of the responsibilities of organized life. And organized life will always warrant the pure philanthropy of which our own philanthropy is an unseemly imitation. Philanthropy must lose its institutional suggestiveness, its tendency towards grouping people according as their opportunities have been denied. Philanthropy, private or paternalistic, will have to establish its right to exist by its honesty, by its willingness to absorb the new idea of the relations of men with men, wherein the individual man will return to the pristine condition of one who has been made in the image of his Maker.

Philanthropy with its high though not unmixed resolve and with its sad failures will receive the same disinterested evaluation that all human institutions will receive at the hands of history. The aftermath of the war will exalt the manhood of man and his reason, both of which the French Revolution failed to effect. It is not likely that the human race will again commit the error of denying the inviolable spirit of the individual man. This is the great hope. This is inevitable. Man must become what he is, the one whom institutions are to serve, not one who is a slave to institutions one of which is known as philanthropy.

BOOK REVIEWS

By Charles S. Bernheimer

"Schools of Tomorrow"

Prof. John Dewey and his daughter, Evelyn Dewey, have given us in "Schools of Tomorrow" (Dutton, New York, $1.50 net) a study of advanced methods of education in the United States as illustrated in schools of Gary, Ind.; Fairhope, Ala.; Indianapolis, Chicago, Cincinnati, as well as Teachers' College, New York City. In regard to the latter, he observes that the best success has come when the child's instinctive activities were linked up with social interests and experience. He argues that our present recognition of education is not that of the isolated academician, as was the case in a former generation, but a training that makes for social and industrial life. Hence, such activities as that of the public schools of Gary, where Superintendent Wirt has worked out a system whereby the every-day things of life are made part of the schools, where the civics is learned by the pupils taking care of their own building, where the school lunch room is conducted by the cooking department and the like. Hence, the use of Public School No. 26 of Indianapolis by Supervising Principal Valentine as a social settlement in a negro neighborhood, a school in which the carpenter shop is open all day and where pupils may work whenever they have free time and where one of the school buildings is used as a boys' clubhouse. The vocational work of Chicago schools and the continuation classes of Cincinnati schools are quoted as examples of the new education which relates to instruction to the acquirement of knowledge for the practical working out of social duties and industrial responsibilities.

Prof. Dewey observes that educational reformers disagree with Madame Montessori in that they contend "that skill cannot be achieved independently of the tools used and the object fashioned in the accomplishment of a special end." That is to say, advanced teachers in this country believe in making real things for real uses.

This exposition of the outgrowth of our school system to meet the needs of our industrial situation—by an educator and social student of the first rank—helps to give insight into the reasons for the unrest pervading our schools and school men amid the endeavors being made throughout the country to readjust the system.

Play in Education

Under the above title Joseph Lee has published a volume (Macmillan, New York, $1.50 net) in which the fundamental thesis is the value of play as an essential part of life, to be considered as an element side by side with industry in the adult and to be regarded as the important occupation of the child. Mr. Lee has always been a great advocate of the recognition of play for youth and this volume contains a detailed analysis of his ideas in the light of modern knowledge and experience. The "boy problem," he says, is really the "grown-up problem." The boy is all right, he maintains; he merely breaks the laws of the adult in obedience to the instincts which he follows in his growth into social being.

(Read at the Baltimore Conference)

HOW DO JEWISH SETTLEMENTS DIFFER FROM SETTLEMENTS IN GENERAL?

