitution inevitably changed all this. The appeal was in a new key and the response was from a new spring. Assistance was no longer claimed as a fraternal right, nor extended as a kin-like obligation. It was the imperious demand of stricken humanity. But, as the situation lost its bitter novelty and the burden settled in onerous pressure, benevolence waned and something much akin to patronage grew. The charitable association became no longer a semi-social device, whereby the more prosperous members of the community relieved the misfortunes of neighbors and associates, but a tax-like charge for the indefinite relief of the misery and dependence of a distinct class, different in speech, tradition and origin, unsought in arrival and unwelcome in presence, whose only claim was a tenuous tie of emotional appeal and an identical negation in religious belief.

It was inevitable that this should be reflected in the conduct of the institutions. Complying to the letter with the requirements of the beneficiaries, there was yet neglect of the more subtle psychological elements; it made the Russian Jew, and later, his Roumanian or Lithuanian confrere, a troublesome beneficiary of German-Jewish charity. What he received was given him, too often, neither in the form to which he was accustomed nor in the spirit to which he was entitled. The hungry were fed, the naked clad, the sick were served, but incomparably more regard was paid to the material than to the intangible elements in the situation.

It was not long, moreover, before the situation was made more complex by the economic betterment of the new arrivals, and their eagerness to assume a part of the burden of relieving the needs of those who still lagged in the bitter struggle. Had the older community been wise it would have strained every nerve to have included within its resources this new force, whose potentiality in economic capacity and in philanthropic impulse was not then, and is not even now, fully appreciated. We should have so modified, enlarged, even reconstructed, our charitable agencies as to have found place and accorded welcome reception to those who, arising from prostration, clamored for a place at the wheel. But we did none of this. We took their money only when it could be given in

the form in which we had been accustomed to assess it. We were slow in electing the newcomers to membership, and we were averse to giving even the foremost of them place in the institutional directorates.

The issue of such a situation was foregone. Given a substantial element then already numerically preponderant and speedily gaining economic influence, whose dependents were not receiving the particular kind of aid desired, or, at least, not receiving it in the particular form and spirit sought, whose self-supporting elements were not permitted to give expression to their charitable impulses in the only manner within their resources, and whose substantial members were accorded slow and grudging recognition in institutional standing and dignity—it was only a matter of time before a group of independent and duplicate institutions and organizations should be called into existence, designed for the relief of the same general class, but administered in a manner technically more intimate and efficient, officered exclusively by those closely related to the beneficiary class and supported by this same class by financial methods consonant with their economic conditions. This is the phenomenon of the downtown institutions whose imminence, whose existence and whose increase, constitute what I think I may term the third phase of American Jewish charitable activity.

Bearing in mind that the term "downtown"—and its correlative possess only historical significance, being in the main divested of whatever geographical and economic meaning may once have attached thereto, the thesis which I venture to maintain is that the logical and rational development of communal Jewish activity is in the direction of an arrest of further duplication of downtown no less than of uptown institutions, and the unification or integration of all the charitable efforts of a community wherever located or however constituted, in that federated form which, while giving free play to individual energy and enthusiasm, will still make paramount the collective responsibility and the common concern.

Neither the statement of the problem nor the forecast of the outcome reveal method of procedure. At this point I can only speak in supremely tentative manner. Communities differ widely as to conditions and constituents, and it is very possible that there is no one universally applicable device.

But, in at least one community, an appreciable step has been taken in the direction suggested by the association within the past twelvemonth of eleven of the most active downown societies in a form of federation. This movement has had the full sympathy and co-operation of the uptown federation. We have recognized that the ideal organization of Jewish charitable activity in Baltimore would be, and ultimately will be, the inclusion, within the older federation, of all organized charitable effort, and the extension over the entire field of the principles already successfully established over a considerable part thereof. But the time for this far-reaching reform is obviously not yet arrived. The income of the downtown institution is derived in large part by direct contributions, paid in small weekly or monthly installments, and in indirect thanksgiving offerings upon many occasions of Jewish social and religious life. The control of the local field to the extent of discouraging the formation of still additional societies can, for the present, be best exercised by the influential leaders of the locality itself, and certainly the degree of advisory counsel which I have already noted as one of the happiest results of federation can be most successfully exercised by those in immediate connection therewith.

As a temporary expedient, rather than as a final solution, the formation of a union among the downtown organizations, similar in scope and activity to the uptown organizations, seems the best practical solution of the existing situation. But the terms, "similar in scope and acivity," are used advisedly. The new organization is not to be a device whereby the support of its included institutions is to be shifted from one section of the community to another. It is happily unnecessary to criticise this as a cheap subterfuge. The self-respecting members of the downtown community have been the first to resent any such substitute as a denial of that historic right of the Jew to give according to his means, and to insist that the same warm humanity which has brought into existence and up to this point maintained, even though with much self-denial and heroic effort, the downtown institution, demands the right to maintain it. Any withdrawal of that right in whatever cause presented, is a perversion of charity, and, above all, of Jewish charity. It may very well be that specific elements may have failed to contribute as they might to the support of those institutions which

their own neglect has permitted to come into being. But the remedy for this lies in added, not in substituted, giving.

If the new organization will introduce economies in the financing of the included bodies, if it will prevent the formation of new and unnecessary institutions, if it will succeed tactfully, but effectually, in raising the efficiency of those already in existence, a great forward move will have been taken toward the goal of complete confederation. In the meanwhile, through the device of a joint standing committee, or, perhaps, even less formally through the medium of warm goodwill, cordial understanding and frequent conference, the two bodies can work into closer and closer affiliation.

The outcome of such affiliation will be gain in efficiency for the younger organizations and escape from complacency for the older. The achievements of the past have been as creditable as the efforts of the present are distinguished. But we may never forget that the opportunities of the future are limitless. In keying up the standard of present effort, in effecting correlation among the related energies, in systematic pursuit of preventive work, in wise direction of individual service, a boundless range stretches ahead. We live in stirring days—days in which "the thoughts of men are widen'd with the process of the suns." If heritage of race and faith stand for anything, there can be for us no mere advance at equal pace but leadership and primacy. Whether it be loyalty to those who have gone before, or a stern self-consciousness of present obligation, or a reliant aspiration for that which is to come, our goal must be a humanity even larger and a service even wiser than that to which the common effort tends.

DISCUSSION.

THE PRESIDENT: I regret that Dr. Hirsch is not able to be with us. I therefore ask Dr. Magnes to come forward.

DR. J. L. MAGNES, New York: It seems to me that the Conference is to be congratulated upon the paper which it has just listened to, and which I have also had the pleasure of listening to for the first time. The paper is admirable both in tone and in spirit. It seems to me that some of the formulas as to existing conditions, as to the history of charitable endeavor, and as to the value of

Jewish charitable endeavor in this country, may well become the standard for much of our work, and surely for much of our talk, during the years that I trust we shall all be together. I have the honor of representing, to a certain extent, the abnormal community and perhaps I shall take the privilege of being an abnormal child of that abnormal community insofar as I shall presume to speak from the point of view of the Eastern European Jews of that community; that is, from the point of view of the large Jewish masses of the city of New York. For after all, despite the provincialism into which a New Yorker soon falls in regarding his community as the center of all the world, the Jewish masses of the city of New York do make up the bulk, the bone and marrow of the Jewish community of this country, insofar as we number now almost a million Jews within the confines of the municipality of New York.

I shall further restrict myself in discussing this abnormal community, from this abnormal point of view, in considering abnormal conditions, insofar as I shall talk not of crime, and not of delinquency, and not of disease, but rather of the single problem devolving upon the community by reason of the poverty therein.

Poverty means that the people need clothing, that they need food, that they need shelter. These are elemental needs of every community that happens to have poor within it. Now the need of clothing, the need of shelter and the need of food, has up to the present time been met very largely by the United Hebrew Charities of the City of New York. And to come right to my point, because the Chairman in a very normal way has said that those discussing papers were to be brief, I would say this: That the United Hebrew Charities, as a relief institution, has to become, and will become, if I understand the spirit of those at the head of it, an institution that will be conducted by, as well as for those Jews who have their nativity in parts of Eastern Europe.

Dr. Hollander has outlined three stages of charitable progress in this country, and he has said as to the third stage—the stage of the unification of the various institutions of the communities—that he was not quite sure as to the method of procedure, or as to how this unification was to be brought about. I should

like to suggest that as far as the City of New York is concerned, the first stage in this unification is the transfer of the United Hebrew Charities of the City of New York as a relief institution into the section where those Jews live who are most in need—that is into the central point of these great masses down town on the east side of New York; and in the second place, the transfer of authority over this institution into the hands of men and women having sprung from these masses themselves.

It is natural that federation should be the slogan of Jewish charitable endeavor, but it seems to me that if federation means a complete centralization of power as far as the City of New York is concerned, it is a hopeless cause. The problem of relief needs a treatment that cannot be had by federation alone, by centralization alone. The United Hebrew Charities will, it seems to me, in the first place become a "down town" institution, and it is rapidly becoming a "down town" institution, insofar as its greatest effort will be the co-ordination, and not necessarily the centralization, the federation of the various institutions now existing among the Jewish masses of the City of New York.

The Jews of the Jewish masses are organized as it is into societies. They have their lodges, they have their synagogues, they have their movements Jewish and social, and they have various kinds of societies which at the present time give relief; and the amount of neighborhood relief in the City of New York—that is the relief of these elemental needs that I have spoken of—transcends even our wildest imagination. I believe it is true that in the month of March—that bitter month of March, 1908, in New York—but one hundred new families applied to the United Hebrew Charities for the relief of their elemental needs, over the number having applied in March of last year. That shows an amount of power within this community of the Jewish masses, an amount of dignity, an amount of ability to help, and an amount of eagerness to help, such as even those best informed had not imagined to exist. It is my opinion, and this opinion is based upon rather a close observation both of the life of the Jewish masses and of the life of those who have come out of the Jewish masses, that the Russian Jewish masses, the Galician Jewish

masses, the Roumanian Jewish masses, have enough wealth, enough power, enough dignity within themselves to take care by themselves of their own hungry, and of their own naked, and of their own shelterless; and what the province of the United Hebrew Charities will be, is merely to find within these masses just those institutions and just those persons which at the present time are helping, and which may in the future be gotten to help all of those who are in need. It will mean a reorganization of the Jewish community along finely differentiated lines.

There are, for example, the Roumanians, the Galicians, the Russians. The Roumanians have just organized themselves into a so-called Verband, and that Verband will, I hope, in course of time, take care of the Roumanian poor. The Galicians have their Verband, which will in the course of time take care of their poor. The Russians cannot be organized so simply, but within the Russians we find lines of division not alone in accordance with places of nativity, but also in accordance with ideal movements. This fine differentiation in the organization of the Jewish community of New York may appear to some to be reactionary, or may to some seem to smack too much of a separatist Jewish spirit—may not altogether please the early German revolutionaries, who are, after all, the reactionaries of to-day. It is, nevertheless, a necessary thing, if we want the Jewish community of New York organized along the lines of least resistance, organized along lines that are most natural, that have grown up by themselves, from within the Jewish masses themselves.

The uptown Jews haven't the duty so much of pure benevolence, as they have the duty of investigation, of study. They are the most advanced, in certain directions, and they know what scientific study and investigation may mean. What the particular province of "up-town" is, and should be, besides contributing their share to the "down-town" United Hebrew Charities, is the establishment of some sort of institution that shall investigate the conditions of poverty, of crime, of delinquency, of disease, such as may afflict the Jewish community of the city. These problems are by no means Jewish problems, because they are problems that all the rest of the world have, but

they are problems after all that concern themselves with Jews—that bear upon the life of Jews, and it is only Jews who can take care of them in the most efficient and most sympathetic manner. So that the actual relief of suffering will be done by those in the family nearest to those who suffer; and the study of the surrounding conditions, the scientific investigation of these problems, such as, for example, the co-ordination of the work, not alone of Jewish charities, but of the general charities in their relation to Jewish charities, and the relation of Jewish charities to the general charities—this will be done by an organization that must be formed by the "up-town" Jews, who will give liberally of their means for administration, for scientific investigation, or for whatever this may be called.

We have, therefore, in New York, as far as the charity problem is concerned, the problem of the organization of the community itself; and the community itself will be organized in large measure by means of its charities. And, if I may just give a short resumé of what I have said, the work of charity is going to be along these lines, I think: the United Hebrew Charities will become an Eastern-European Jewish *Zedakoh Gedolah,* that will take advantage of all the *vereins,* all of the lodges, all of the movements, all of the finely differentiated marks of division among the Jews; and in the second place, this work of charity is to be organized by the establishment of an institution for scientific investigation elaborative, which shall be supported to a large extent by those of "up-town"—that is, by those who are blessed with greater means than, perhaps, the others are.

MR. MILTON E. MARCUSE, Richmond, Va.: Mr. Chairman, in reading over the program that has been sent out, I see my name is announced as one of the speakers on this subject; and the title following my name might give rise to the thought that my official position came to me as a tribute to the Jewish community in the criminal institutions of this State; but happily I can say to you that for the last eight years it has been my honor to preside over the board of directors of the Virginia Penitentiary, during seven of those years I have been the only Jew connected with the prisons in Virginia; but by a strange irony

of fate, hoping to keep that record clear to present it to you, a jealousy has arisen, and now, unfortunately, out of a population of nineteen hundred prisoners under our control, three of them happen to be Jews, but they are there because they belong there.

Dr. Hollander has well said, after holding up to us the pictures of past achievements in communal activity, that our keynote must be vista, not reminiscence. So be it. Let us build the superstructure of our future activity upon the tried and true foundation of past labor. Our effort shall be to develop the one touch of nature that makes the whole world akin, and to alleviate the suffering and distress caused by man's inhumanity to man; remembering ever that in union there is strength, and hoping eventually to earn title to that great motto of our great republic, *"E pluribus unum"*—one composed of many—an indestructible federation of indestructible organizations, and always bear in mind that man is but part of one stupendous whole, whose body Nature is, and God the soul.

Mr. Leon Kamaiky, New York: There is an old axiom in the Talmud that the merchant shows first his inferior goods, and leaves the best for the last inspection. I see here it is the other way; the best has been presented first, and there is nothing left for me.

I want to make a remark in regard to the unification of charities. Last night I had the pleasure to meet the Superintendent of the National Hospital, and had a brief talk, and I understand there are two hospitals in Denver for the cure of consumptives. The main hospital has about 100 beds, for 100 patients. The white plague is abroad in Denver, and the Russian Jews saw the necessity of establishing another hospital, but what is the result? Each one sends messengers throughout the country saying its institution is doing the work all right, while that the other is not. I think if such a thing cannot be unified, then how can there be hope of the unification of charities among the Russian Jews and the so-called German Jews? Certainly, if they cannot act in harmony in the carrying out simply of one kind of work—that is, helping the sick—they cannot get together in the larger cities where there are so many different

problems that confront them. Still, I think, by looking over the field in New York, when Mr. Bijur tried a year ago to bring about the federation of charities, it was not so hard to federate the Russians with the German Jews as it was to federate the German Jews themselves. It was those who conducted the charities of the German Jews who created all the obstacles. I think the Chairman will bear me out in that.

THE PRESIDENT: Quite true.

MR. KAMAIKY: The Russian Jews, I think, are not yet ripe for organized charity, but the time will come, I hope, when the German Jews will get together, in New York, and then I think the Russian Jews will not stay out.

DR. GUTTMAN, Syracuse: I want to congratulate Dr. Hollander on the splendid paper which he has read to us—or rather, congratulate the audience in having had the privilege of listening to such an excellent paper; and while he was reading it I was reminded of the story that is told of a man who went into a forest to hunt, on a foggy morning. The forest was enveloped in mist. He saw some moving object afar off and thought it was a deer; upon getting a little nearer, and making ready to shoot, he discovered it was a human being—a man. When he got very close he found it was his own brother. He didn't shoot then. I think this bears out the suggestions made by Dr. Hollander. We are getting closer together; the gulf dividing "uptown" from "down-town" is being bridged over; the fog is rising, the mist is passing away, and before long there will be federation, there will be true unity between Portugese, German and Russian Jews, for "have we not all one Father; hath not one God created us all; why shall we deal treacherously brother against brother?"

