Among the many forms of American social welfare, a number have been of Jewish inception. One of the most conspicuous of these is the community chest. The first of the community chests, in the familiar sense of the term, was the Cleveland Federation for Charity and Philanthropy, which began its activities early in 1913.1

The type of organization adopted at Cleveland was that which had, for almost a decade and a half,2 prevailed in the Jewish federations.3 The discussions connected with the start of the Cleveland undertaking took definite cognizance of Jewish precedent;4 while the actual creator of the Cleveland Federation for Charity and Philan-
thropy was a prominent Jewish executive, Mr. Martin A. Marks, a national figure in the B'nai B'rith and, for twenty-six years, president of the Cleveland Temple. Persons near to Mr. Marks testify that the Jewish federation served as his model.

A number of previous attempts at federated financing of benevolence had been launched in Liverpool, in Denver, in Elmira, N. Y., in Grand Rapids, Mich., and in San Antonio, Texas. All these exhibited glaring defects. Their chief inadequacies were lack of centralized budgeting, lack of competent, full-time staff, and lack of year-round functioning. The structure devised by Mr. Marks avoided all those shortcomings.

The community chest movement grew rapidly and extensively. An authoritative source places the number of chests, active in 1950, at approximately 1,500.

Welfare Funds for Non-Local Needs

2. Another instance of Jewish pioneering might be the Jewish Welfare Fund. The war chests, in the various communities, during both of the World Wars, conducted joint or federated solicitation for a list of regional, national, and overseas appeals, as contrasted with the strictly local character of the community chests. But the war chests operated only in war time. Jewish welfare funds operate in peace as well as in war time.

Something like them in general welfare has been broached, and something which approximates them has been achieved in the form of state non-local chests in Michigan and in Oregon. Reports, however, do not refer to Jewish models. There is no question of Jewish precedence. The only issue is that of Jewish influence.

Charity Chest of the Fur Industry

3. Also a Jewish invention was the Charity Chest of the Fur Industry of the City of New York. The fur industry may have held some non-Jews, but, in the prospectus of its Charity Chest, Jewish names dominate overwhelmingly.

The Fur Chest endeavored to correct certain drawbacks incident to solicitation by Jewish federations and by community chests. In the words of its executive director, "The federation has failed to protect the giver. The community chest has failed to protect the giver. It has remained for the giver to form his own chest to protect himself."

The Fur Chest aimed, accordingly, to immunize its members against the plethora of appeals. Members would contribute annually to a substantial fund from which their committee, watched and advised by the rank and file, made disbursements to various causes. In 1925, the Fur Chest raised $480,000. Later came a year in which 2,113
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members contributed $540,574.86. During the first five years, over two million dollars were allocated. The number of agencies aided was 874 in 1927 and 919 in 1928.19

The Charity Chest of the Fur Industry disbanded at the onset of the depression.20 Years later, the racing interests attempted something similar. It was reported in 1924 that the racing interests had, since 1942, contributed sixteen million dollars to various philanthropies.21 Otherwise the Fur Chest evinced neither longevity nor influence.

Solicitation for community chests and for Jewish welfare funds is often organized, in part, along occupational lines. But this resemblance to the Charity Chest of the Fur Industry is only fortuitous. The Fur Chest existed not to aid but to rival the prevalent modes of charity financing. Though abortive and devoid of any clear imitation, it was, nonetheless, a species of Jewish pioneering.

TRANSPORTATION RULES

4. Another device of Jewish contriving was the group of practices known as the Transportation Rules.22 Those rules sought to eliminate the irresponsible passing on of necessitous persons "from town to town." These regulations prescribed the granting of transportation not to "the next town," but all the way to the proposed destination, after inquiry of a reputable social agency at the proposed destination had established that residence at that place actually promised improvement in the client's circumstances.

The Transportation Rules were first formulated at the National Conference of Jewish Charities in 1900 at the urging of Mr. Max Senior, its president.23 Their spread into non-Jewish usage was rapid. A committee of the non-Jewish National Conference of Charities and Corrections fostered their adoption in 1902.24 "At least two leading members of the Jewish National Conference took part in the discussion." Max Senior himself was one of them.25

For an entire generation, social welfare agencies, both Jewish and non-Jewish, would pledge themselves to observe their Transportation Agreement. To supervise and enforce this agreement, an independent organization, the Committee on Transportation of Allied National Agencies, came into being.26 This committee functioned until 1934, when the practice of signing the Transportation Agreement was abandoned. The principles embodied in the Agreement have become so thoroughly ingrained in social welfare practice as to render those formalities superfluous.27 For all that, it was still felt, as late as 1948, "that it would be valuable to reaffirm in terms of present-day philosophy and practice the sound basic procedures which were embodied in the former Transportation Agreement."28

In 1933, the Transportation Agreement had 1,099 signatories.29
5. Another example of Jewish pioneering is the Visiting Housekeeper Service, also called Substitute Mother Service or Homemaker Service. This is a form of aid for families needing aid because the mother has to be hospitalized. It is a service which obviates removing the children from the home. Until the mother's recovery, the visiting housekeeper prepares the meals, maintains cleanliness and order, and looks after the children's health, attiring, schooling, and recreation. It has been reported that the higher standards of housekeeping introduced by the visiting housekeeper sometimes so impress the family as to secure the continuation of those standards after the mother's return.