Walter Leo Solomon
Cleveland

In considering the question of how Jewish Settlements differ from Settlements in general, the initial problem is a problem of definition. Especially is this a matter of weight when one believes, as I do, that the title "Jewish Settlement" is a misnomer and a contradiction in terms. In fact, as the chief thesis of this paper will be to point out the anomalous character of the so-called Jewish Settlement, I feel much as the mathematical student who explores for the first time the realm of imaginary numbers. Yet, if we are to march together in this inquiry, we must find common ground, and some form of definition, the simpler the better, must be accepted. I believe that we shall not be too narrow if we take as a starting point the dictionary definition of a Settlement as a group of men and women of education living together in a working-class neighborhood for the purpose of establishing mutually helpful relations with their neighbor, or even better, to quote Miss Dudley of Dennison House—"a group of educated men or women (or both) living among manual workers, in a neighborly and social spirit." If we accept for the time being the term Jewish Settlement, we must assume in the light of our definition of the Settlement in general that in the former the Settlers are Jews, that they settle among Jews, with a conscious Jewish purpose. I am well aware of the fact that few of the so-called Jewish Settlements in this country would fit this description and it is the actuality rather than the ideal that this paper must for the most part consider.

In analyzing so flexible an agency as the Settlement, it is inevitable that none of the observations or conclusions will be universally true. In the thirty odd years of its history, the Settlement has thus far escaped crystallization, and while there are many specimens of the genus, scarcely two seem to belong to the same species. If my statements at times seem sweeping, and exceptions to the rule are apparent, the infinite variety of Settlement organization must be held partially responsible. In my own relations with Settlements both Jewish and non-sectarian (or, better un-sectarian) I have experienced marked divergencies from characteristics, to which I shall have occasion to call attention.

It seems to me that the so-called Jewish Settlement differs from the Settlement in general in motivation and in method. Residents in Jewish Settlements have felt, I believe, little of the subjective need of the Settlement, to use Miss Addams' pregnant term. Their presence and participation in the efforts of the Settlement have seldom been the answer to an inward call. The writings of the earlier generation of Settlement residents, English and American, are full of the shame of social inequalities, of the spiritual poverty of the poor, of the inarticulate helplessness of the immigrant in a new environment. They saw these things, these men and women whom we regard as pioneers; they saw these things and they suffered keenly. A social order in which the few had much, the many little or nothing, was to them intolerable. They felt that their own lives were rich, full of opportunity for growth and development, full of beauty, while their neighbors, by the chance of birth and circumstances, were gradually deadened into wantlessness. They recognized that a political or social theory which accepted slavery of the many as essential to the culture of the chosen accepted as logical the condition of the less fortunate classes in the great cities. But democracy, it seemed to them—and they believed in democracy—could not live on so unstable a foundation, and they as democrats could not endure without protest life in so fetid an atmosphere. They felt too that those gifts and privileges that had come to them undeserved were social gifts and privileges and that it behooved them to share their spiritual riches with their brothers.

These Settlement fathers had at the same time another angle of approach. In their more or less sheltered lives they were so far removed from the ultimate realities that they had at times almost forgotten these fundamentals. Hunger and cold and want and brutalizing poverty were evolving, in the great cities, a type of human being differing in outlook, in hopes, in ideals from the recognized human type. And the far-seeing pioneers, realizing that the hope of democracy lies in the human rather than in the animal in man, and that only through the insight and the sympathy that come through intimate knowledge of the conditions that brutalize the unfortunate comes hope of amelioration, were impelled to become a part of the life of miserable neighborhoods, that they might learn from their neighbors and at the same time share their own spiritual stores. One of the earliest statements of the purpose of the first of the Settlements began: "For some years past the momentous spiritual and social questions involved in the condition of the poor have awakened an increasing interest in our universities; and the conviction has grown deeper that the problems of the poor can only be solved through a more practical experience and closer intimacy and sympathy with the poor themselves."

These facts are doubtless known to all who are interested in the Settlement movement, and it would be idle to recall them were it not that it is in this very point of origin, of motivation, that the so-called Jewish Settlement shows its widest divergence from the true Settlement. There may be in this country residents in so-called Jewish Settlements who are there because of some such revolt against social conditions, some such urge for sharing as moved those social pioneers who have gathered about themselves spontaneous groups in England and America. Some such indeed there may be; but is it not true that the great majority of residents in so-called Jewish Settlements have chosen a respectable profession and are not living out an irresistible spiritual demand?