MR. CYRUS L. SULZBERGER, New York: Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to pay my tribute of admiration to Dr. Hollander for his masterly paper. I, too, have been thinking, since Dr. Hollander finished as to what it is to be normal. It has bothered the President, and bothered Dr. Magnes, and seems especially devised to bother our Jews from New York, but after careful reflection I think I know what constitutes a normal Jew in New York. A

normal Jew in New York is one who either himself or whose father speaks English with a German accent. An abnormal Jew in New York is one who speaks English with a Russian accent. If we will bear this scientific division in mind we shall see that we have right at hand a solution of all our difficulties. A man who speaks English with a German accent is naturally a native, but a man who speaks English with a Russian accent is a foreigner. Now it stands to reason that the hundred thousand or so of native Jews of New York cannot permit the eight hundred thousand or so of foreign Jews of New York to dominate the institutions of New York. That is so obvious that it requires no further explanation; and it is upon that obvious, scientific theory that we Jews of New York, and you Jews of Richmond, and you Jews of Chicago and Cleveland and elsewhere, have managed the Jewish institutions. That has been the fundamental position. We German Jews, and descendants of German Jews, have inherited these institutions, and they are ours by vested right. It is quite true, as I said the other day, we occasionally select a Russian upon our boards. We do this to show that we have no prejudice, precisely in the way that certain clubs elect a Jew to membership, to show that they have no prejudice against Jews.

Now there is only one of two ways to treat this. We must either laugh over it or cry over it. I would rather cry over it than laugh over it, because it is such a shocking situation that we should go on, year after year, doing this thing, heaping up injustice upon injustice, and doing it not alone in New York but throughout the United States.

Do we wonder that a rival Jewish hospital is built, when in the Jewish hospital which is being managed by these native born Jews with a German accent, whose religion is so liberal, they offer these foreign Jews with a Russian accent, lobster, oysters and other things which they know is an aversion to the soul of the patient? Is it a wonder that these men will struggle and strive to build themselves an institution where their sick can be treated without having violence done to their conscience? Is it a wonder that new homes for the aged are being erected? I heard the story the other day of a poor old blind woman who

was in the almshouse of New York. When found there she was taken out and put in the home for aged and infirm people. Before she was there she said she didn't know when Shabbes came, but she did know when it was Wednesday, because she said, "we always had pork on Wednesday." That is a new kind of *Luach*. Now I don't hold anyone responsible for this poor old woman having pork in the almshouse; but suppose she had been sent to a modern Jewish institution and been given lobster and oysters there—as in the case of many of them? Can these institutions ever be unified, so long as we deliberately show our disregard of the opinions of others by literally thrusting our liberality down the throats of these poor patients?

DR. M. LANDSBERG, Rochester: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that we have come together here in order to fight any prejudice. I take it that everyone in this assembly recognizes in the Russian Jew a brother; that no one wants to force pork down his throat, and that nobody thinks of this division line here. Of course, I have had but a limited experience compared with that of the gentleman who has spoken before me. We have a Jewish community of about six to seven thousand people. Now I do not want to waste any time in speaking in admiration of the remarkable paper we have heard to-day—it alone pays us to have come all the way here to Richmond to listen to the analysis, which was not only scholarly, but most instructive to every one, and enjoyable to those who do not know this development from their own experience, as I do. But, while we have listened to this paper, I think we ought to discuss it in a proper way, and not by telling stories and making jokes, which are very bitter jokes and leave only a bitter feeling in the hearts of those who leave this place. I must say that I fully agree with Mr. Kamaiky. Mr. Kamaiky has said just that which I have learned from my own experience. I have been interested in this charitable business for thirty-five years, and practically have done most of the work that has been done in the community of Rochester. We had our charities united before the Russian immigration began in 1882; we had our charities united over thirty years ago; we had no fairs, we had no concerts, but everything that was given

for the charities—all this time that I had any control of it—was contributed right out by donations. The moment we had this Russian element there—we had Russians in our community long before, some of the best members of my congregation, because when they came in slowly and in the natural course of emigration, they were very easily absorbed, and there was no prejudice; we didn't think of it — or thought so little of it that the moment we had this influx we did the very thing that Professor Hollander so beautifully recommends, and which would suggest itself to everyone—worked in unison with them. We had a relief committee of seven, who discussed questions; two of them were Russian Jews. We had them not in order to show that we had no prejudice against these people, but in order to get the benefit of their experience. And what was the result? The result was that it was utterly impossible to make even these men, who were acclimated—who were Americanized—who talked English just as well as the eloquent speaker whom I have always admired for his charity and for his many glorious qualities—but they had no experience with scientific charity—they did not want to trust to our investigations. Now is it not natural that these very people should have to go through the same experience, and through the same development, that we had to go through? When I came to this country nearly forty years ago I didn't know anything of scientific charity. I didn't know anything about investigation. I was accustomed to live in a community where everybody knew everybody else; and so it was in the City of Rochester when I came there. We didn't need our money which was contributed for the benevolent society, except for travelers. When a man who was a resident was failing in business and became poor, what did the people do? They chipped in three, four or five hundred dollars, and in nearly all instances the money was paid back. Now, on this same principle, these very men—these men who were on our committee—thought they could do exactly the same thing with their coreligionists from Russia, who had just arrived; and for this very reason it was necessary that they should go through the same development that we have gone through in order to achieve proper results. They must

first make the same mistakes. They must meet with the same failures which befell those whom you very improperly call "German Jews." I am not a German Jew. I was born in Germany. I consider that my stepfatherland. This is my only fatherland; and they are not Russian Jews, when they have become citizens of this country. We are all Americans, but happen to profess the Jewish religion. I look forward to the time intimated by Professor Hollander, when there will not only be no more Russian and German Jews, but no more necessity for any Catholic or Jewish Conferences of Charities—when they will all be united in a National Conference of Charities and Correction, because they feel that they are all one in spirit and in ambition, in the performance of the good work which they attempt to do.

MR. BERNARD GINSBURG, Detroit: I was very much pleased to listen to the paper by Professor Hollander this morning, and there was one thing about it that struck me as rather unique, when he suggested that the final success would be the federation of one side of the city, and then of the other side, and then the final combination of both. Every time I hear this discussion I feel like congratulating our community. Possibly we are unique. If we are unique, I am glad of it. We have not had the problems that Professor Hollander suggests. We have not had the problems that Dr. Landsberg suggests. We federated our charities seven years ago, on the very broadest lines, and I am glad to say that we have been successful. In the question of communal activity in this city of Detroit, we do not know anything about Russian Jews, German Jews, Orthodox Jews or Reformed Jews. We are a federation of Jewish people for the work committed to our care; and under those auspices I want to state just one practical fact: that within the last six or seven years, we are finishing now the completion of a building, devoted to settlement and relief work, costing $43,000, on which we only owe five or six thousand dollars. We have trebled our collections in those years, and have the concentrated support of every element in the city of Detroit. When I say that, possibly some of those here might take exceptions—there is an insignificant minority who is opposing us, and will continue to oppose us, but as a mass I hope

and believe, from the remarks I have heard here as to other communities, that we are an ideal community.

MR. LOUIS H. LEVIN, Baltimore: I admit being normal, to this extent, that I will discuss the paper—the actual subject—and also limit myself to fifteen minutes. I want to say a few words in regard to the propositions put forth by Dr. Magnes. I disagree with him so completely that I want to emphasize my disagreement here. I do not think that a premeditated division between the two—the up-town and down-town wings of the community—in actual charitable work, is either feasible or proper, or will work out. I think the differences now existing among the Russian Jews, the Galician Jews, the Roumanian Jews and others that he has named, are divisions that are due simply to the fact that the people who have come over here have not become acclimated. They are still under the influence of foreign conditions, and those conditions will be wiped out in America. The result will be that the time will come—Mr. Kamaiky is correct—the time has not yet come, but the time will come, and we are on the way to it, when the whole community can be and will be organized, and I think I understand why, perhaps, as I happen to be a unique delegate. I am here as a delegate from the Federated Jewish Charities of Baltimore—the up-town federation—and I am here as a delegate of the United Hebrew Charities, a down-town federation of Baltimore. I represent thirteen up-town organizations, and eleven down-town organizations, practically nearly all the organized charities in the City of Baltimore. I think that we are a normal community, and that in any normal community that can be accomplished simply by treating the situation in a perfectly normal way—not by seeking theories by which we can divide—and when there is a problem, facing the problem, and not seeking too curiously to know exactly whom we minister to. We shall lose if we encourage class and national distinctions.

DR. LEE K. FRANKEL, New York: Before we adjourn I suggest that the incoming Executive Committee be requested to print Dr. Hollander's paper before the next meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Charities. CARRIED.

The Convention adjourned until 3 o'clock P. M.

TUESDAY, May 5, 1908.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The convention reassembled at 3 P. M.

Vice-President Ginsburg assumed the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will open the session this afternoon, with a paper by Rabbi George Zepin, Superintendent of the United Hebrew Charities, of Chicago.

The following paper was then read by Rabbi George Zepin.

INTERMUNICIPAL CO-OPERATION IN CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES.

RABBI GEORGE ZEPIN,

Superintendent Jewish Aid Society of Chicago.

Modern charity in its organized forms and its institutional aspects is peculiarly a large city product. An improvised almshouse answer the needs of an agricultural district, but the large industrial centers with their death dealing machinery annually produce their quota of widowed mothers and orphaned children; the strenuous life of the city sends its increasing numbers of mentally disturbed patients to sanitariums; the temptations of urban civilization produce their alarming number of delinquents. In this aspect the Jew has fared but little better than his neighbors. With his natural inclination towards cerebral and nervous activities, the Jew has produced his full share of mental wrecks, in a civilization where nervous tension is at its highest. Industrial accidents have reaped a grim and ghastly harvest here as elsewhere. The squalid Ghetto has left its deteriorating mark on the fine old Jewish morality of the preceding generation. The Jewish charitable and correctional activities have therefore followed closely in their development the other sectarian and non-sectarian charities incident to city life. The relief office and the charity hospital, the orphans' home and old people's refuge have followed each other pretty much in the rotation given; then have come legal aid bureaus, children's temporary homes, nurseries, homes for working girls, and working boys' settlements, etc., etc.

With all this rapid increase of the instruments of construction and prevention, we have not yet kept pace with the powers of destruction. The various combinations of circumstances have produced cases in need of charitable refuges for whom no adequate homes could be provided. There are old men too sick for Homes for the Aged, and yet with ailments too chronic for ordinary hospitals. We have children too innocent to be kept at Reformatories and too worldly wise to be placed in Orphanages. While we are to congratulate ourselves that these are for the present "exceptional" cases, and that they occur in such small numbers as not to need in each city a separate institution, we must not lose sight of the danger of neglecting several distinct classes of dependents, nor should we be content that other denominational institutions be called upon to house our unfortunates. Both alternatives are untenable. For cases of this kind we stand in especial need of inter-municipal co-operation.

While few if any would be content to see a large class of needy Jews go without adequate provision for their relief, there is a considerable class who do not feel any compunction at seeing Jewish poor in sectarian and state institutions. Certain classes of defectives, like the insane, are necessarily cared for by the State. Nor would we desire it to be different. However, certain other classes, including some delinquents and dependents, are cared for by the State governments, but who should properly be cared for by the Jews themselves. I therefore venture to say a few words, by way of digression, upon the need of having Jewish institutions for the Jewish poor.

There is a tendency among the leaders of labor movements to relegate all charity to the State authorities. To a large body of men for whom socialism mumbles out a vague promise of readjustment of human conditions, the government also seems properly to become the custodian of the non-producing consumers. The Socialist movement, always democratic, conserves towards the abolishment of class distinctions and sectarian differences. As a result of these leavening influences there is a growing conviction that the poor of each community, irrespective of religious affiliations, are properly the pensioners of the public funds. The widespread

call for State supervision of private charities is mistakenly adding argument to this contention. The mistake of this point of view is that we are trying to bring about one of the effects of socialism without bringing about the actual social readjustment. When the Government shall have become the only employer of labor it will then become necessary and proper that the same Government pension all those who are not able to labor. But until that time comes private charity must logically supply the needs of the industrially incompetent. There are two very cogent arguments against governmental control of philanthropy. The first is furnished by the example of England, whose experience in governmentally controlled charities has been both long and unfortunate. England is now making a heroic effort to rid itself of this system towards which we are stretching out grasping hands. The second argument is the difficulty of determining who is and who is not an American. This is of considerable significance in a country where 1,285,349 immigrants land in one year.

To us Jews this presents a problem of more than ordinary difficulty, because the Jews form an appreciable percentage of the immigrant invasion, and even more so because the Jews who need charity are for the most part recent arrivals. The Jewish problem of charity is a problem of forced emigration. A system of charity controlled by governmental officials will evolve into charity for citizens. By the time the Jew becomes a citizen he no longer needs charity. We must concede that it is almost an axiom with us today that wherever possible the Jews must take care of the Jews. As our modern civilization throws on our shores its industrial wrecks, we must make provision for their care. In accordance with this philosophy we have worked out a creditable array of charity organizations. In several lines of charity work where the volume of dependency was not great enough in any one city to form a local institution, we have evolved the quite original idea of inter-municipal co-operation, and inter-municipal institutions. The abundant success that has attended the several inter-municipal orphan asylums, and the several national sanatoriums for tuberculosis patients, has demonstrated both the need and practicability of such a step. It is a far cry from a certain kind of inter-muni-

cipal co-operation which consists in helping every pauper to the next town, to another form of co-operation wherein we sent our poor to distant cities and support them there at our expense.

By way of developing the several suggestions contained in this paper, let us pass in rapid review over the classes of poor for whom our present organizations provide no specific relief. Considering first our defective population, consisting of the insane, feeble minded, deaf mutes, and blind, we find that there are no distinctly Jewish institutions for their care. Outside of New York there probably is not a city in the United States where there are enough of any one of these special classes to warrant the establishment of Jewish institutions for their care. If on the other hand we were to include in one territory the cities Cincinnati, Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis, and contiguous territory, we probably would find enough cases to start a separate institution for every form of defective humanity above mentioned. I have never heard that such a movement is contemplated, nor does it seem either feasible or necessary. I touch upon it merely because the program requests the treatment of this subject matter. The State handles this problem with far greater efficiency and financial resourcefulness than private charity can ever hope to do.

However, in one particular, there certainly is need for inter-municipal co-operation as it effects the defective classes and some others. While we cannot segregate the Jewish defectives, and probably would not if we could, we should provide those Jewish inmates of public institutions that desire it with some avenue of communication with the larger Jewish world. The medium of communication that has usually been created for such conditions is the district chaplainship. This is a legitimate field for private charity. This very convenient official serves in many capacities, according to the exigencies of the situation. In the homes for blind children he is a religious teacher. At the various insane asylums he holds services from time to time for the lucid. He visits periodically the penal institutions in his territory, occasionlly holding a public service in the institution for adults and giving instruction in the institutions for juveniles. To all these—his parishioners — he is at all times a friend, ready to do whatever

the situation requires. A more general adoption of this suggestion would do much to lighten the burden of a considerable number of Jewish defectives.

When we pass from the consideration of defective humanity to a consideration of the dependent classes we find a more definite task before us. There are comparatively few cities in the United States where there are homes for the aged. In almost every such Home membership is limited to residents of that particular city, and very often five years' residence in a community is required previous to application.