The first venture at Visiting Housekeeper or Substitute Mother or Homemaker Service was inaugurated by the Jewish Welfare Society of Philadelphia in October, 1923, when it employed ten women to act in that capacity. This fact is noted in the Child Welfare League Bulletin of June, 1929. The Jewish Welfare Society of Philadelphia is specifically mentioned in this Bulletin, without allusion to any prior attempt. An account of the Philadelphia undertaking had appeared already in the Jewish Social Service Quarterly of May, 1925, which also speaks of the project as something entirely novel.

The Children's Bureau at Washington has published various monographs on this Homemaker Service, among them a Directory of Agencies Providing Homemaker Service, which tells that, in 1947, Homemaker Service was furnished by 52 agencies in 21 states of the Union and by nine agencies in Canada.

Integration of Birth Control with Family Welfare

6. "Family Welfare Through Family Planning" would be a suitable designation for some pioneering credited to the Jewish Social Service Bureau of Chicago. The Jewish Social Service Bureau, to meet a need besetting clients of a certain type, established facilities for counseling and instruction in the use of contraceptives. "This service," we are informed, "has been pioneering in a difficult field." The first client was referred to this service on September 20, 1922. In the early 1930's, after it had been rendered unnecessary by the rise of birth control clinics under other auspices, that service terminated.

Correctly or incorrectly, one gains the impression that this was the first of the clinics devoted to birth control exclusively. Obviously it was the first instance of integrating birth control with family welfare. Since that Jewish venture, referral, when necessary, to birth control clinics has featured much of non-Catholic family case work.
Religious Sanction of Birth Control

7. It was a Jewish religious body that pioneered at vesting birth control with religious sanction. Meeting at Detroit, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, on June 27, 1929, passed a resolution calling for “the recognition of the importance of the control of parenthood as one of the methods of coping with social problems.”

The next religious body to manifest a liberal attitude was the Universalist General Convention meeting in October of the same year. The third religious body to do so was the New York East Conference of the Methodist Church, which took action in April, 1930. That same year, a mildly concessive pronouncement on birth control was voiced by the Lambeth Conference in England. “That the careful and restrained use of contraceptives by married people is valid and moral” was proclaimed by the American Federal Council of Churches in 1931. All other church pronouncements on birth control have issued subsequently.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis was thus the first of the religious bodies to assume a progressive stand on voluntary parenthood. All the others expressed themselves later. As stated by a leader of the birth control movement, “The Central Conference of American Rabbis pioneered in the religious support of birth control, as it was the first national or even large regional organization to do so.”

The question arises: Did the Central Conference of American Rabbis influence those Christian groups, as Jewish welfare agencies influenced non-Jewish agencies? This question we shall have to leave unanswered; data on this point proved unobtainable. All we can affirm is that the Central Conference of American Rabbis spoke first.

Aid to Dependent Children

8. Aid to Dependent Children, formerly called Mothers' Pensions, is a uniquely American form of social security. Since its rise, forty years ago, it has grown apace. Under the New Deal, the federal government began matching funds with the states for that purpose. In 1949, forty-seven states, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii were participants in the federal-state program. The sum of $352,600,000 was expended during 1948. The number of families aided was 392,000 in June, 1942.

Considerable evidence indicates that the movement, as we know it, began in 1911, when the Missouri Legislature authorized Kansas City (Jackson County) to expend $12,000 for the “partial support of poor women whose husbands are dead or convicts, when such women are mothers of children under the age of fourteen years.”
The moving spirit in the Missouri proposal was Judge E. E. Porterfield, of the Kansas City Juvenile Court. Judge Porterfield was "familiar with the fact that certain pensions were being paid to widows of the United Jewish Charities of Kansas City. . . . These things influenced the judge to advocate a widows' pension law. He drew up a law which applied only to Jackson County, and this was passed by the Legislature in the winter of 1910-1911." 54

The late Dr. Jacob Billikopf, who at that time headed the United Jewish Charities of Kansas City, 55 claimed that it was he who broached the idea to Judge Porterfield when the two were together on vacation at Excelsior Springs, Missouri, in 1908.56 Will this entitle us to trace, to Jewish incentives, the movement known as Aid to Dependent Children?

Religious Endorsement of Aid to Dependent Children

9. Little doubt exists as to Jewish priority in buttressing this benevolence with religious endorsement. It was on July 2, 1918, that the Central Conference of American Rabbis called for "The preservation and the integrity of the home by a system of mothers' pensions." 57 The Presbyterian Church of Canada voiced that demand in 1919 and again in 1920. 58 The Northern Baptist Convention followed suit in 1921.59

Here again all that can be imputed to the Jewish group is chronological precedence. The question of influence must remain undecided. Inquiry of the Baptist and the Presbyterian survivors failed to solve the problem.