Men and women of good family, culture, education and comfortable circumstances who, without financial consideration, elect to become volunteer residents are distinctive phenomena of the Settlement. Temporarily and sometimes permanently they make their homes in a poor neighborhood, living their own lives, socially, to a certain extent, yet identifying themselves with the life of their neighborhood—bridging in a measure the ever-widening chasm that cuts class from class and social group from social group. With no external obligation, with no business or professional motive, but simply to meet a powerful spiritual demand, they give the best that is in them to their neighbors. How far does this phenomenon appear in Jewish social efforts? A simple little questionnaire recently sent to all the Jewish institutions that I could discover throughout the country which might in any way come into the Settlement classification brought twenty-two replies. In only fourteen of these organizations were there any residents at all. The total number of residents in the so-called Jewish Settlements throughout the country (exclusive of children), I am led to conclude, is fifty-eight; and only seventeen of these fifty-eight are not paid workers. When we deduct from the seventeen the wives of superintendents and those who with outside employment find the so-called Settlement a cheap and convenient place to live, the number of the Settlement residents, in the old sense, in Jewish organizations throughout the country, approaches the vanishing point. For some reason, moreover, there are certain Jewish agencies in different parts of the country that retain the name of Settlement as their official title, and yet, as a matter of principle, reject the settler. Yet to quote the headworker of Dennison House again: "Nothing is essential except residence and a spirit of brotherhood, exercised actively."

That the genesis of the so-called Jewish Settlement is not identical with the development of the Settlement in general is evident. Its birth throes have been of a different kind. The forceful personality, feeling poignantly the need for social expression, associating with himself other like-minded souls, presenting the situation and the plan so convincingly to people of means that support in greater or less degree is forthcoming, does not seem to characterize in general these social center activity of the

Jews. On the contrary, the Jewish development seems to be quite the reverse. Jews of an earlier immigration, established in social position and in financial standing, with a community sense of responsibility for their more recently arrived and less fortunate brothers, have been moved to provide for the new-comers social and educational opportunities. To carry out their plans and to attend to the details of their community center they have employed agents. They have given much time, money and devotion. They have lent their sons and daughters as volunteer workers. But themselves or their families as residents of a poor district they have not given.

They have remained outside, directing to greater or lesser extent the activities of their paid representatives inside. Their frequent attitude toward their representatives is quaintly revealed in this bit of generous praise culled from the annual report of an institution president: "Much commendation is due to our superintendent and staff generally. They have always done their work as though they loved it for its own sake, not merely because they were being paid for it." With the history of the Settlement in mind, there is a grim humor in this naive and almost astonished recognition of the disinterestedness of the superintendent—in this case a resident. It is quite evident that this particular social agency is an institution and not the expanded home of a group of people of culture in a poorer neighbrhood. In the striking difference in motivation between the so-called Jewish Settlement and the Settlement in general lies the secret, it seems to me, of the striking differences in methods. It is inevitable that the activities of the group of people brought together by a common desire to share their lives with the lives of less fortunate neighbors will take a different path from the activities of an institution for the poor, created and directed by the wealthy through their employees.