It is manifest that this works a hardship on the Jews of smaller communities. Many an old man whose kin is dead or criminally neglectful, is forced to become "a traveler" from town to town because he is a man without a city. In an ideal arrangement each Old Folks Home would draw upon a more or less contiguous territory for support as well as for applications. This form of intermunicipal co-operation which has been successfully tried in several orphan asylums could well be imitated by many of the homes for the aged.

Another class of dependents for whose accommodation we have no adequate provision is the class of "Incurables." In the last two years I doubt if fifteen persons have passed through the office of the United Hebrew Charities of Chicago who would ordinarily become candidates for a Home for Incurables. I eliminate all those who have relatives to care for them, all those who are able to pay for their own care, and thirdly, advanced consumptives. The first two classes are omitted for obvious reasons, namely because the institution is intended for charity patients only. The third class—those suffering from pulmonary consumption—is omitted because the task of caring for them is so stupendous that only some agency of public government can cope with it successfully. With diligent search I have no doubt but that we could find fifty persons in Chicago today who would be eligible for such a home. The four States, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Missouri, could supply enough applicants to run such an institution economically. Under the present arrangement we are compelled to apply to sectarian homes for the care of our incurables. Our experiences

in Chicago are rather discouraging. The waiting list of the local Home is very long. Some months ago one of our sick people died before we succeeded in gaining admission for her. We have two persons resident at the Home, for one of whom we pay $15 a month. A number of others are being housed with poor families under anything but ideal conditions. An institution of this kind would be a great boon to many sufferers who cannot gain admittance to either Old Folks Homes or hospitals.

There has been some talk about a national organization, with headquarters in Denver, to care for consumptives and their families, who are sent to that city from all parts of the United States. It seems to me that the existence of a society of this kind would draw a vast number of people to Colorado who could receive adequate treatment in their respective home cities. While it is advisable for a man who has been cured in Denver to stay in Colorado, and while it is both humane and wise to send his wife and children to join him when he is cured, the cost of maintaining him until he is self-supporting should fall to the lot of the individual community which has sent him to Denver. The sum necessary to insure this treatment is considerable, but is not large when compared with the amounts spent on the same cases after they return to their home cities. The growing sentiment in favor of home-cure for consumption, and the rise of local sanatoria, will probably contribute to keep the number sent to Denver for the next five years about the same. This will give the various cities thus sending cases a chance to experiment along these lines.

When we turn to a consideration of the class of delinquents we come across a field where inter-municipal co-operation can accomplish great results. We need a Jewish institution for delinquent boys and girls. Last year's annual report of the Cook County Charity Service states that 166 delinquent Jewish boys and 17 delinquent Jewish girls passed through the Juvenile Court. The report for the year just closed gives the number of delinquent Jewish boys as 164, and Jewish girls as 32. Reports from other cities would doubtlessly disclose similar conditions. These delinquent boys and girls are ultimately placed under probationary care. But in a very large majority of cases they need a period of

rigid institutional discipline to make them appreciate the blessings of liberty, and to teach them certain wholesome laws of life. The period of discipline may last from three months to a year, depending upon the age, the disposition, and the needs of the boy or girl.

For the Jewish wards of the Juvenile Court we need a Jewish institution. The Jewish children who live on the avenues do not get into Juvenile Courts, because their environment, and even more than that, their companionship is elevating. A very large percentage of the juvenile crime is the result partly of slum environment, but mostly of slum companionship. In taking the Jewish boys from the evil environments of slum life, and placing them in the usual places of correction provided by the State, we are merely placing them back into the midst of the same companionship under whose inspiration they got into trouble.

The rough, boisterous elements of slum life are not contributed by the Jewish boys, but the Jewish boy like every boy admires this sort of melodramatic action, and emulates it to his undoing. Here again there comes into play the passion for the admiration of strangers. Among his own Jewish companions Isaac is moral. Among his superior Gentile companions Isaac is hungry for admiration. Under the observation of strangers he out-Herods Herod in his work, his play, and his mischief. When this Isaac gets into trouble he should be taken away from his Gentile companions and placed in more natural surroundings. I have great faith in the Jewish boy and the Jewish girl. The inherent strength of character, that is the result of centuries of self restraint can be hidden only for a short period. If given the proper surroundings and the proper companionship he can become a good citizen, despite his youthful waywardness.

For this reason I would welcome a Jewish protectory for Jewish children. There is another reason. These children more than others need a firm grounding in moral truths. Many methods have been devised for teaching morality, but it is conceded on all sides that religion is the medium that has showed the best results in teaching these truths to children. In order to teach religion we must segregate these children from children of other denominations.

The number of Jewish delinquents in Chicago hardly justifies the establishment of a Jewish protectory. The same condition prevails in all the cities of the central West. Two or more of these cities could combine for the erection of a protectory at some accessible point. When such a protectory shall be so situated and endowed that the methods of the George Junior Republic can be introduced, we shall have made vast strides toward counteracting the evil influences of the slums.

A word concerning the methods of supporting institutions of this character. It is my opinion that in the establishment of inter-municipal institutions, the Jewish Fraternal Organizations have a mission not fully exploited in the past. The organized charities of each of the cities entering into such an arrangement would of course be expected to contribute their share towards the maintenance of such an institution, but the founding and partial support should be provided by some fraternal organization.

I counsel this plan advisedly and from a careful study of the charity subscription lists of several cities. In Chicago, for instance, the well-known merchants and high-salaried men, are pretty well canvassed for charity subscriptions. A very large percentage of the available material has been organized. But out of ten thousand available persons who might contribute from $5 a year upwards, only 3,000 have been reached by this method. The portion not reached by the charity lists represents, roughly speaking, the clientele of the fraternal organizations. We must not imagine that the same people will pay for it no matter how the money is raised. The fraternal order has succeeded in organizing a class of smaller donors whom the charity lists never reached.

In this day there has been much talk about the decline of fraternal orders, in spite of their largely increased numbers. The elimination of the insurance feature has turned these societies into inter-municipal charity organizations. The opportunity before them is vast. In almost every large city we have exhausted our supply of large givers. To supply the demands for charity we will have to make a determined effort to organize the smaller donors.

Institutions such as have been outlined above could make excellent use of a field secretary. An institution accepting applications

from considerable territory has a right to look to that territory for support. In the larger cities where organization exists this can be easily secured. In the smaller centers one must first organize the machinery for periodic collections, and arouse sympathy for the cause before support is forthcoming. For such work a field secretary is indispensable.

There is nothing particularly original in the idea of inter-municipal co-operation. It comes into play in the simple problem of not shirking the responsibility of one's own poor. It shows itself in a somewhat more complicated form in establishing central institutions. As far as I can trace it, it is an idea peculiar to fraternal organizations.

In Jewish charity circles the question of co-operation has long ago been solved. The fact that we deal with a definite class of people whose life and aims are pretty well understood, makes co-operation easier for us than for the various components of the nonsectarian charity world. We have realized the value of the principal of co-operation from an economic point of view. In this paper I have taken its value for granted and sketched a few lines along which this principle might successfully be pursued.

THE CHAIRMAN: The discussion will be opened by Mr. Jacob Furth of St. Louis.

MR. FURTH: As has been stated by the presiding officer, I have the honor to represent on this occasion the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith. This is my first attendance upon a National Conference of Jewish Charities. Before proceeding to say anything about the very excellent paper that has just been read, I desire to give expression to the great pleasure, and the great profit which I have derived from attending this meeting. This meeting differs very materially from meetings of the so-called fraternals, which as you know are only attended by the male sex. It is and must be to all an inspiration to have the attendance, the attention and the co-operation of the best part of God's creation, and I believe that I am within the confines of the truth when I say that the excellent results which have been achieved by the National Conference of Jewish Charities

are due to the interest taken in the work by our good ladies. The great interest—the great benefit which, in my judgment, comes from attending a meeting of this kind, comes not alone from the scientific papers that are read, and from the discussion of their topics, but from those thoughts which naturally and spontaneously arise in one's mind as he listens to the discussions. This morning as I sat here and listened to Dr. Blaustein, and to the reading of the very excellent paper presented by Dr. Hollander, the thought came to me that in the councils of the B'nai B'rith order we should do one thing, we should inaugurate a system under which we would be less of a close corporation, and by virtue of which we too would receive the benefit that comes from scientific training from collegiate and university sociological education.

The conditions that were described in Dr. Hollander's paper this morning still exist. It is still a fact that there is too much dilettante work on the part of those who have charge of important local, state and national charity organizations. I believe the time to be opportune, and by the end of this month at a meeting of the executive committee of the Order, I will make it my business and pleasure to suggest that we invite to labor with us, men of such scientific attainments—men so abreast of the times, men so thoroughly posted as to the needs and requirements, and as to the proper method and system of doing charity work—that we will go forward on a path more pregnant with excellent results than anything that the Order has thus far accomplished on these lines.

As I said, I am here today representing that great organization of Jews—the greatest organization of the best Jews that has ever been formed, here and in the countries of Europe. I regret that the President of the Order is not here himself, to stand up for it. You will have to be satisfied with the feeble efforts that I can put forth in its behalf and in its name. The inter-municipal charity work that we do is slight if any. The Order has divested itself very largely of local charity work, deeming that to be the domain of Federations where they exist. It has undertaken to work larger fields. It has been said by the gentleman who read the paper here, that out of 10,000 possible subscribers in the city of Chicago, 7,000 are not subscribers to the Associated Charities, and that they

make up the membership of the fraternals. I beg to differ with the gentleman; although I do not live in the city of Chicago, I think if the facts were known, and statistics properly compiled, he would find that out of the 3,000 who are subscribers, perhaps the majority and the largest subscribers are members of our Order. I am reminded of the story of the politician who once said that while it is true that every member of a certain party is not a horse thief, it is equally true that every horse thief was a member of that political party. You can see the application.

I am here to stand up for the institutional work of the Order, so far as it relates to orphans. I am more than pleased to have heard that portion of the gentleman's paper wherein he pays tribute to the institutional work done for Jewish orphans in this country. I realize that in the bringing up of orphans, as on every other question there are different views, and I respect each one for his or her opinion. A great deal has been said and written of late against placing orphans in institutions. This morning's local paper gives a description of something that transpired in the St. Vincent de Paul Conference here, wherein very strong grounds are taken against the placing of children into orphan asylums; and you all know that a number—not a large number, but a number of well meaning, highly intelligent men and women of our own faith, work tooth and nail against placing children in institutions, because they believe that the character of the child, and its peculiar natural gifts, are not developed in an institution; that in them all things go according to machine rule. That may be so in some institutions, but not in all of them. It has been my honor and pleasure to have been connected with the Cleveland Jewish Orphan Asylum for the last thirty years, and I think we can point with pardonable pride to the results of our labors, in that particular—we can show that wherever a talent of any kind was discovered in a child, it was cultivated, and our former inmates today occupy positions of honor and trust throughout the land, in all the various paths of life, but above all, they form a splendid element of American citizenship, and the doctrines of civic duty and their ideals of ethics were inculcated in the great institution in Cleveland, under the guidance and supervision (with all due

respect to those engaged in similar work) of a man whose equal has not yet been found. It has been the boast of the Cleveland Orphan Asylum that it comes nearer to the ideals of a home than any institution of the kind elsewhere. I do not know whether that is literally true, or not—but we love to make that claim, and up to the present time it has not been successfully contradicted.

I did not know just how this Conference felt on the question of the orphan, but I am delighted to find its prevailing sentiment. I want to say frankly and honestly that I came into this Conference with rather peculiar views as to the make-up of the men and women who constitute it. The chairman will bear me out, he is with me on the Board of the Cleveland Orphan Asylum—that I have probably had perverted views on the question of *scientific* charity work. A week or two ago, in the splendid city of Chicago, Archbishop Glennon of St. Louis, delivered an address in which, as the headlines of the daily paper showed, he flayed the professional charity workers. I am not in sympathy with that. I am not in sympathy with the views of the Roman Catholic prelate, who believes that no good can be done except it be done on the lines of the Roman Catholic faith, and strictly within the governmental range of that great hierarchy, the Church; but he gave expression to a few thoughts with which I can heartily coincide. He does not believe in that sort of charity which is as closely figured, as a man figures when he draws a check on his bank. He believes, and I believe, that behind charity and charity work, there must be more than science. Behind it all there must be soul, and without soul—without that sentiment which ennobles both him who gives as well as him who receives—without that wealth of emotion which differentiates man from the brute creation, proper charity work can not be done, no matter whether you do it scientifically or otherwise.

But from what I have seen here today, I am ready to admit the great worth and value of the American Jew, of conferences such as this. Of course it would not do for me to be personal. Perhaps some here will know what I mean when I say that this mingling with our people of those who stand as far above as the submerged are supposed to be below—those blessed not only with ordinary minds and ordinary wealth—those who have attained a professional standing far above the ordinary niveau—those meteoric

successes achieved in the great metropolis of our country, and sometimes elsewhere, who had heretofore fostered a Pharisaic spirit which for want of anything better I would call the "holier than thou" spirit, has been and must continue to be, productive of excellent results. It has done my heart good to see them of a different mind. When I see cynicism done away with—when I see the purse-proud come down to the level of the average citizen; when I see these great changes, I attribute them to the co-mingling of men and women such as I see here today, and I see the dawn of a better day for American Jewry. These are some of the results of the National Conference of Jewish Charities.

I don't wish to detain you any longer, ladies and gentlemen, I have nothing to discuss. The gentleman who read the paper gave expression to my sentiments. I have nothing on which to differ with him at all. I only want to pay this tribute to the organization which, as I say, it has been my pleasure to have joined, and I hope that as we return to our respective homes we may take with us that catholic spirit, that broad gauge mentally which pervades this assembly, so that each one, in his own locality, and in his own way, may act the missionary for that better, higher, nobler, and, if you please, more scientific work which this Conference advocates.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the absence of Mr. Grabfelder, Dr. Calisch will read his paper.

DR. CALISCH: This is a paper prepared by Mr. Samuel Grabfelder, President of the National Jewish Home for Consumptives. He says:

WHAT MUNICIPAL CO-OPERATION MEANS FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE NATIONAL JEWISH HOSPITAL FOR CONSUMPTIVES AT DENVER.

I believe that I can find no better illustration of the need of inter-municipal co-operation of charitable activities than is presented by the early history of the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives.

It is not my purpose in this paper to go at length into the obstacles that stood in the way of the establishment of this national

institution, nor of the manner in which they were finally overcome. I desire simply to say that when the good people of Denver saw the need of a hospital for poor consumptives they imagined that they could establish and maintain it without the help of the great cities of the land, without calling upon the adjunct activities of the Federated Charities of these municipalities.

The panic of 1893 was in one sense of the word something of a godsend, for it made immediately impossible what would have been a long-drawn-out struggle had the panic not occurred. The good people of Colorado, as you will remember, raised $40,000 for the building of this hospital, and then it stood like the wailing spirit of a broken promise, its bleak walls resounding to the footsteps only of a poor keeper, but nowhere the activity and the helpfulness that had been the fond dream of its founders.

It was only when the national appeal was made, when the great order of B'nai B'rith was asked to assist, and when, finally, the municipalities both through their individuals and through their federated charities were induced to lend their aid, that the hospital took its position among the great helpful institutions of the world.

I judge from the request that was made of me that I am to deal especially today with the relation of the National Jewish Hospital to the local sanatoria of the country.

First of all you will pardon me if I quote from my sixth annual address, delivered at Chicago in June, 1906, for the statement I made at that time is if anything, more pertinent today than it was then. In fact the hospital today contains even a larger percentage of cases that were cared for in Eastern institutions than it did at the time this was written. This is what I said at that time:

"The greater the number of institutions projected in the East for the treatment of consumption, the more imperative the need of such institutions as ours. During the past two years it is a matter of record that a large proportion of the cases sent to Colorado by order of physicians, came from Eastern institutions. In the Agnes Sanatorium of Denver, founded and endowed by Laurence Phipps, Dr. Holden, the superintendent, states that one-third of his patients now come from Eastern hospitals for the treatment of tuberculosis.

