

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 downtown 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 activity," 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 criticize 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

Cite occurrence
 (every copy of the)
 the original of
 plat. edition, all
 by copy and the
 printing period
 occurred (with
 Hollander's version)

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 "up-town" 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

*The preceding
speech repeated
in the Russian press
and many strong
comments.*

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 Shabbos 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.