What are these differences in methods? To attempt an exhaustive analysis would be to attempt the impracticable in so brief a paper as this and in view of the infinite variation in Settlement organization almost the impossible. Certain broad differences in tendency can, however, be indicated. Perhaps the most striking point of divergence between the so-called Jewish Settlement and the Settlement in general, as far as methods are concerned, is emphasized by the reverberating plea for increasing Jewishness in Jewish Settlements. We are told that unless the Jewish Settlement is a *Jewish* Settlement it has no reason for existence. Yet if one considers the history of the Settlement as such, it is apparent that the community center that emphasizes Jewishness, valuable though it may be, is not a Settlement. I have the greatest respect for Institutional Churches, Temples and Synagogues, modern Talmud Torahs, People's Institutes and sincere agencies for the propaganda of Zionism or any other political or social ideal. But when we, here in America, confuse intelligent religious education or nationalist propaganda with that subtler form of social effort called the Settlement, it seems to me we are in error. No Settlement can live unless its whole fabric is pervaded with a rich religious quality—if we take religious to mean deep and noble convictions. Religions rise and fall; religion lives while man lives. But if one views religious quality through the more or less narrow window of any creed or sect, the Settlement loses its universality and becomes a mission—perhaps a Home Mission—but still a mission. Nor can I conceive it to be the function of an American Settlement to train citizens for any national life other than American national life. And to work most effectively toward that end, it must help them to live as members of a heterogeneous group, emphasizing the essential unity rather than the differences in all human beings. The Settlement, never forgetful of the contribution of the past and its traditions, looks ever forward. Its aim, if it has a conscious aim for the young people who share its activities, is, in America, the evolution of good American citizens. Naturally, good American citizenship involves loyalty to one's traditions—racial, national or religious. But to substitute loyalty to the past for loyalty to the future, as an aim, is to make progress backward. The Settlement is not the destroyer but the conserver of all the fine traditions that people of foreign lands have brought

to our shores. It tries by every means at its command to bring home to the youth of all races, all religions, all nationalities, the beauty of their heritage. It helps them to re-interpret their national and religious festivals in pageantry, drama and song. It decorates its walls with pictures of places and events dear to them. In homogeneous communities it defers to the community conscience by refraining from activity on holy days. Catholics are not invited to dance in Lent nor Jews to feast on Yom Kippur. But it does these things with the hope that all that is fine in the heritage of the many-people-in-one that are in America will merge into the multiple pattern of American traditions. This freedom from all narrow limitations has been distinctive of the true Settlement from the beginning. The late Canon Barnet, himself a churchman, describing the mother of Settlements, wrote: "The place is a clubhouse in Whitechapel occupied by men who do citizens' duty in the neighborhood. The residents are not as a body concerned for education, teetotalism, poor relief or any special or sectarian object. Each one leads his own life, earns his own living and does his own duty in his own way. Catholic, Churchman, Jew, Dissenter and Agnostic, they live together and strengthen one another by what each other contributes to the common opinion." To expect a Settlement to advance the cause of any sect or philosophy or belief or faith would require homogeneity in its residents. The cause of socialism would not be furthered by a mixed group of socialists and capitalists, and agency devoted to urging the superiority of Catholicism would necessarily require a wholly Catholic staff. Likewise a Settlement having as its object the Judaising of Jewish youth must maintain its Jewish atmosphere by a Jewish homogeneity of its workers. Yet homogeneity in the religious or racial sense is an absurdity in the Settlement which stands primarily for heterogeneity. As Dr. Lee K. Frankel ably phrases it: "The care of the sick, the relief of the widow and orphan, provision for the aged and infirm are religious duties not the especial functions of any particular sect. The same may be said of that broader education which considers not only the mental and intellectual needs of the individual but the improvement of his physical and moral conditions and surroundings as well."

I have given perhaps too much time to the consideration of this single point of difference, which might have been expressed more briefly by saying that the Jewish Settlement is Jewish and that the Settlement in general is a Settlement; that the Jewish Settlement is limited in its appeal while the Settlement is universal; that the Jewish Settlement is narrow in its outlook while the Settlement vision ceases only at the broad horizon; that the Jewish Settlement with its emphasis on Jewishness seeks at its best to make good Jews and thereby good American citizens, while the Settlement in general seeks at its best to make good American citizens and thereby good Jews, or good Christians, or good agnostics, or good any other sect or creed or faith.