The record of the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives, while not so extensive as this, nevertheless, shows a constantly increasing demand for admission from patients of Eastern institutions. The conclusion we are forced to reach from these and like records is that, with the establishment of new state and private hospitals for the treatment of consumption, many more cases are brought to the surface, which, in the opinion of physicians, can be benefited only in Colorado, or in like climates.

"The physicians, with the advance of knowledge in the treatment of tuberculosis, are taking the high ground that, while the Eastern records of cases show most commendable results, much of this is due to the wise and extremely careful selection of cases to be treated. In almost every instance the Eastern institution for incipients gets incipients. When patients are sent to Colorado the very opposite is the case, and the so-called incipient is seldom an incipient. Yet the record of cures of incipient cases and restoration to earning power, in the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives is over eighty per cent., and that record has been maintained throughout the history of the hospital, and is, as well, the history of Colorado."

As a matter of fact Colorado has no indigenous problem with relation to these consumptives, and I will cite the report of the city physician of Denver, of two years ago, the last one that bears on this subject, in which he says that there were 64 deaths from non-imported consumption to 150,000 inhabitants. This report, as well as the valuable statistics compiled by Dr. Sewall, who is on the Board of Trustees of the National Society for the prevention of tuberculosis, prove conclusively that Colorado has something like one death to every 3,000 which can be attributed to consumption contracted in the State of Colorado. In Colorado Springs there have been ten deaths from what I will term indigenous consumption in twenty years. A town of the same size and gradual increase of population in the East would have had 630 deaths from the disease in twenty years.

So I believe I am correct in stating that we have no problem that is not forced upon us by conditions outside of the State of Colorado. The one great pressing desideratum is that there should be the most

careful selection of cases that are sent to Colorado. I need not here go into the problem of preventing the incurable poor from coming to that state. That problem most of us are dealing with in a sensible and an effective manner. It is to be regretted that any of these incurables should reach Denver, and almost criminal when they are invited to go there.

And for the purposes of this selection I can advocate nothing so much as inter-municipal co-operation in the establishment of sanatoria.

The new Glackens law in Illinois, passed by the last legislature, permits, as you know, the municipalities of that state to vote funds for sanatoria. Here it seems to me would be the best opportunity for co-operation. Outside of Chicago it would be manifestly wise for Congressional districts or sections about as large, to join in the establishment of sanatoria. In Chicago, of course, the work is of so tremendous a character that the problem must be dealt with as they are beginning to deal with it. I am thankful that I have the opportunity of speaking a good word for the new Naperville sanatorium, in which the Jewish people of Chicago are taking so deep an interest. How utterly impossible it is for the National Jewish Hospital to deal with this problem unless it have the wisest selection made, largely through sanatoria, is best evidenced by the following from a paper on tuberculosis in the Jewish district of Chicago, in 1904, by Dr. Theodore B. Sachs. He says:

"For a period of eighteen months an effort was made to record every case of tuberculosis that occurred in the Jewish district of Chicago. This was facilitated by the fact that a large proportion of Jewish tuberculosis poor sooner or later apply for admission to the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives. In that period of eighteen months 840 Jewish consumptive poor applied for treatment at various hospitals and dispensaries in this city, the majority of them receiving treatment at institutions conducted by United Hebrew Charities. More than one-third of the entire number sought admission to the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives."

In other words, for a period of eighteen months there had been nearly 300 applications for admission from Chicago alone, and it was due to the wisdom and carefulness of our excellent examiner,

Dr. Sachs, that only such cases were sent to Denver as could be benefited by that climate, and could be cured or at least greatly assisted.

This but emphasizes the need of the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives as a co-operative institution, out there where conditions are, one might almost say, ideal for the cure of the disease.

There is not a sanatorium of note in the country which has not sent patients to the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives in Denver, and which has not found it a very necessary adjunct to its work. We have within a year had patients who have come to us from Bedford, White Haven, the Maquoqueta Sanatorium in Canada, the Warrensville Municipal Sanatarium for the poor consumptives of Cleveland, Rutland, and quite a number of others. And these cases are as a rule such as can be surely benefited by the high, dry air of Colorado, and by that eternal sunshine which is its God-given capital.

The establishment of sanatoria all over the country means a greater helpfulness on the part of the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives. If it is possible to effect a cure by a sanatorium near the home of the patients that is where they should first of all be sent.

The National Jewish Hospital stands in the relation of adjunct to nearly all of those mentioned above, and I hope this will be its position always.

We must stop the indiscriminate sending of consumptives to Colorado, and we can do it only through the co-operation of sanatoria and of the charities of the land.

I could cite here at least a hundred cases that have been sent to Denver by well-meaning people, in which the grossest injustice was done to the patients.

I will record a few solely for the purpose of emphasizing the statements I have made above.

One case that came to us from a city in New York State turned out to be a case of sarcoma of the lungs. I desire to say that in this instance the hospital's physician had made a correct diagnosis, but the patient went to another physician, and, working upon the sympathy of one of the directors, secured his transpor-

tation to Denver and his admission papers. Of course when he came to Colorado our physicians immediately discovered what his ailment was and instead of treatment at the National Jewish Hospital gave him six weeks free treatment at one of the general hospitals of the city, later sending him home for hospital treatment there.

One case that was sent us by a sympathic director and a physician who had been induced to allow the case to pass, died on the way from the depot to the hospital.

But I could go on almost indefinitely citing the mistakes of well-meaning people. I recall at this moment the instance of the head of one of the large Jewish Orders of the country sending a consumptive from New York to Denver who had been pronounced incurable by two physicians, and who was sent to Denver solely for the purpose, as the gentleman put it, "of getting rid of him."

Naturally, therefore, I would like to have the work of selection of cases for Denver entirely in the hands of the charities or of sanatoria. In that way the sympathy of good people cannot be abused, and in that way only can the institution be made most thoroughly effective in the great crusade on the white plague.

And now will you pardon me if I just add a few words about the curative powers that God has given us to work with out there in Colorado, and I do this solely that you may not forget that you have in the National Jewish Hospital one of the most powerful instruments for the eradication of the disease.

Out there the rainfall is 14 inches. In Chicago it is 34.8. In St. Louis, 41.1. Denver averages 304 days of sunshine per year.

Our greatest throat specialist, Dr. Robert Levy, member of the advisory board of the hospital, in an article in the New York Medical Journal, presents an analysis of 205 cases of tuberculosis of the larynx, saying:

"The effect of high altitude is to retard the development of laryngeal tuberculosis by more than a year. That in cases in which both lung and throat lesions develop in Colorado, the throat lesion manifests itself 48 weeks later than in those originating elsewhere. That in cases in which lung lesions develop elsewhere

and throat lesions in Colorado the throat lesions manifest themselves 62.3 weeks later than those originating elsewhere."

Dr. Solly in his "Medical Climatology" says that in the first stages of the disease the percentage of those in lower climates who were cured was 75 and in Colorado 89; in the second and third stages the comparative percentage was 47 and 63; for all stages, the comparative percentage was 59 to 76.

Co-operation—sane, carefully regulated co-operation—now means much for the patients who go to the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives. About 1,400 have been sent out, fully 80 per cent. of whom—according to the records of the physicians—have either been cured or at least restored to economic worth—that is to earning power. Today with an annual capacity of 300 patients this figure will soon be greatly increased.

But it means much too in the way of education. Our English classes in charge of an experienced public school teacher number from 40 to 50. Our trade school, while yet in its infancy, has for its purpose the acquirement of new outdoor callings.

The establishment of a loan fund is also under way, and has already been utilized to place discharged patients on their feet. In fact we are aiming to be helpful not alone from a climatological and medical, but from a social and economic standpoint as well.

I therefore beg of you in conclusion not to forget the tremendous benefits that lie in Colorado for the poor consumptive, but that the highest degree of success of the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives in Denver depends altogether upon the care that is taken in the selection of cases that can be benefited out there.

DISCUSSION.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any more discussion of this particular topic?

JUDGE JULIAN W. MACK, Chicago: I feel impelled to say a word or two of dissent from some of the things that have been said; but let me first express the hope that as many of you as can secure copies will look over the proceedings of this organization at

its four other sessions, and thereby learn so far as you do not know it, that all of us who are engaged in philanthropic work—all of us who believe in putting philanthropic work both on a scientific and a business basis—know that mere business and mere science is not enough in philanthropy, but that we fully know and have always said, that soul is even more essential. May I also criticise one other expression of the second speaker, in which he referred to the Order that he represents, and to which I happen to have the honor of belonging, as the greatest organization of the best Jews in the world. I haven't met all of the Jews in the world. I have met a few. Many of them were members of that Order—many thousands that I know personally—but I believe that there are at least an equal number of non-members who are just as good, and from all that I have been able to learn my guess would be that there are a good many in the benighted lands of the East, particularly Russia, who in mental ability, as well as in many other respects, are, at least, the equals of these best Jews. That same spirit of patting ourselves just a little too much, it seems to me, entered into some of the points made by the first speaker; and let say at once, what I ought to have said in the beginning, when I suggested that those who had not attended the previous Conferences might with profit read the proceedings, that we believe this Conference to be an open forum for full, free and frank discussion, and that nothing that is said is ever meant as personal, or as reflecting in any degree upon the person; but because incidentally we may differ from the remarks of any individual, it is the theory of these conferences that we must not be silent when principles are involved, for fear that statements might possibly be misconstrued, though such misconstruction I hope will not prevail in this instance. I say that, both as to what I have said and what I shall say.

Dr. Zepin spoke about the care of the delinquent children. I shall not venture, in the few moments that one speaking from the floor can permit himself, to discuss several of the other portions of that able paper, but my thoughts have been directed for a rather long time on the subject of the delinquent child, and perhaps, therefore, I may be permitted to say a word or two on this subject. I do not believe that we Jews are very different from the rest of the

community. In fact, in a most interesting address that was delivered by Dr. Birnbaum, the great Austrian Jew and Nationalist, which I am not, he pointed out with a great deal of pride, as strongly indicative that the Jews are a nation that where they are great in numbers, in their own homes in Galicia, they have all sorts and classes. They have the rough and boisterous, the scoundrel, the rascal and the degraded, just as every other nation has. That is a normal thing in every race and nation; and whether we be a nation or not, I am very sure that we Jews have plenty of individuals who count themselves Jews, of whom many of us would be thoroughly ashamed; but we must not hide that fact; we must not be continually puffing ourselves up and believing that because we are, in a sense, the chosen people—chosen for duty and responsibility—that therefore, we are chosen above the others for good, and for all that is fine and noble. We do not stand much different, if at all different, from the rest of our fellows, and moreover, we are going to be part of the communities in which we live, for whether we be Nationalists or Zionists or Itoists, or Orthodox, or Radical, or Conservative or assimilation Jews, we all believe that we should form an integral part of the American people as long as we may make America our home—as long as we claim American citizenship; and if this be our purpose as adults, I see no reason why we should train our children always and under all circumstances, entirely separated from the rest of the community of which they form a part.

Of course, I believe that they should get the Jewish spirit—get it thoroughly. Of course, I believe that we should endeavor to keep every Jew a firm, sound and believing Jew; but as to the delinquent children, if they have reached the stage where, in the judgment of the state, it becomes necessary for their own good to take them away from their homes; where it becomes necessary because they are violating the rules and the laws that the state lays down, when the point is reached that they are right up against the laws of the state, there is no socialism in the state taking charge of them. The state is doing only its duty by and toward them, when under these circumstances (and I am now talking only about delinquents) it takes charge of them, and those

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

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

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

DISCUSSION.

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

THE FUNCTION OF THE CONFERENCE OF JEWISH CHARITIES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DISCUSSION.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 repellant; 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 mezuza 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 corner-stone, 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

> "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

ever hope to eradicate the cause of such conditions. Organized effort, as applied for instance in large cities, like New York, Philadelphia and Chicago, would not necessarily be successful if applied to conditions existing in smaller cities like Atlanta, Birmingham or Mobile. Poverty is not as acute or as oppressive in the smaller cities as in the larger communities, and therefore the problem is a simpler one to remedy.

In the small city of 25 to 50,000 inhabitants we are immediately informed of cases requiring relief; the Jewish community is not large, seldom over 5 per cent. of the entire population. The assistance that is given is immediate, although not always of a kind to insure permanent relief, and poverty among the Jews in the smaller cities does not stalk the highways and the byways. We find also that in cities of this size in this country most of the Jewish communities have some sort of charity, relief or benefit organization; some of these are members of our Conference, but regretfully we must admit that there are still a large number who are not yet with us.

Going a step farther, to communities of less than 25,000 inhabitants, we find little or no organization amongst the Jews for the purpose of dispensing rational relief.

In such cities the Jew is not strong numerically, and whenever the stranger wanders in his midst, tired, sore at heart and short of purse, he is, with as little delay as possible, reshipped to some nearby larger city in the direction in which he desires to go. The hat is passed around, a collection is quickly made up and the wanderer is again on his way. No effort is made to care for him, to secure suitable work for him, or to induce him to locate and work at his trade. Oh, no; that is not what the old-time Jewish relief stands for, and the elders who handled these cases considered the next train out a better solution than a long stay in.

To the small community, relatively speaking, I charge nearly all of the evils growing out of the abominable system of pauper transportation, and the resultant "dumping" of a charge from one place to a larger pleace nearby. Such aid is so unsystematic that it frustrates the very purpose for which it was given. I do not believe that in the smaller communities there has yet

come that awakening in the Jewish conscience of the responsibility of each locality to care for its own dependents, and I do not believe that such a condition will ever exist or be created until we devise some means by which we can organize the smaller communities, as we have been doing with the larger ones. As soon as we broaden the propaganda of organized effort on modern lines the sooner we will find the work more effective. Such a development can only be accomplished in a thorough and satisfactory manner through a visit or frequent visits of a field secretary, competent in every way to explain to such communities the benefits accruing by systematic organization on modern lines, supplemented by frequent and direct communications with affiliated organizations in all the surrounding territory.

With a complete and working organization of this kind the wandering Jew will per force become a mere byword, and not the actual living reality, with whom we come in contact with such unpleasant frequency.

With this accomplished there will also be a reaction in the shape of a lightening of the burdens on the larger cities.

Take, for instance, the work of the Removal Office; for years they have been heroically working to get as many people as possible to locate in the suburban communities. The railroad fare and expenses are paid and they are sent to smaller cities. Of course, some remain and some do not, which is entirely natural. Now, those who begin a shifting, drifting career are assisted by short jumps from one small place to another, finally reaching again the larger centers of Jewish population, not only nullifying to a certain extent the original work and its attendant expense, but adding a useless burden to each stopping place on the journey, and, worst of all, producing a *chronic tramp.*

Suppose we had organized these way stations? Well, the wandering would cease to a large extent, and the nomad would have to work out his own livelihood. Again, I have found during the past year, in my efforts to secure additional members for the Conference, a woeful lack of knowledge as to what we stand for, what we have done and are doing, and I would consider it a wise move to inaugurate charity extension by sending out a paid traveling secretary into the towns of the country to tell

our people not only what we are doing, but what we expect them to do also. They should be told in plain and forceful language that the burden of relief must not be saddled upon the nearest larger community and will not be countenanced. When some unfortunate brother reaches a small place an effort must be made to find employment and a permanent abode for him without delay. Personal service under such conditions is worth more than money, and, if given freely by our co-religionists of the smaller towns, the problem of overcrowding the ghettoes in large cities will be lightened to a very large extent.

It is a well-known fact that there is little or no cohesion between charity workers of the reform and orthodox creeds. This is very much to be regretted, and as the prejudices which originally produced such feeling gradually disappear I hope for a better feeling and understanding between the forces that should always be united in working for the common good. Be the original cause what it may, there can be no reasonable doubt on the proposition that a diplomatic, tactful and earnest representative in the person of a field secretary could do very much to bring these seemingly repellant forces together, so that with the same object always in view in their work harmony instead of discord would prevail.

