Judge Leon Sanders, the president of the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society, estimates that 1,500,000 Jews who have been uprooted from their homes and sent from district to district have not as yet found a permanent resting place. A large part of the Jewish population of America is vitally interested and concerned by this tragic upheaval, as most of the Jews living in America have relatives in the war zone to whom they would gladly extend help if they knew their whereabouts. The Society has received thousands of letters from every part of the country from persons who are anxious to locate their families abroad. The Society has also received from European organizations the names of thousands of persons in Europe who desired to be put into communication with those to whom they are related in the United States and whose addresses they have lost.

The State Department has been co-operating with the Society since the beginning of the war in locating the present residences of families of American citizens as well as those who have declared their intention of becoming citizens. The task was found enormous, in view of the numbers involved, and a conference was held in Washington between Assistant Secretary of State Adee and Judge Sanders, at which it was decided that as the American consular representatives were not properly equipped for this immense undertaking the Society should send its own representative to organize the necessary agencies to carry on this work.

The Society has prevailed upon Isidore Hershfield, a member of its Board, to undertake the task of organizing this immense work. By reason of his broad acquaintance with conditions both here and abroad, he is particularly qualified for this mission. Mr. Hershfield, who is an American by birth, is a lawyer and well-known communal worker in New York.

Mr. Hershfield has for many years been interested in Jewish education: he is the oldest director in point of service of the Uptown Talmud Torah of New York and was for many years its honorary secretary. He is also the honorary secretary of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America and a member of the Spanish Portuguese Congregation of New York. Mr. Hershfield is also a member of the Independent Order B'nai B'rith and for many years a senator of the National Union for the State of New York. Mr. Hershfield has a wide experience in immigration matters, being one of the most active directors of the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society; for many years he was the chairman of its Law Committee and he frequently argued important immigration cases and matters before the Department of Labor. He is now the chairman of the Society's Committee on Education of Immigrants.

Mr. Hershfield will be fully equipped with means and with the necessary facilities to create a widely extended organization in the countries affected by the war. He will organize a clearing house in a neutral country for the receipt of all inquiries regarding persons who, on account of the war, have been unable to get into touch with those from whom they hope to obtain financial assistance. The clearing house will be located at the Hague and a staff of experts will be placed in charge. These central headquarters will direct the work in the various large centers in which registry offices will be established.

This enterprise on the part of the Society will, it is expected, call for the expenditure of a vast sum of money, but the good that will be accomplished is out of all proportion to the amounts that will be expended.

It will result in millions of dollars being sent across the water for the relief and the support of the suffering Jews of Europe by their immigrant brethren of the United States. The Jewish immigrants here have always taken a deep interest in the welfare of their co-religionists and have sent even in normal times large sums of money to Europe to aid their relatives. In this work the task of relieving the Jews in the war zone will be immensely expedited.

EXCHANGE BUREAU

Help Wanted

WANTED—Experienced young man for social work with boys between the ages of 15 and 21 years. Address C, Jewish Charities.

MAN AND PHILANTHROPY

By Abraham Caplan

Europe of course is being put to the acid test by the war. But the very nature and magnitude of the conflict have a deep meaning for our common civilization. The delimiting of the colossal fight to Europe and the Near East is in a measure a chance matter only. Our own dizzy nearness to the verge of war puts our common life to the test to which the whole human race is being subjected. Not merely this institution or that, not alone this form of government or that is being tried as to its efficacy, but the whole fabric of civilization, the whole history of man is being called to Time's silent tribunal to justify itself or acknowledge failure.

And as all of life and civilization are being tried, even that which is almost universally accepted as good must make adjustment. The strictures and doubts leveled at religion have not yet been directed at philanthropy. I mean philanthropy in an all-embracing sense, not charity alone, not alone the various measures of uplift, public and private, but that spiritual attitude which expresses itself in a hundred and one measures for human welfare.

Like every other institution, social service will have to take into account the new psychological content of life which the war will inevitably occasion. The new order of life will center less around institutions than around a recreated conception of man as such. Modern civilization, in shaping institution after institution, has almost with the intensity of will brushed aside the integrity of man as man. The boast of American statesmanship that ours is a government of laws rather than of men comes too near to affirming that the ultimate end of government is to deify law and to subordinate humanity to a more or less flexible legalism. But this conception cannot last very long, for, if anything, the war shows that the freedom emanating from Magna Charta and supposed to be the portion of the individual is for all practical purposes a snare and a delusion, a feeble straw before the windstorm of governmental expediency.

In the light of historical stricture the individualism of Rousseau, divested of its materialism and spiritualized by the "sweet reasonableness" of real brotherhood, stands out as a beacon light across the dark waters of turmoil. That monumental aberration—the French Revolution—mad with unintelligible desire, is realizing the fruit of its accursed seed. Taking away privilege from monarchy, it vested power in an institution of government which denied the individual man his birthright of freedom. Almost our whole modern civilization has been patterned after the ideals promulgated by latter day eighteenth century France; and in those countries where they have failed to influence, the pressure of institutionalism, part of it good and most of it oppressive, has crushed the integrity of the free man. By means of false patriotism, by doctrines of race superiority goaded on by selfish cliques, by various popular ideas productive of the greatest crimes in all history, man has been robbed of the character and attitude expressed in the term of manhood.

Philanthropy is surely one of the great modern institutions. Modern life has brought the subtle phenomenon of human love to the stage of a system, of an institution. But love of one's fellow-man, presupposing, like justice, the recognition of the equality and integrity of all men as men, has given birth to a sort of caste system with pernicious results. Social workers speaking of clients as "cases," welfare institutions taking the downward glance as from an eminence, the arrogance of contributors and directors expressing itself in a half-concealed and sugar-coated contempt of the recipients of their bounty, these are the evil fruits of the seed that in England less than a century ago gave promise of the real social conscience.

The real social conscience. This is the crux of the whole matter. The real social conscience stands for justice and love, not for arbitrary institutionalism. It stands for pure freedom and reason, for equality among men, for the recognition of a humanity of men. It bespeaks that attitude that divines a future based upon the strength and the wisdom and the fine impulses of free men, free from the shackles of selfish government but heedful

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.