I cannot leave this phase of the subject without pointing out, by a quotation from the report of the headworker of a Settlement, the confusion in thought that arises from attempting to superimpose a sectarian goal on an unsectarian conception. To quote, "I wish to dwell upon the Italian situation in our neighborhood briefly. When we first considered remodeling or improving our Settlement home two years ago our eyes were opened to the fact that our neighborhood was becoming Italianized very rapidly and that our life as a Jewish Neighborhood House on————Street was limited thereby. The Italians are creating the condition which surrounds us; they are neighbors by proximity and they compel our attention and interest. Fortunately our Jewish followers have not moved far from our center, and even those who have moved at a great distance from us have remained our loyal adherents, so that of the 79,652 who have been in attendance at the ————Settlement during 1913 barely 3 per cent are Italian and those are mostly young children on our playground." To interrupt for a movement may I point out that the headworker of the Settlement is here apparently boasting that the immediate neighbors of the Settlement do not come in. To continue, "We are constantly endeavoring to make our work more Jewish, as we should. By the re-establishment of our Jewish religious school, by the continuance of Friday evening lectures of particular interest to Jews, by the observance in clubs or classes of Jewish holidays, by constant personal example we aim to do this. The reception of our Italian neighbors need not encroach in any way upon our Jewish work—and it should, I believe, be welcomed. The continuance and broadening of such work can only be undertaken after much and careful consideration, but in considering it we should be mindful of the fact that the social worker serves his neighbors best who lives and works with him and who shares his joys and sorrows regardless of race, creed or tradition." I am at a loss to reconcile the true Settlement viewpoint of the final sentence of this remarkable quotation with that previous excerpt "we are constantly endeavoring to make our work more Jewish, as we should."

A second notable difference traceable again directly to the motivation and history of the so-called Jewish Settlement is the difference in the attitude toward labor problems. Jewish labor difficulties in many of the large cities have been particularly acute. The relation between Jewish employers and their Jewish employees have been unhappily full of bitterness and misunderstanding. The founders, supporters and officers of the so-called Jewish Settlements are often large employers of labor and the people who make use of the facilities thus provided are their own employees and the children of their employees. The Settlements in America, through their close association with working people, are practically as one in their championing of the cause of working people in times of industrial strife. Settlement residents have come to realize that only through organization and collective bargaining can industrial democracy supersede industrial aristocracy and feudalism. "A Settlement with no relation to the industrial movement," says Graham Taylor, "is trying to play Hamlet by leaving Hamlet out." Jane Addams, Mary MacDowell, Lillian Wald, Robert Woods, Henry Moskowitz are names to conjure with in labor difficulties in their respective communities. They have all been Settlement residents; most of them are still; but even the Jewish names among them cannot be connected with the so-called Jewish Settlements. Where then have the so-called Jewish Settlements stood in industrial crises? Perhaps some of them have allied themselves with their neighbors, but how many? Is it reasonable to suppose that an agency controlled and directed by employers can take the part of the employee in a struggle, even if those who carry out the policies of that institution are in sympathy with their working-class neighbors? Perhaps the so-called Jewish Settlement tries to be neutral. Is there any neutrality in such a situation? And is not any desertion of one's friends and neighbors in times of difficulty a gross breach of all that is sacred in such a relationship? Part of the program of this conference is a consideration of certain of the methods of industrial adjustment that have been worked out in industries where Jews predominate. And those who know the story of the creation of this new industrial machinery know that Settlement residents were intimately concerned with its conception and development. The Settlement residents are Jews and they have lived among Jews; but they consider their activities not as Jewish activities but as American and human efforts. I have read with more or less care for the past year the successive numbers of the publication that represents the best and latest thought of Jewish Social Workers, but I recall no discussion or consideration of the great labor problems that filled many pages of the publication that represents the best thought and efforts of non-sectarian social workers, Jewish and Gentile. The Settlement in general has played no small role in the development of industrial democracy; the so-called Jewish Settlement's contribution seems to have been pitifully slender. I believe that in this contrast lies a very striking difference between the so-called Jewish Settlement and the Settlement in general.