In my own experience I have found that the lack both of knowledge and appreciation of the value and effectiveness of modern charitable relief methods on the part of our orthodox friends has frequently been the source of detrimental interference and actual nullification of much of our good work.

A field secretary, able to give interesting and forceful public addresses, would soon be in position to grasp the local situations as he might find them, and suggest and even apply the necessary remedies and corrections. In this field of developing a better and kindlier understanding among all the various charitable organizations and bringing them in closer touch with each other, a field secretary's work would be of inestimable value.

Let us spread the gospel of the National Conference far and wide, so that every Jewish community of this broad land, no matter how small, shall know its duties and live up to them; shall respect its neighbors, and not shift upon them a responsi-

bility all its own; shall do and not shirk its share of the noble work of relief for the man who is stranded and in need, and for whom a willing, helping hand should be ever ready to tide him over a period of depression, and enable him to become independent and self-sustaining.

This Conference should not adjourn without devising ways and means to carry on this work. Let us not lose another two years in the development of such an important detail of Jewish philanthropy. Let us

> "Do noble things, not dream them all day long,
> And thus make life, death and that vast forever
> One grand, sweet song."

DISCUSSION.

DR. EDWARD N. CALISCH, Richmond, Va.; I was asked to discuss a paper on the question stated here in the program, "Should the Conference, at its biennial sessions, devote itself entirely to the consideration of specifically Jewish questions, or should the program include the consideration of questions not specifically Jewish, but of interest to Jews in common with the rest of the population of their respective cities, and not yet undertaken by organizations dealing particularly with Jews in their respective communities?" The paper that was given on this question was not wholly relevant to the question itself, and as I believe the question is paramount to the paper I propose to confine my discussion to the question.

If I were asked to give a categorical answer to the categorical question whether this Jewish Conference should turn its attention to things not specifically Jewish, I would say simply in the affirmative, yes; that I believe it advisable to do so; because, while it is true, as has been so aptly quoted this morning, that charity is mankind's concern—all mankind's concern—and while it is further true that those dependent upon the help of their neighbors are to be found among all classes and nations of people, yet it is also true that the causes for poverty and dependence are not alike among all peoples. Because these things differ in their causes, a comparative study of the various causes will certainly be helpful to all who engage therein.

I take it that the question means the co-operation of this organization with other organizations of a similar kind. In its fundamental form charity is a thing that is alike in all cases. Hunger and nakedness and homelessness are hunger and nakedness and homelessness whether they come from one cause or another, whether they spring from alcoholism or inherent depravity, or whether on the other hand they are the fruitage of Russian or Roumanian tyranny. Our conditions are peculiar and unique, but none the less we, like others, must first give the material aid that is necessary. We must feed the hungry and clothe the naked, and shelter the homeless first of all, before we do anything else. In its proper place I believe in the emphasis of the religious tendency, of which so much has been spoken this morning. Naturally, as a teacher of religion, I believe in the teaching of religion, but I also believe that it is not a wise thing to preach to men with empty stomachs, except perhaps on *Yom Kippur*.

The first steps of relief having been given, higher philanthropy, like higher medicine, seeks to know the causes in order to prevent their continuance. Our Jewish poor are always with us, but the Jewish poor are such more from objective than from subjective causes, and that while we have the poor with us always, and doubtless always will have them, yet there is no such thing as chronic pauperism among us. The magnificent recuperative spirit of the Jewish people is one of the finest and most helpful aids we have in solution of our problems. Though our conditions be unique, and the causes thereof be peculiar to ourselves, I yet believe it advisable and desirable that this Conference should engage in the study of other questions which are not specifically Jewish, because, after all, underneath all distress and all forms of poverty, underneath everything that may come to us in the shape of those who appeal to us for help, no matter what may have been the cause of it, whatever form of moral or economic inefficiency there may be, we have under it the one common form of humanity, the one common body that suffers and heart that is anguished. An old Latin poet said: "I am a man, and nothing that is human do I consider as alien or foreign to me." While we are dealing with specifically Jewish problems, and while it is right that we should maintain our

Jewishness, and I will add that on occasions we should emphasize our Jewishness, yet we are also men, and nothing that comes to us in the form of a cry for help, and nothing that appeals to our sympathy or aid, should be foreign to us or alien to this National Conference of Jewish Charities.

I believe that the study of other problems and of other conditions will be likewise helpful to us. The old rabbinic maxim had it: "From all my disciples I learn," and though I do not pretend to say that other charitable organizations are disciples of ours, still I do say that taking the note of co-operation which this question sounds, that the study of conditions that are not specifically Jewish, of conditions that appeal for aid among others, and from other causes will likewise help us in the study of our conditions. I believe that co-operating with other organizations of this kind, learning from them of their experiences, and giving to them from our experience will be mutually helpful; that where we can learn we will take freely and gladly, and where we can help we will give freely and gladly. I believe, also, that this will bring us into that closer contact with our fellow citizens and neighbors that will make for a larger charity than that which speaks of material aid and material assistance. To reverse the lines of Pope that were quoted this morning, while it is true that in faith and in hope the world may disagree, that all mankind's concern is charity, yet in neighborly and brotherly co-operation on the wide field of charity all of us, Jewish or non-Jewish, will learn this one thing that, while faith and hope are not to be put aside, yet the forms of faith and hope, that differ from one another, will not be found to be of such importance but that we may learn that larger faith and that nobler hope which speaks to us of our common brotherhood and our dependence upon the one common Father of us all.

Dr. H. G. Enelow, Louisville, Ky.: I confess to some embarrassment at this moment, as I am down on the program for the discussion of a paper, as you can see; and you know that we really haven't had a paper on the subject announced officially. When

my friend, the secretary of the Conference, asked me whether I would consent to discuss such a paper I said that I should certainly be glad to do so, provided I were given an opportunity of acquainting myself with its contents. The secretary was kind enough to answer that the paper would be sent to me some time before its presentation at the Conference. However, the paper never came. I thought I might have an opportunity of hearing it read. Now, it is unpleasant to criticize the speaker, especially as he is absent this afternoon, and I assure you I do not consider it a very agreeable task. But the fact is the paper was really not presented, and for that reason, by rights, I ought not to be called upon to discuss it. What we have heard sounded very much like a conference sermon, but the program really did not call for a conference sermon, much as we members of the rabbinical profession might regret the fact.

Now, some of you may remember the Hebrew adage: "There is no use discussing a sermon." It would be a pleasant task, indeed, to dilate on the eloquence and the dramatic manner of the speaker yesterday afternoon, but I have been asked to speak about a definite subject, and it will be best for me and for the Conference, as our time is limited, to confine myself to it.

There is another adage of which I am reminded this afternoon: "Where the sun shines brightly, of what use is a little taper?" That is exactly how I feel this afternoon. I am really a novice here; I have never been to the Conference of Jewish Charities before; I don't feel that as a matter of justice I should be called on to discuss the question of the scope of the Conference when so many of the pioneers and valiant fighters of the movement are present. I came here more to learn than to teach, and it would behoove me very little indeed to try to teach some of you, who have made this Conference what it is, who have promoted to a great extent the organized charitable work of the Jewish community of this country, and who have been helpful in promoting the larger philanthropic movements. But I will proceed to do what I have been asked to as well as I can.

I regret that I shall have to disagree with the speaker who preceded me in my answer to the categorical question on the program. We are asked, Should this Conference discuss sub-

jects that are not peculiarly Jewish, such as agricultural schools and trade schools, such as the Jewish community in its needs shares with the general non-Jewish community? The last speaker has said it was his view that such subjects should be brought within the province of this Conference. I do not agree with him. I think that such discussions should be strictly eliminated from the meetings of the National Conference of Jewish Charities and for the following reasons:

In the first place, I think that there are very few communities indeed in this country, in which such problems as bear on the creation of trade schools and agricultural schools are of sufficiently large proportion, in relation to the Jewish community, as to require separate study. Take a city like New York, for instance, or Chicago, where the Jewish population is very large, and where there are large masses of Jewish people that may need such institutions. In such a community the problem pertaining to the establishment of trade schools or similar institutions may be of particular interest to the Jewish community. But this is not the case in the larger number of the Jewish communities of our country, and I think that we should always remember that this conference is a National Conference of Jewish Charities—that while it is true that a city like New York or Chicago, owing to the multiplicity of its problems and the size of its Jewish population, is bound to play a very important part in the discussions and problems of this Conference—nevertheless this Conference is a national organization, and one of its chief purposes is to bring help, enlightenment and instruction to the men and women who come here from all over the country. Now in the great majority, preponderating majority, of American cities the Jewish population is not sufficiently large to require a separate discussion of the problem of trade schools, for instance. I mention trade schools because it so chances that I am interested just now in the question of trade schools in my own community.

In Louisville we have been talking about the inauguration of a movement in favor of trade schools recently, but I do not find, in dealing with the question, any particular reason for raising the point of Jewish trade schools. There is no such thing

as a Jewish trade school. We don't teach Jewish carpentry, or Jewish bricklaying, or Jewish masonry. Hitherto trade schools have been established by individual philanthropists or by societies, but at present the question has arisen whether, in the course of time, we may not succeed in making trade schools part and parcel of our public school systems. Thus far, I believe, only one community has succeeded in establishing such a school in connection with its public school system. At any rate, it is not a distinctly Jewish problem; it is a problem which our communities share with the remainder of the population.

But even in New York (I think the gentleman from New York will agree with me) trade schools do not present a distinctly Jewish problem. You may be called upon to establish in the congested district of New York, where the majority of the population are Jews, a trade school which will, in the course of time, be attended largely by Jewish boys and girls, but that does not make it a Jewish trade school.

For this reason I feel that we ought not to introduce the subject of trade schools or similar institutions into the meetings of our National Jewish Conference. The place to discuss such questions—the center to which we ought to bring all we have to say on such a subject and all that will shed light on it—is the National Conference of Charities.

Now, Mr. President, you said in your opening remarks. I believe, that we are all members of the National Conference. Of course we are, and if we are not, we ought to be. One of the watchwords of the movement of organized philanthropy today is co-operation. We are always talking about not duplicating work, and this is just the place where we should apply this principle of co-operation and economy. If we ought to have no overlapping, or duplication, of work done by individuals or societies, certainly there should be none in respect to the relation of the Jewish Conference of Charities and the National Conference of Charities and Corrections. Why duplicate discussion of philanthropies that concern us all alike? This, I think, really disposes of the question.

And if you will permit me I want to say right here that this is a view that I take even locally as to the doing of certain kinds of

philanthropic work. I don't know how many will agree with me in this, but I feel that even locally such work as child labor work, as juvenile court work and all similar activities ought not to be split up between the different sections of the community. I do not see why there should be a group of Jewish women doing such work separately, and a committee of Protestant women again doing it separately, and so on, in their own little sphere or circle. If a community has a child-labor association, I think every man or woman, Jew, Protestant or Catholic, who is interested, ought to enter into that association and do whatever she or he can to contribute towards its success, morally and financially, instead of keeping on multiplying committees to do that same work simply to gain glory for some particular organization that wants to have its say. This being my view even in regard to the local activities in which the whole community is interested, you will readily understand why I should be opposed to the introduction of the separatist idea into the National Conference of Jewish Charities.

But then some may say—and I have heard such doubts expressed here—what is this Conference going to do if we eliminate all such subjects from its program? What are we going to do for programs? By way of answer, permit me to remind you of the old rabbinic interpretation of the biblical verse: "Blessed be the Lord day by day." The Lord has provided for human life and human history in such a manner as to have for us always some new task. There is always a new item on the program, and I feel with respect to this Conference that as long as it remains a live, energetic and earnest organization it is going to have something to do, and I am not at all afraid of its becoming moribund for lack of work or topics of discussion.

There are certain tasks right here and now before this Conference, even with relation to work that some members of the Conference may imagine has already been accomplished. And here again, if you will pardon me, I must refer to the fact that this Conference does not represent merely the City of New York, or Chicago, or Cleveland, but the whole country, and the more sections of the country it gets to represent the better for the vitality and growth of the Conference. Take the question of

federation; one of the speakers has said that at the first Conference he had heard of federation, and it is not yet an accomplished fact. Of course not. It is an accomplished fact in six or seven cities, but there are a great many cities throughout the country in which it is not an accomplished fact as yet, and where public opinion on the subject is just as backward now as it was before the Conference was called into life. And if this Conference by virtue of its activity, by influence and agitation and propaganda can bring about a federation of the charities in our different cities, I think it will be doing a great work for many years to come. If I may cite my own community, I would say that for two or three years we have been trying to federate our charities. We have not succeeded as yet, though we are making progress. I am confident that from this very meeting of the Conference there will go forth a greater stimulus and inspiration to the people of Louisville to try to do that which some of you have been so fortunate as to accomplish some time ago.

There are a number of things which the Conference can continue to do along the line of its original program, and it will not have to go to pieces on account of lack of work. Then there is always going to be something new to do, as long as the Jewish community of this country is a vital, developing, striving community. My idea is that this note—active Jewishness—which has been struck here (and I am told it is a new note), is not going to be silenced with the closing of this Conference. It is going to ring on and on, and reverberate for many years to come. As Lincoln said, "You have not solved any problem unless you have solved it right;" and may I be permitted to say that I think it is not the right way to solve this problem by creating a prejudice in the minds of any class of our people against another class? Will you permit me to say—and I am saying it with all the earnestness at my command—that it is just as wrong to create prejudice among the Russian masses as against the German and American Jews, as it was for the German and American Jews to harbor a prejudice against the Russian Jews?

Now, let us take this to heart. I think that this is the great need of the hour. Let us use moderation in all that we do; and tolerance. I am afraid that all of us are apt

to go a little bit to the extreme, and become a trifle fanatical in the views we hold. Now, it may be true that some of the greatest work of humanity, as I need not tell you, has been done by fanatics, and it is necessary sometimes for us to have a little bit of fanaticism in our work, but we ought to avoid being too strenuous in it. We should try to work in a spirit of co-operation and charity, of tolerance and justice toward one another. It seems to me that none of these problems, whether of *kosher* or *trefah,* or orthodox or reform, none of them can be discussed in categorical terms; a great deal in every instance depends on conditions and circumstances, and upon the individuals involved in the work. This is an absolute truth—I know whereof I am speaking. I have in mind a hospital in our community; I have in mind a settlement, and other institutions, and observation and thought in connection with the work of these institutions, and reflection on the criticisms that have been uttered on this floor, lead me to say that we cannot solve any of our problems unless we are moderate in our views and our conclusions. There is, for instance, the kosher question. When we in Louisville first opened a Jewish hospital, largely for the benefit of the poor immigrant Jews, we heard a great deal of complaint about their not being allowed to eat Kosher, and being forced to eat trefah. There was not a soul in my community that really wanted to force these poor patients to eat trefah. That was not the purpose for which the hospital had been created, to do violence to the most sacred sentiments of the poor patients. Not one of the members of the Board, nor the Superintendent of the institution, wanted to do that. But when the matter was investigated it was discovered that the real trouble was that some of the poor women, through no fault of their own, but simply because they knew no better—the wives or mothers of the patients—wanted to introduce all manner of home food, which of course could not be sanctioned by the hospital authorities. Little difficulties of this character are often at the bottom of a great many of the serious complaints made.

But this is not my subject, and I am not going to talk about it any longer. I do wish to say, however, in conclusion, that we ought to stick to Jewish problems; we ought to stick to the dis-

cussion of Jewish subjects, and ought also to realize the fact that one of the greatest benefits of this Conference is the social contact brought about between the workers in the different communities, and the source of enlightenment, instruction, and inspiration that the Conference thus becomes; and I want to thank you, Mr. President, and all the older workers who have been here for years and years, for the great source of inspiration and pleasure the Conference has been to me personally, and I hope it will go on in this manner and do its good work and succeed.