Let us turn our attention now to the specific consideration of the activities within the Settlement walls. Here, of course, it is hard to generalize, because of the wholesome variation. Yet certain tendencies are quite apparent. The Jewish social center, with some notable exceptions, inclines toward the educational institute rather than the Settlement. Some of these agencies disclaim any desire to be Settlements and

regard themselves solely as Jewish Neighborhood Centers. With a strict interpretation, such institutions can scarcely be considered within the limits of this discussion; yet the line of demarcation is too blurred for fine distinctions. In this chosen field of providing rich educational opportunities for their neighborhoods, they have shown splendid adaptability and resourcefulness. Lectures, concerts, courses and classes of a high degree of efficiency, well administered and generally well patronized, are the just pride of many of the Jewish Educational Institutes and Alliances throughout the country. They have learned to supplement the work of public educational facilities so well that at times they can compete successfully with the public night schools. One may doubt the wisdom of such competition, but it is surely a testimony to the high efficiency of the Jewish educational agencies.

But rich and varied educational opportunities for people of humble circumstances do not exhaust the possibilities of constructive social effort in the community; and the social agency that is content to be a modified university or school extension station would seem to be an educational institution rather than a social agency. To quote once more from the Warden of the Chicago Commons: "They (the Settlements) can better stop short of certain undertakings which require highly organized efforts and non-resident control than to lose the men and women of high ideals and initiative who are conspicuous by their absence from those Settlements where freedom is sacrificed to acquire an assured income or institutional organization." This weakness in the fundamental social viewpoint reflects itself somewhat in the almost universal practice in Jewish social centers of measuring results in terms of attendance. It does not require very profound insight to perceive that a quantitative analysis of the effectiveness of a Settlement is futile. Not the number of boys and girls in gymnasium and club and class, but the warmth of inspiration that those boys and girls get is important; and I sometimes wonder whether a large, well organized and efficiently administered social center does not defeat its own purpose just because of its efficiency and thorough organization.

There are, to be sure, certain advantages inherent in the Jewish Community Center. Because of its homogeneity, the so-called Jewish Settlement has in many cases a richer comprehension of the heritage, the traditions, the prejudices and hopes of its members. Its historical viewpoint is their historical viewpoint. Its very name inspired a confidence in the older generation that years of patient effort on the part of the non-sectarian Settlement fails to bring. Older men and women find in it an identity of interest, while the Settlement in general often meets with a native distrust. But with the division in the ranks of the Jews, is not this confidence sometimes misplaced? Grave and wide differences in opinion divide the Orthodox Jew from his reform brother. Yet so-called Jewish Settlements conduct in orthodox neighborhoods Sabbath Schools and Friday and Saturday services, full of the spirit which to them is Jewish, but to their neighbors is a strange perversion. And these varying degrees of Jewishness in Jewish Social Workers must be a source of real distress to those who hope to find in Jewish Social Centers religious unity.

To summarize briefly, the differences between the so-called Jewish Settlement and the Settlement in general seem to be chiefly the physical manifestations of the psychological difference. It was inevitable that an institution with the genesis and history of the Jewish Community Center should not follow the same lines as the Settlement, with its motivation and development. Perhaps there is a place for the Jewish Community Center. It is not my province to go deeper into that question. I have tried to indicate some of the ways in which the Jewish Center differs from the Settlement and to voice my belief in the superiority of the Settlement as a social agency in America today.

Worker Wanted

Wanted—A young man to work with Delinquent Juveniles and Adults in their homes and in reformatories, and to do Big Brother work. Address "H. B. S."—"Jewish Charities."

JEWISH CHARITIES

Entered at the Postoffice at Baltimore, Md., as Second-class Matter

Vol. VI. Baltimore, November, 1915 No. 4

Modern Homes for Dependent Children

Armand Wyle

Training for Social Workers

Ludwig B. Bernstein

Bulletin of National Conference of Jewish Charities.

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO 411 W. FAYETTE ST., BALTIMORE, MD.