DR. M. M. FEUERLICHT, Indianapolis, Ind.: Apologies seem to be in order, and I am sure that the explanation both my predecessors and colleagues have given applies likewise to me. I have only this to emphasize their statement—and inasmuch as they have quoted the Talmud I hope I also may be permitted to do so—I recall the Talmudic rule—"The lowest man in the discussion of a question should always be the first to give his opinion, lest he be influenced by those who precede him." The program has reversed and violated that rule, and has almost impelled me to feel this afternoon (especially after the interesting discussions by my colleagues), that I am "also a speaker, but not likewise."

Dr. Enelow has emphasized precisely the position that I desire to take upon this question. Whatever the program may mean by the term "specifically Jewish question," there is no doubt that there are in every Jewish community problems which are neither distinctly Jewish nor Christian, but in which both are mutually and vitally interested. They belong primarily to the state—they are civic, non-sectarian, if that term pleases you, as it did not this morning. The state, whether we like it or not (as Judge Mack hinted yesterday), is greatly enlarging its philanthropies, and is absorbing more and more of the burdens which heretofore each religious denomination has considered peculiarly its own. The Catholic, the Jew and the various denominations of the Protestants, each have their distinctive and separate hospitals, their homes for the aged, their orphan asylums and their institutions that are calculated to supply the needs of a more or less primitive charity; but with the increase in our population the burdens are becoming too great for each to bear sepa-

rately, and so they have all united to shift the burden upon the common protector, the state. Accordingly, we are witnessing in this country what I, for one, do not deplore, in spite of the aspersions that were made this morning upon "non-sectarianism" in Judaism—we are witnessing in this country the realization of one of the sublimest ideals of democracy: In the place of the union of church and state, we are having a union of charity and the state; and in the process of that union—of that unification, the Jew, outside of "abnormal" New York even, is contributing his proportionate share. Whether the Jew wants it or not, it is one of the unconscious, the inevitable, but still beneficent phases of his assimilation into American life. That is particularly true in the smaller cities, and by smaller I do not mean Birmingham, Mobile or Atlanta, but even Cincinnati, Cleveland or Louisville—any city outside of New York. While the Jew in New York or even in Chicago may build his isolated Kosher hospitals or orphan asylums, and orthodox homes for the aged, the state is constantly building more and more of its institutions for the defective and the dependent. It is building its villages for epileptics, its sanatoria for consumptives, its industrial and technical institutions for the indigent. Separate institutions for Jews, as Dr. Enelow hinted, are manifestly impossible, unless, as Dr. Zepin suggested yesterday, the fraternal organizations will undertake to build them.

But I am no prophet, nor the son of a prophet. It requires one to be neither to predict that this will not be done in one generation. In the meantime, what shall be the attitude of the local Jewish charities to this proposition? What method shall they pursue in order to permit the Jew to enjoy the benefits which the state affords, and at the same time permit him to preserve his Jewish identity, and prevent his complete disruption and disintegration at least in a religious sense? This is what I understand by a specifically "Jewish" question. It is not, at least so far as the country at large is concerned, a question of orthodoxy or reform, of kosher or trefah, of uptown or downtown, of Roumanian or Russian. It is not a question which concerns us alone even; we have grown, outside of New York, to a point where we have problems with those who are outside of

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

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

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

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

DISCUSSION OF DR. WISE'S PAPER.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

as the most orthodox Jew would wish. I won't agree to give this "gafilter" fish—if that is the right name for it—I think I struck it pretty closely, anyway; but not long ago I saw in a Jewish paper in New York a letter from a Jewish rabbi appointed by me to visit the Jewish patients and inmates of our institutions, saying that some of the inmates of the City Home (you know that is a pleasant way of saying Alms House), were obliged to eat ham, and that they were very much opposed to it; and he wanted to take up a collection to buy them other food. So I sent for him and said, "Don't take up any collections to buy food for the Jewish inmates of the City Home. The City of New York is able and willing to buy everything that is necessary, in order to give them the kind of food they want; they don't have to eat ham, and, further than that, I want you to let me know every dollar you have received from that appeal, and just what was done with it, because I like to discourage appeals of that sort. The city wants to do the right thing by those people. Now not long ago a lady came to me and said, "You know we are going to have the Passover Week soon; do you think you can give the Jewish inmates of the institution *motzas?*'" I said, "All they want of them." So that was settled; I told the dietitian to order in all the motzas they could possibly eat. Then she came later and said, 'Do you think you could let them have extra meat and cakes?" I said, "Certainly, they can have all the extra meat and cakes they want." Well, that was settled. Then a little later she said, "Do you think you can give them"——I said, "all they want." A little later the dietitian said, "They want to know if they can have some prunes?" I said, "Let them have all they want." And that is the way I think all such things should be met. It does not cost any more; it is a little more trouble, but if everybody is pleased and happy, why not do it?

Now, at the City Hospital, which is on the south end of Blackwell's Island—and which, I think, perhaps very egotistically, is one of the best hospitals in the city—we are building a new service building; it is going to be a fine building, too; it will cost us about $150,000; and that building is to have a refrigerating plant, a storage capacity, and kitchens and dining rooms, and in that building we are putting a kosher kitchen, and we expect to run it on strictly kosher lines.

Now, I don't happen to be responsible for Gouverneur Hospital, which is one of the public hospitals. That hospital is under the Board of Trustees of Bellevue and allied hospitals, of which I am a one-seventh part, but I think Mr. Nelson is mistaken when he says its wards are not crowded. I think they are overcrowded, and that is the reason they had to extend the hospital. The dispensary is certainly overcrowded every day, so that they had to buy additional land on which to erect a new dispensary. I think there is plenty of room for the kosher hospitals, and the non-kosher hospitals, and that we should all work together, in public and private charity, and do that which is right and just and equitable; and I think if we are imbued with the right spirit we will have no difficulty whatever in reaching a satisfactory agreement, and doing our work so that every one will feel that we are doing it in the right spirit. I thank you for this—may I call it opportunity, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Bernard Greensfelder, St. Louis. The general topic for discussion is the functions of the National Conference of Jewish Charities. I have nothing to say in reference to the situation in New York, but one remark made by Dr. Wise attracted my attention, and that was, that the Conference should stand as a keynote for something. The point that I want to call to your attention is this: that I believe it should be the purpose of this Conference, after listening to these magnificent papers delivered by the gentlemen whom you have heard, to have prepared a resume or syllabus of these different papers, and that the Conference should adopt a resolution setting forth whether they are in favor of each of the propositions, or not; and that a pamphlet be prepared by the Executive Committee and circulated immediately, or as soon after this Conference as possible, among the members of the Conference, and sent to the other organizations, not members of the Conference—to the congregations and similar institutions that are engaged in this work. And if it is not out of place at this time, I offer this motion: That the incoming Executive Committee be instructed to prepare a resume or syllabus of each one of the papers that have been presented, and draft a set of resolutions voicing the sentiment of this Conference on these

different points. I submitted this proposition to Mr. Sulzberger informally a little while ago, and when he said to you that he had spoken enough, he did not tell you that he had written something also. He has prepared a set of resolutions, which may be added to, or cut down, or altered in any way that the Executive Committee may deem best—but just for the purpose of showing what Mr. Sulzberger and I intended to convey, for instance: *Resolved,* That in every Jewish community efforts should be made to unify all communal activities, and to that end the Conference recognize a closer affiliation between the various component elements of the community, and a more determined attempt at a common understanding of the different view-points (That should be under the first paper.)

Resolved, That the Conference regards the maintenance of a Jewish atmosphere in educational institutions as one of the most important factors in the development of character.

Resolved, That inter-municipal co-operation in cities not capable of supporting separate institutions, is important, and this Conference will do all in its power to encourage such co-operation.

Resolved, That the efficiency of the National Hospital for Consumptives should not be impaired by sending such advanced cases as are not suitable for treatment in that institution.

Resolved, That the National Conference of Jewish Charities is to deal only with such questions as have a distinctly Jewish bearing; and that to consider questions not having such a bearing is a form of sectarianism that cannot be too strongly deprecated.

Now, this is the general point that I have to suggest to this Conference; and that will answer the question. I say it will help this Conference, and it will help us in our work—not only in the larger communities, but in the smaller ones; and this motion I have made I hope may be acted upon in due time.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will act on this when we come to the business session.

MEMBERSHIP.

MR. GINSBURG: I am glad the President has passed this along to the business session, because I think it is truly a matter that belongs to the business part of the Conference. I have had the privilege of

being on the Membership Committee, and probably this was the outcome of a suggestion I made two years ago along the same line. I know the Jewish people have always been slow to be missionaries, and to me it has always been the thought that probably we have missed a large part of our history because we were not missionaries, but I made the suggestion two years ago—and I want to repeat it very briefly—that if this Conference means anything (and it ought to mean a great deal to all the communities of this country), we ought not to be satisfied to leave the work done only at the Conference. In the large correspondence I have had—possibly with every Jewish community of any size in the United States (and I say it very deliberately, because during the past four years I have been in communication with every single Jewish organization of a charitable nature in the United States—a very broad statement, but the Jewish Year Book, which I have used, has been my guide), I have found simply a terrific lack of knowledge about questions connected with the charitable work in the United States. Without going any further it might be proper to say that there are very large communities in this country in which (Dr. Enelow made the statement very emphatically) there is still work for this Conference, when Louisville is yet to form a federation. Now if that happens to Louisville—I want to say we have only two cities in the State of Michigan, who are members of this Conference, that have any conception of what the Conference is intended to do, or any conception of what charity work means along Jewish lines.

Without saying anything derogatory to the National Council of Jewish Women, or of the B'nai B'rith Clubs throughout the country, it seems strange that there should be such an amount of ignorance as has been manifested by the correspondence which has come into the hands of Mr. Kriegshaber and myself from communities in this country; and it has occurred to me and to the members of our Membership Committee that it is about time, if this large wave of immigration is to continue into New York, and if that immigration is to go still further—to the West—that something practical should be done, for which this Conference ought to stand. I suggested that we distribute, if possible to do so, pamphlets touching upon questions belonging to the Jewish Con-

ference, and send them broadcast through the country. You would be surprised to see some of the questions which have come to me, in connection with the work of the Conference, and there were special suggestions made in connection with this work which I think ought to be discussed from a business standpoint.

The question of a field Secretary involves a good deal, and yet some practicable and feasible plan might be worked out.

There is still another suggestion, made by our very modest Second Vice-President, that we solicit personal memberships in the Conference—not simply organizations and associations. I I found that in a great many small towns throughout the country there were some few people who were interested in charity work and who wanted to become members of the Conference. We have been in existence now for ten years, and I think the brother said we have something like 125 members in our Conference. Now just imagine! We have only 125 organizations in this country, members of this Conference. It is a question that should be considered from a practical standpoint. We talk a good deal about the City of New York. We have been calling it "abnormal." I think it is very normal. And there is another suggestion—I say it very candidly and very sincerely, as a man living outside of New York, that we must help the people there solve their problems, and the only way we can help them is to have a continuous chain of organizations throughout the country, that will help and assist New York, and by assisting New York we are going to relieve the problems that belong to all the charity organizations in this country. So I think we ought to take the question up from a very practical, business-like standpoint, as a very important part of the future work of the Conference—how can we get at these little communities?

There is just one more suggestion: It was suggested in the case of Worcester, Mass., which begged for some one to come there and organize that community, that possibly we could have some nearby organization send its representative there. I am sorry to have to criticise my friend, Mr. Max Mitchell, of Boston, but he promised faithfully to go there. I understand, however, that he is a very busy man, and there was no one available to go there—it is the old saying that what is everybody's work is nobody's work; and if it were possible, as I think it is, I believe it would be a good

idea to work out some plan by which we could have someone go to these cities. In my own state, Grand Rapids, with 100,000 people, has no organization of any consequence—they know absolutely nothing about it. Toledo, a city of 150,000, just federated their charities in the last twelve months. Now it seems to me we have listened to a great deal about the work of the Conference from the social service standpoint; and speaking purely as the Chairman of the Membership Committee for the last four years, we really feel that there is a necessity for something tangible to be done by the National Conference of Jewish Charities.

I wish to submit my report as Chairman of the Membership Committee:

Our work has not been as successful during the past two years, as it was for the preceding two years.

Mr. Kriegshaber has worked very studiously and energetically, and is able to submit some very promising reports.

The writer has sent out a great many letters, and has been very persistent in his efforts to secure memberships, but there seems to be some reason why we are not able to get a larger membership at the present time.

Inasmuch as there is going to be a larger discussion along the lines connected with the work of this Committee, it will be better to defer a detailed statement, such as I wish to make, until that time.

The memberships that have been added during the past two years are as follows:

DETROIT DISTRICT.

Sioux City, Iowa.....Jewish Ladies' Aid Society.
Kalamazoo, Mich.....Congregation B'nai Israel.
Troy, N. Y...Ladies' Society, Cong. Berith Shalom.
Muncie, Ind.....Congregation Beth El.
Ligonier, Ind.....G. J. Straus.

V. H. KRIEGSHABER.

Pensacola, Fla.,
Paducah, Ky,
Louisville, Ky.,
Vicksburg, Miss.,
Meridian, Miss.,
Dallas, Texas,
Savannah, Ga.,
Macon, Ga.,
Charleston, W. Va.,
Alexandria, Va.,
Richmond, Va.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the Committee which is to make nominations, I would like to say one word to Richmond. It has been a common practice for conferences or conventions that have met in any city, to pass resolutions of thanks for the treatment which their members have received at the hands of the local community. I have talked this matter over with some of the members of our Executive Committee, and it has seemed to us that it would be an exceedingly poor acknowledgment of what has been done for us here, to pass a resolution. We think it would be rather more logical to say nothing, because you have probably noticed all through these discussions that the men who meant most, and had the most to say, said the least. So we feel that if we pass no formal resolution, but let you know, as you must know, —from our conduct—how we feel, that you will appreciate our thanks a great deal more than if we were to have them engrossed on a piece of paper. Moreover, you have here in Richmond paid us the great compliment by your very large and enthusiastic attendance. It does seem to me that it would be very absurd if we should pass a resolution of thanks here, and then try to deliver it to you, because I am sure many of you would make the mistake of voting on the resolution, and we could not send it anywhere, or do anything with it but leave it here—where you all are. So I trust you will take through me, from the Conference, the assurance that no reception could have been more hospitable, and no attendance more complimentary, than that which we have enjoyed here in Richmond. We will now hear from the Committee on Nominations:

BUSINESS MEETING.

JUDGE MACK: The Committee on Nominations beg leave to report the following ticket, which they earnestly hope may be successful:

President, Jacob H. Hollander, Baltimore, Md.

First Vice-President, Martin A. Marks, Cleveland, Ohio.

Second Vice-President, Mrs. Max Landsberg, Rochester, N. Y

Secretary, Louis H. Levin, Baltimore, Md.

Treasurer, Bernard Greensfelder, St. Louis, Mo.

For members of the Executive Committee (in addition to the ex-Presidents of the Conference, who are Messrs. Max Senior, of

Cincinnati; Max Herzberg, of Philadelphia; Julian W. Mack, of Chicago, and Nathan Bijur, of New York), the following:

Samuel S. Fleischer, Philadelphia, Pa.
Joseph H. Cohen, New York, N. Y.
Lee K. Frankel, New York, N. Y.
Julian Rosenwald, Chicago, Ill.
Lucius Solomons, San Francisco, Cal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegates and members of the Conference, you have heard the report; what is your pleasure? Is there going to be an active contest, or can we have a motion?

MR. LOWENSTEIN: I move that the ticket just read be elected by acclamation.

A MEMBER: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of the ticket you have heard read will please say aye; contrary minded, no. It seems to me that that ticket is unanimously elected, and I so declare it. All in favor of referring these resolutions to the Executive Committee, with power, will say aye; contrary minded, no. The ayes have it; and the resolutions will be referred to the Committee.

MR. LEVIN: I don't know whether it is the custom for the Conference of Jewish Charities to pass resolutions of the kind offered this afternoon, but I do know that the National Conference of Charities and Corrections makes it a special point never to pass a set of resolutions that will commit its body to any distinct policy. It is its policy to have the National Conference an open forum, and it will not under any circumstances as I understand it (and if there are any members of that Conference here I hope they will correct me if I am in error) commit the Conference to any policy, especially as in the course of the development of social work and charity work, it will perhaps in a short time have to change and modify its views; and I call attention particularly to a very serious objection to the passing of resolutions of the kind that have been offered. Those resolutions indicate a policy which will, or may, affect certain institutions, members of this Conference. I take it that the members here have

no authority to vote upon the resolutions presented here, and I think we would be doing ourselves an injustice, and making a great mistake, to say, for instance, that a certain policy shall be pursued in child labor work or in connection with hospital work; for when we come to the next Conference certain institutions may say, "We will not send delegates there, because the Conference has passed resolutions which we do not accept." Moreover, I think it would be mischievous for us to pass a set of resolutions, drafted, it seems to me, hurriedly. If we wish to take this matter up, it should go over at least to the next meeting of the Conference. Let the questions be studied and thoroughly sifted, and then let the Committee report, and if we then think it is a function of the National Conference to declare what the policy should be along certain lines, every delegate coming here will know that he will be called upon to vote, and will have the question clarified in his mind, and can vote on it intelligently. I think it would be dangerous, in our present state of information, to take a vote on those resolutions. I, therefore, move that they be laid on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: You need not make that motion, because, if you recall what the practice is in the National Conference, they have a Committee on Resolutions. Those resolutions which are executive and administrative, are generally brought to its immediate attention, but resolutions which commit the institution to a policy are taken as being more an expression of individual views, and not reported, and our Executive Committee has generally performed that same function, except that we have two years to reflect on the resolutions, and they improve with age.

MR. GINSBURG: I would like to suggest to the Conference a matter for discussion. I am surprised Mr. Fleischer has not anticipated what I was going to say, because the suggestion originated with him last night. Two years seems to be a long time between the meetings of the Conference. We were last night discussing the question, and felt that if it were only for the personal intercourse that was derived, that possibly it might be a good idea to change from biennial to annual sessions; and I would like to make that recommendation to the Executive Committee,

and have them take it under consideration, and see if we cannot commence next year with the first annual meeting. If necessary, I will hand that in as a resolution, to the Secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: They can report that. You will remember we took up a number of resolutions which were offered at the last Conference. In their case we have virtually acted on the resolutions without expressing any opinion; so they do get to be effective when referred to the Executive Committee. If the Executive Committee finds it necessary to have an amendment to the Constitution, they can report it to the next meeting.

MR. KRIEGSHABER: Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following motion: That the Executive Committee be authorized to provide ways and means of paying the expenses of a Field Secretary, and if necessary, create an individual or associate membership of this Conference.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. What is your pleasure? All those in favor will say aye; contrary minded, no. The ayes have it, and the motion is carried.

DR. BOGEN: I wish to say that the Superintendents met last evening, and we have decided to form a permanent organization, if possible, in connection with the Conference of Charities. A committee of five has been appointed, and they are going to see what the Superintendents have to say about it. I wish this to be embodied so that the next President will not forget us, as the former one did.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you mean by the former President, myself, I will say that the Superintendents were not forgotten, and an arrangement was made for their meeting, but Max Mitchell was detained in Boston by the Chelsea fire. It will be noted by the stenographer, and will go before the Executive Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: It gives me great pleasure, in the absence of our new President, to introduce our new Vice-President. He will please take the Chair, as the law would not permit me to remain in it longer, now that he is here.

VICE-PRESIDENT MARTIN A. MARKS, Cleveland, O.: I certainly appreciate the compliment of having bestowed upon me another office in addition to the twenty-five that I now hold in Charitable and Communal work—this makes the twenty-sixth, and I had solemnly promised that twenty-five would be the limit. It will be an honor to be associated with the distinguished gentleman whom you have elected as the President of this Conference.

I know that he accepts that position with great personal sacrifice. When within the last hour or two I was informed that I was to be nominated for First Vice-President, knowing of the efforts that had been made to persuade Dr. Hollander to accept the Presidency to which he finally consented, I felt I did not have the right to refuse. Consequently, I am willing to act as an assistant to that gentleman.

I feel that we should not forget those who have served our cause so faithfully during the past two years. Two years ago it was my pleasure and privilege to offer a resolution of thanks to Judge Mack, and to those who assisted him, and I wish now to present this motion, to be placed upon our records; that the thanks of this body, and of all those interested in the noble work of organized Charity be tendered to President Nathan Bijur, to Vice-President Ginsburg, and to the Second Vice-President, Mrs. Eckhouse; to the members of the Executive Committee, and last, but not least, to my distinguished fellow fat man, our conscientious Secretary, Solomon Lowenstein, who has done so much towards making this Conference a success. All may vote upon this question. All in favor of the motion will say aye. Those opposed, no. You are all duly thanked.

Now is there any other matter to come before the Conference? If not, we will declare the meeting adjourned.

REPORT OF TREASURER.

RECEIPTS.

1907.			
Nov.	27th	Balance on hand per last report.....	$1,791.45
Dec.	21st	Hebrew Ben. Society, New Haven, Conn.	5.00
Dec.	23rd	Jewish Charitable and Educational Union	40.00
Dec.	27th	Hebrew Charity Assn., Wilmington, Del.	10.00
1908.			
Jan.	2nd	United Hebrew Relief Assn., Louisville..	5.00
Jan.	3rd	Ladies' Hebrew Ben. Society, Vicksburg..	5.00
Jan.	8th	Ladies' Hebrew Ben. Society, Savannah..	5.00
		Federated Jewish Charities, Youngstown, O.	5.00
Jan.	13th	Y. M. H. A. of N. Y.....	5.00
Jan.	14th	Hebrew Ben. Society, Waco, Texas.....	5.00
		Jewish Ladies' Society, Bloomington, Ill..	5.00
		Rothschild Bros., Ithaca, N. Y.....	10.00
Jan.	15th	Daughters of Israel Relief Society, Oakland, California	10.00
Jan.	17th	Jewish Relief Society, St. Paul, Minn...	5.00
Jan.	23rd	Home for Hebrew Orphans, Phila.....	10.00
		Hebrew Relief Soc., Birmingham, Ala....	5.00
Jan.	25th	Touro Infirmary and Hebrew Ben. Assn., New Orleans.....	25.00
Feb.	1st	Hot Springs Relief Society, Hot Springs, Arkansas	5.00
Feb.	12th	Hebrew Ben. Society, Baltimore.....	21.00
		Bicker Cholem Society, St. Paul.....	5.00
Feb.	13th	Free Synagogue, N. Y.....	5.00
		Hebrew Orphan's Home, Atlanta.....	13.00
		Jewish Foster Home and Orphan's Asylum, Philadelphia.....	25.00
		Women's Sewing Society, Boston.....	5.00
Feb.	14th	Jewish Ladies' Aid Soc., Bloomington, Ill.	5.00
		United Jewish Charities, Detroit.....	5.00
		Congregation Beth Ahabah, Richmond, Va.	5.00
		Ladies' Hebrew Ben. Assn., Norfolk.....	10.00
Feb.	17th	Council Jewish Women, New York.....	5.00

	Congregation Mickva Israel, Savannah...	5.00
	Federation Jewish Charities, Atlanta....	5.00
	United Jewish Charities, Syracuse, N. Y.	5.00
	Ladies' Hebrew Ben. Soc., Niagara Falls.	5.00
Feb. 18th	Jewish Charities, Columbus, Ohio.....	5.00
	Ladies' Auxiliary Y. M. H. A., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.....	5.00
	Jewish Ladies' Aid Society, Sioux City, Ia.	5.00
Feb. 19th	United Hebrew Charities, Mobile, Ala....	5.00
	Hebrew Ben. Soc., Evansville, Ind.....	5.00
	Hebrew Ben. Soc., Galveston, Texas.....	5.00
	Fed. Jewish Charities, Cleveland.....	46.00
Feb. 22nd	United Hebrew Relief Assn., Pittsburg...	8.00
Feb. 24th	Congregation Adath Israel, Louisville....	5.00
	Ladies' Hebrew Aid Society, Reading, Pa.	10.00
Feb. 25th	Jewish Ladies' Ben. Soc., St. Joseph.....	5.00
Feb. 26th	Hebrew Ben. Soc., Colorado Springs.....	5.00
	Jewish Ladies' Aid Society, Lincoln, Neb.	5.00
	Hebrew Ben. Soc., Los Angeles, Cal.....	5.00
	Jewish Women's Ben. Soc., Portland, Ore.	5.00
	Emanu-El Sisterhood, San Francisco....	5.00
	Hebrew Ladies' Ben. Soc., Toledo.....	5.00
	United Jewish Charities, Cincinnati, O..	28.00
Feb. 28th	United Hebrew Charities, New York....	50.00
	United Hebrew Charities, Philadelphia...	27.00
	Leopold Morse Home and Orphanage, Mattapan, Mass.....	10.00
	Hebrew Ben. Soc., Charleston, S. C.....	5.00
March 4th	The Jewish Federation, Indianapolis.....	5.00
	Braddock Lodge, Braddock, Pa.....	5.00
	Bureau of Personal Service, Chicago.....	5.00
	Young Women's Union, Philadelphia.....	14.00
March 5th	Eureka Ben. Assn., San Francisco.....	21.00
March 7th	Jewish Relief Society, Denver.....	5.00
	Jewish Women's Ben. Soc., Houston.....	5.00
	Hebrew Relief Assn., Peoria.....	20.00
March 11th	United Hebrew Charity Assn., Lancaster Pennsylvania	5.00

	Jewish Ladies' Relief Assn., Scranton, Pa.	5.00
	Hebrew Ladies' Ben. Soc., Minneapolis...	5.00
March 16th	Hebrew Free Loan Assn., New York.....	5.00
	Hebrew Relief Society, Nashville, Tenn..	5.00
March 18th	Hebrew Relief Assn., Pine Bluff, Ark....	5.00
	Temple Aid Society, Duluth.....	5.00
	Hebrew Orphan Asylum and Ben. Society, New York.....	5.00
March 19th	Hebrew Ladies' Ben. Society, Richmond..	5.00
	Congregation Emanu-El, Dallas.....	5.00
March 20th	Federated Jewish Charities, Buffalo.....	6.00
March 23rd	Federated Jewish Charities, Baltimore....	50.00
	First Hebrew Ben. Assn., Portland, Ore..	15.00
March 26th	United Hebrew Relief Assn., Memphis...	10.00
March 31st	Hebrew Ben. Society, Albany, N. Y.....	5.00
April 2nd	Baron De Hirsch Fund.....	50.00
	Jewish Orphan Asylum, Cleveland.....	50.00
	United Hebrew Charities, Wheeling, W.Va.	5.00
April 6th	United Jewish Charities, Rochester, N. Y.	5.00
	Orphan Asylum Assn. of Western N. Y., Rochester	5.00
April 8th	Orphan Asylum Assn. of Western N. Y., Rochester	2.00
April 11th	Jewish Char. and Ed. Union, St. Louis..	40.00
	Jewish Aid Society, Chicago.....	86.00
	Jewish Relief Society, Salt Lake City....	5.00
April 14th	Hebrew Relief Union, Fort Wayne, Ind..	5.00
	Orphans and Guardian, Philadelphia.....	5.00
	Federated Jewish Charities, Youngstown, Ohio	5.00
	Federation Jewish Charities, Boston.....	12.00
	Assn. for Relief of Jewish Widows and Orphans, New Orleans.....	25.00
	Ladies' Heb. Ben. Society, Seattle, Wash..	5.00
April 15th	United Hebrew Charities, Washington...	15.00
	Hebrew Ladies' Relief Assn., Kansas City, Missouri	5.00
	Hebrew Ben. Society, Alexandria, Va....	5.00

	Daughters of Israel Relief Society, Oakland, Cal.	5.00
April 17th	United Hebrew Relief Assn., Louisville.	5.00
April 20th	Hebrew Relief Assn., Milwaukee	20.00
	United Heb. Charities, Montgomery, Ala.	10.00
	Associated Jewish Charities, Vicksburg, Mississippi	5.00
April 22nd	Mt. Sinai Congregation, El Paso, Texas.	5.00
April 24th	Y. M. H. A., New York	5.00
April 25th	Hebrew Ben. Society, New Haven, Conn	5.00
	Hebrew Charity Assn., Wilmington, Del.	5.00
April 29th	Congregation Beth El, Pensacola, Fla.	5.00
	Ladies' Aid Society, Portsmouth, O	5.00
	Interest on Deposit	13.40
		$2,963.85

DISBURSEMENTS.

1907.		
Dec. 17th	S. Lowenstein	$10.00
Dec. 26th	Accurate Printing Co	6.00
Dec. 27th	S. Lowenstein	5.00
Jan. 13th	Stettiner Bros	3.25
Jan. 25th	S. Lowenstein	5.00
Jan. 27th	Stettiner Bros	836.28
Feb. 10th	S. Lowenstein	5.00
Feb. 24th	Stettiner Bros	1.50
Feb. 24th	Jos. Pedott	50.00
March 16th	S. Lowenstein	5.00
March 21st	S. Ginsberg & Bros	15.35
April 11th	Jos. Pedott	150.00
April 11th	S. Lowenstein	5.00
April 27th	S. Lowenstein	5.00
April 29th	S. Ginsberg & Bros	11.85
	Exchange	2.40
		$1,116.63

Total Receipts	$2,963.85
Total Disbursements	1,116.63
Balance	$1,847.22

The retiring Treasurer, on May 31, 1906, paid me $619.50 on account of the Scholarship Fund. On February 24th we paid Jos. Pedott $50.00, and on April 11th, 1908, we paid him a further sum of $150.00, making a total of $200.00 drawn on account of the Scholarship Fund, leaving a balance of $419.50, which balance is included in the total balance of $1,847.22, as above.

Respectfully submitted,

BERNARD GREENSFELDER,

Treasurer.

INDEX.

ABRAMOVITZ, S. J., depicts Jewish beggars, 46.
AGED HOMES, 73, 74.
AGRICULTURAL SCHOOLS, not a subject for Jewish charity, 153.
ALCOHOLISM, not a general cause of poverty among Jews, 100.
AMERICANISM, 116.
AMERICANIZATION OF THE OLD, 125.
AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, 28.
"AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK," 28.
"AMERICAN REVIEW," Investigation by, 29.
ANNUAL SESSIONS, change to, from biennial, 180.

BALTIMORE, new hospital building in, 27;
home for tuberculosis in, 27.
BEGGARS, in Russia, 46;
traveling, 46;
"Heckdesh" for, 47.
BELLEVUE HOSPITAL, New York City, 165.
BETH ISRAEL HOSPITAL, New York City, 137.
BIJUR, NATHAN, presidential address of, 25–31.
BLAUSTEIN, DR. DAVID, member of committee to prepare paper on Russian Charities, 48; 122.
BLIND, care of the, 28.
B'NAI B'RITH: See I. O. B. B.
BOGEN, BORIS D., 143.
BOSTON, thorough organization in, 26;
a Greater Federation at, 27;
started social work in hospitals, 165.
BOX TAX: See Korobka.
BOYS, Jewish, rough elements, 75.
BRAMSON, L. M., 37, 47.
BREGMAN, of Grodno, 41.
BRODSKY, of Odessa, 41.
BROWNSVILLE, few consumptives from, in public institutions, 171.

CALISCH, DR. EDWARD N., reads Mr. Grabfelder's paper, 81;
discusses specifically Jewish character of the Conference, 149–151.
CANDLE TAX: See Korobka.
CARE OF CHILDREN IN NEW YORK, 161.
CASE of woman unprovided with food, 93.
CASE of widow with children in asylum, 103;
of women with children in asylum, 104, 162.
CATHOLIC PROTECTORY, Jewish children at, 136.
CHARITABLE PROGRESS, three stages of, 58.
CHARITIES, minor, in Russia, 44;
Jewish, ailment of, not functional, but organic, 92;
lacks extensiveness and intensiveness, 92;
gaps in, 93;
superintendents of should be leaders, 99.
CHARITY, Jewish, should apply the Mosaic principles, 107.
CHARITY ORGANIZATIONS, array of, 71.
CHARITY, Scientific, 80, 88, 164;
should be personal, 95;
officialism in, 97;
Jews should be pioneers in, 101;
preventive, 110;
ignorance of, 175.
CHAZANOWITCH, DR., of Bialostock, charity worker, 43.
CHEDARIM, 36.
CHELSEA, Mass., fire at, 26.
CHICAGO, tuberculosis in, 84.
CHRISTMAS, celebration of, 126.
CITY HOSPITAL, on Blackwell's Island, will have a kosher kitchen, 172.
CLEVELAND ORPHAN ASYLUM, 28, 79.
COLLECTION Boxes, 44–5.
COLLINS, DR. M., 165.
COLORADO, has no indigenous tuberculosis problem, 83;
incurables should not be sent to, 84.
CONFERENCE, see National Conference of Jewish Charities.
CONSTITUTION of the National Conference of Jewish Charities, 7–8.
CONVALESCENTS, relief work for, 95;
homes for, 165.
CO-OPERATION, intermunicipal, 71, 73;
for defectives, 72;
for delinquents, 74;
not new, 77;
among organizations, 150, 151.
COUNCIL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL INSTITUTIONS, 29.
COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, 138;
settlement work of, 138.

DEAF AND DUMB, care of the, 28.
DEBORAH ESTHER, of Wilna, 42.
DEFECTIVES, 72, 73.
DELEGATES, register of, 18–21.
DELINQUENTS, 70, 74;
co-operation for, 74;
in Chicago, 76;
Jewish, not different from others, 88;
state care of, 89;
training of, 90;
separate institutions for, 90;
and religion, 133;
and love of race, 134;
in Indianapolis, 160.
DENVER, two hospitals at, 62;
treatment of tuberculosis in, 74;
Jewish Hospital for Consumptives at, 81;
cases sent to, 82;
conditions in, ideal for cure of tuberculosis, 85, 86;
indiscriminate sending of patients to, 85;
case of patient with sarcoma, 85;
visiting nurses' associations in, 165.
DEPENDENTS, 70, 73.
DESERTION, 112.
DETROIT, federation in, 67.
DEVELOPMENT OF JEWISH COMMUNAL ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES, 49–50.
DIETARY LAW, complications arising from, 30.
DIET in institutions, 64.
DOWNTOWN INSTITUTIONS, 55;
federation of, in Baltimore, 56.
DUPLICATION of Jewish charitable activities, 53.

EDUCATIONAL ALLIANCE, in New York, religious activities of, 119;
Jewish character of, 127.
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, the need of a distinctly Jewish tendency in, 112–122.
EDUCATION in Russia, 36.
EMIGRATION, Jewish, forced, 71.
ENELOW, DR. H. G., 151.
ENGLAND, government control of charities in, 71.

FEDERATION, greater in Boston, 27;
rejected by New York, 29;
of charities, 51, 156;
of downtown institutions in Baltimore, 56;
hopeless in New York, 59;
at first conference, 143.
FEUERLICHT, DR. M. M., 158.
FIELD SECRETARY, need of, 147, 176, 181.
FISCAL CONDITIONS, improvement of, 52.
FRANKEL, DR. LEE K., 68, 109;
work of, for State Conference of Charities, 167;
"associate" of Dr. Devine, 167.
FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS, 76.
"FUNCTION OF THE CONFERENCE OF JEWISH CHARITIES, THE," 91–109.
FURTH, JACOB, 77.

GABAITE, The, a charity worker in Russia, 42.
GALVESTON MOVEMENT, 28, 168.
"GEMILATH CHASODIM," 39;
of Deborah Esther, in Wilna, 42.
GINSBURG, MR. BERNARD, 67, 69;
submits the report of the Membership Committee, 174–7.
GLACKENS LAW, in Illinois, 84.
GLENNON, ARCHBISHOP, of St. Louis, 80.
GOUVERNEUR HOSPITAL, empty beds in, 170;
overcrowded, 173.
GRABFELDER, SAMUEL, paper of, 81–87.
GREENSFELDER, BERNARD, 173.
GUTTMAN, DR. A., 63, 140.

HEBBARD, ROBERT, 171.
HEBREW INFANT ASYLUM, New York, 162.
HEBREW LANGUAGE, in Jewish educational institutions, 120;
study of, 125, 139.
HEBREW ORPHAN ASYLUM, New York City, 163.
HEBREW SHELTERING GUARDIAN SOCIETY, 28.
HEBREW UNION COLLEGE, philanthropic work studied at, 120.
HOLIDAYS, Jewish, celebration of, 126, 140.
HOLLANDER, PROF. JACOB H., paper of, 49–57.
HOSPITAL, Jewish, nature of, 95, 121–2;
tendency at, 137;
in Louisville, 157;
social work in, 165.
HOSPITALS in Russia, only in the large cities, 44.
HUTZLER, CHARLES, 127.

ICA: See Jewish Colozination Association.
IMMIGRANTS, number of, 71;
problems of, 71.
INCURABLES, 73.
INDIANAPOLIS has solved the problem of the delinquent, 160.
INSANE, 70.
INTERMARRIAGE, 126.
INTERMUNICIPAL CO-OPERATION IN CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES, 69-77.
I. O. B. B., 77, 78, 88;
intermunicipal work of, 78;
work with orphans, 79;
Aid to National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives, 82.

"JEWISH CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES IN RUSSIA," 31–48.
JEWISH COLONIZATION ASSOCIATION, 38.
JEWISH COMMUNITY OF NEW YORK, 60.
JEWISH INSTITUTIONS, the early, 50;
support of, 50, 51;
social worker needed in, 91;
emphasis on Jewishness in, 131.
JEWISHNESS, emphasis on, 131.
JEWISH PROTECTORY, New York City, 168, 170.
JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF AMERICA, 120.
JEWS, must take care of Jews, 71.
JUSTICE, 108, 111.
JUVENILE COURT, 75.

KAFTAN, SEMON, of Wilna, 32, 42.
KAMAIKY, LEON, 62–3.
KOROBKA, 33, 37, 38, 40;
farmed out, 35.
KOSHER DIET in hospitals, 157, 170;
in public institutions, 171.
KRIEGSHABER, V. H., paper of, 145–149.

LANDSBERG, DR. M., 65.
LEBANON HOSPITAL, New York, 137.
LERNER, M. G., 47.
LERNER, O. M., 34.
LEVIN, LOUIS H., 68, 179.
LEVY, DR. ROBERT, quoted on conditions in Colorado, 86.
LEWIN-EPSTEIN, ELIAS, member of committee to prepare paper on Russian charities, 48.
LILLIENTHAL, DR. MAX, 34.
LOAN AND SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS, in Russia, 39;
form of organization of, 39.
LOUISVILLE, federation in, 156.
LOWENSTEIN, S., 112, 161.

MACK, JUDGE JULIAN W., 87.
MAGNES, DR. J. L., 57.
MARCUSE, MR. MILTON E., 61.
MARGULIS, M. G., 34.
MARKS, MARTIN A., 182.
MARSHALL, LOUIS, paper of, 112–122.
MEAT TAX: See Korobka.
MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE, report of, 177.
MEMBERSHIP OF THE N. C. J. C., 17;
too small, 28;
personal, 176.
MENDELE MOCHER SPHORIM: See Abramovitz, S. J.
MEYER, THE SHOEMAKER, charity worker in Pinsk, 42–3.
MICHAEL REESE HOSPITAL, in Chicago, 27.
MOTTEL, RABBI OF SCHAVEL, charity worker, 43.
MOUNT SINAI HOSPITAL, New York City, 137, 165.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF JEWISH CHARITIES, Constitution of the, 7–8.
amendments to the constitution of the, 8;
interesting, 30;
warrant for existence of, 30;
an open forum, 88;
advisory jurisdiction of, 93;
should seek new needs, 94;
should rest on Jewish principles, 101;
constructive work of, 143;
specifically Jewish character of, 149.
NATIONAL JEWISH HOSPITAL FOR CONSUMPTIVES, at Denver, 27, 81;
relation of, to the local sanatoria, 82, 85;
statistics of, 87.
"NEED OF A DISTINCTLY JEWISH TENDENCY IN THE CONDUCT OF JEWISH EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, THE," 112–122.
NELSON, ABRAHAM, 134, 168.
NEW YORK CITY, new institutions in, 27;
protectory in, 27, 168, 170.

NEW YORK CITY, new buildings not in, 27;
Solomon and Betty Loeb Memorial Home for Convalescents, 27;
Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, 28;
institutions for the blind, deaf and dumb, 28;
rejected federation, 29;
federation in, impossible, 59;
reorganization of community, 60, 61;
duty of uptown Jews of, 60;
normal Jew in, 63–4;
care of children in, 161–2;
visiting nurses' associations, 165;
situation in, 169;
NOCHEM SHAMUS, charity worker of Grodno, 43.
NOMINATIONS, report of committee on, 178.

ODESSA, taxes in, 34;
education in, 37;
charitable institutions in, 41.
OFFICERS, 1906–08, 5;
1908–10, 6;
election of, 179.
ORGANIZATION, lacking in smaller communities, 146.
ORSHENSKY, G. O., Russian legal author, 33, 34, 47.

PALE OF JEWISH SETTLEMENT, 35, 36.
PAMPHLETS, on questions discussed at the Conference, 175.
PARENTAL SCHOOL, lack of Jewish religious training at, 132.
PARENTS AND CHILDREN, 142.
PENSIONS for teachers in Russia, 37.
PERLZWEIG, of Odessa, 41.
PERSONAL SERVICE in Russia, 42;
in small towns, 148.
PHILADELPHIA, new buildings in, 27.
PHILANTHROPY, government control of, 71.
PHYSICAL CULTURE, neglected by the Jew, 123–4;
must be introduced cautiously, 124.
PLACING-OUT SYSTEM, 102.
POLAND, charities of, 48.
POVERTY, no crime, 100;
less acute in the smaller communities, 146;
among Jews, 150.
PRIDE OF THE POOR, in Russia, 44.
PRISONER should support his family, 105;
our duty to the, 106.
PROBATION OFFICER, 94; lack of, in New York City, 168.
PROTECTORY, JEWISH, 27, 75, 90, 119.

RACE, love of, 134.
RELIEF WORK, 110;
in Russia, 37, 40;
in Odessa, 40;
in small cities, 146.
RELIGION, role of, in education, 113;
the function of, 128;
instruction in, 136;
not the only reason for Jewish existence, 144;
need not be injected into charity, 144;
emphasis on, 150.
REMOVAL OFFICE, 147.
REMOVAL WORK, at second conference, 143.
RESOLUTIONS, 173, 179;
left to the Executive Committee, 180.
RICHARDS, BERNARD G., member of committee to prepare paper on Russian charities, 48.
RICHMOND, programme of the meeting at, 22–24;
proceedings of the meeting at, 25;
hospitality of, 25, 178.
ROCHESTER, federation of charities in, 65.
ROSENBERG, MRS. HUGO, 138.
RUBENSTEIN, JUDGE PHILIP, 130.
RUSSIA, charitable activities in, 30, 31;
formation of the Kahal, 33;
Korobka, 33;
education in, 36;
ICA in, 38;
self-help and mutual aid in, 39;
problems of relief in, 40.
RUSSIAN IMMIGRATION, the effect of, on the charities, 50;
the cause of conditions in this country, 169.

SABBATH, the, complications arising from, 30.
SABSOVICH, H. L., member of committee to prepare paper on Russian charities, 48.
SACHS, DR. THEODORE B., quoted for statistics of Jewish consumptives in Chicago, 84.
SAN FRANCISCO, visited by Conference representatives, 25.
SCHOLARSHIPS IN CHARITY, 166.

SCHOOLS OF PHILANTHROPY, 98.
SCIENTIFIC CHARITY, 80, 88, 164.
SETTLEMENTS among the immigrants, 123;
out of touch with the neighborbood, 123;
young people's services in, 124–5.
SETTLEMENT, a new, at Cincinnati, 27.
SETTLEMENT WORK of Council of Jewish Women, 138.
SHELTERING GUARDIAN SOCIETY, 168.
SICK, society for the care of, 43.
"SMALLER COMMUNITIES, Should the Conference Undertake the Work of Organizing Jewish Charitable Effort in the", 145–149.
SOCIALIST MOVEMENT, attitude of, toward charity, 70.
SOCIAL PROBLEM of the immigrant, 126.
SOCIAL WORK in hospitals, 165.
SOCIETY for the Promotion of Education, 36;
for the Promotion of Trade Education and Agriculture, 37;
of Mutual Aid, 37.
SOLLY, DR., quoted on curative powers of Colorado climate, 87.
SOLOMON AND BETTY LOEB MEMORIAL HOME, 27.
"SOMECH NOFLIM," 39.
SPECIFICALLY JEWISH CHARACTER OF JEWISH CHARITIES, 158.
STATE CONFERENCE OF CHARITIES, New York, 167.
STATE, THE, assuming the burdens of philanthropy, 158.
STRANGERS, entertainment of, on the Sabbath, 43;
Hachnosath Orchim for, 44.
STUDENTS boarded by families in Russia, 43.
SUBSCRIPTIONS in Chicago, 76.
SULZBERGER, MR. CYRUS L., 63, 142, 166.
SUPERINTENDENTS of educational institutions, hard to find, 120;
permanent organization of, 181.
SVETSNI SBOR (candle tax): See Korobka.
SYNAGOGUE, charities centered about the, 145.

TALMUD TORAHS, 43.
TAXES: See Korobka.
TEACHERS, training of, 121.
TRADE SCHOOLS, not a subject for Jewish charity, 153.
TRANSPORTATION of applicants for charity, 146.
TREASURER, report of, 183–187.
TUBERCULOSIS, 73;
national organization, 74.

UNEMPLOYED, Jewish, cannot emigrate, 28.
"UNIFICATION OF JEWISH COMMUNAL ACTIVITIES, THE," paper by Prof. Hollander, 49–57.
UNITED HEBREW CHARITIES of New York City, 58, 93, 96, 112, 166;
changes of, suggested, 59;
co-operation of, with the Charity Organization Society, 167.

VIRGINIA PRISONS, Jews in, 61.
VISITING NURSES' ASSOCIATIONS, 165.
VOLUNTEER SOCIAL WORKERS, dearth of, 96, 139, 166.
VOORSANGER, DR. JACOB, 26.

WARSAW, organization of charity in, 48.
"WHAT MUNICIPAL CO-OPERATION MEANS FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE NATIONAL JEWISH HOSPITAL FOR CONSUMPTIVES, AT DENVER," 81–87.
WILNA, "Zdoko Gdolo" in, 47–8.
WISE, DR. STEPHEN S., paper of, 91–109.
WOLKOWIZKY, of Bialostock, 41.
WORCESTER, organization in, 176.
WORKERS: See volunteer social workers.

YOUNG MEN'S HEBREW ASSOCIATION of New York, religious tendency of, 119.
YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES, 124–5.
YOUNG WOMEN'S HEBREW ASSOCIATION, religious outlook of, 119.

ZEDAKAH, 31, 32.
"ZDOKO GDOLO," 47.
ZEPIN, RABBI GEORGE, paper of, 69–77.
ZHVIV, charity worker of Odessa, 43.