Social Service Bake Shop

10. Another Jewish innovation was the Bake Shop established in 1929 by the United Jewish Social Agencies of Cincinnati. The Bake Shop, serving attractive luncheons and selling high-grade pastry, also contrives protective employment, especially part-time employment, for women with families. Skills thus gained are said to have enabled some of those assisted to secure similar employment in regular industry and even to engage in the baking business.

That the Bake Shop was something novel is vouched for by the fact that persons closely associated with the Bake Shop fail to recall any precedent.60

An article on the Bake Shop, published in 1935, dwells upon visits of inquiry by social workers from other cities. New York City had already reproduced the enterprise, while Portland, Ore., St. Louis, and Santa Monica, Cal., had such a move in mind.61 Yet, in a letter dated August 14, 1950, the author of that same article names only New York and Pittsburgh as having followed the Cincinnati model, and then pro-
ceeds to state that both the New York project and the Pittsburgh project had ceased.

No data were available for determining whether those, in other cities, who adopted or contemplated adopting the plan were Jewish or non-Jewish.

**Elevation of Relief Standards**

Various studies, a number of years ago, demonstrated that the relief allowances of Jewish social agencies were, on the whole, ampler than those of non-Jewish agencies. It sometimes happened that, when Jewish agencies would join, in community chests, with non-Jewish agencies, the higher Jewish standards would provoke some tension. Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver urged Jewish social workers to strive for equalization by endeavoring to bring about an increase in the grants of the non-Jews—"a standardization upward, instead of a standardization downward."

A number of years later, this actually occurred in Dr. Silver's own city. The leading figure here was Marc J. Grossman. Referring to a joint relief committee which raised money for distribution to several relief agencies during the depression, the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* observes: "Relief allowances of the Jewish Social Service Bureau were somewhat higher than those of the Associated Charities. The relief committee, pressed for funds, sought to bring the Jewish Social Service Bureau standards down to those of the Associated Charities. Grossman, as president of the Jewish Social Service Bureau, led a successful fight—of which the public was unaware at the time—to raise the Associated Charities standards, instead, to those of the Jewish Social Service Bureau."

Later Grossman became the head of the New Deal governmental agency, the County Relief Committee, in which capacity he is reputed to have lifted the relief standards "from the lowest in the country to among the highest."

This was obviously an instance of Jewish pioneering on a local scale. Conditions were ripe for similar stirrings on a national scale, and this might have eventuated had not, as an outcome of the depression, the entire American system of relief become transformed.

**Social Case Work for a Fee**

Among recent trends in social welfare is that of case work for a fee. Persons able to pay, resort, upon payment of a fee, to social agencies in crises of family relationships and of child rearing, and perhaps other emergencies inviting a case worker's skills. The purpose of such fee-charging is not so much that of revenue as that of rendering an agency's services acceptable to persons who would
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otherwise shrink from applying. 69 Forty-five family welfare agencies throughout the country were proffering this type of service in December, 1947. 70

Jewish priority in this matter might be challenged on the basis of a publication which, speaking of case work for a fee, observes: "The earliest policy reported was established in 1941 by Philadelphia Family Service. New York Jewish Family Service established its fee charging in 1942." 71 Notwithstanding this, the Jewish Family Service of New York did, apparently, in some sense, pioneer. The Social Work Year Book 1949 would otherwise not have regarded 1942 as the initial date. That Year Book recalls: "It was not until 1942 that a separate office for paying clients was established." 72

Insisting upon priority here, a letter from the Jewish Family Service of New York avers "that in 1942 the Jewish Family Service, on an organized basis, established a demonstration program in which it interpreted to the community at large that this service was available at its Consultation Center for those people who wished to and could afford to pay for the service." 73

The essence of the matter appears to be that fees for various kinds of social work had long prevailed and had eventually entered case work; but that a separate office, an avowed program, and a publicized policy were the special accomplishments of that New York Jewish body.

It may be proper to add that, so far as is ascertainable, case work for a fee was first propounded by Bruno Lasker, a Jewish writer, closely identified with Jewish interests as well as with those of general social welfare. 74

**Industrial Removal Office**

13. Another example of Jewish pathfinding 75 was the Industrial Removal Office established by the Jewish Agricultural Society in 1901 76 and reorganized as an independent agency in 1907. 77 For twenty-one years, the Industrial Removal Office procured, in the vast interior of America, remote from the Atlantic seaboard, employment and, correspondingly, new homes for Jewish newcomers. 78

This Jewish endeavor profoundly impressed officials of the federal government. 79 The result was that the government brought, into its immigration service, a Division of Information which was to appprise "immigrants of the labor opportunities awaiting them throughout the country." 80 But governmental auspices did not duplicate the success of Jewish auspices. Labor unions viewed the government's move with suspicion; financial support also remained inadequate. 81

The Industrial Removal Office was liquidated in 1922, when the need for that type of service had declined. 82 Still, with the new influx of immigrants since the Nazi upsurge, and especially since the passage
of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, attempts resembling the industrial removal work have been initiated by the Jewish United Service for New Americans and by its various non-Jewish counterparts, such as the Catholic Committee for Refugees and the Protestant Committee on Displaced Persons. The Displaced Persons Commission appointed by the federal government in 1948 also revived some of those earlier methods.

We must leave it to conjecture how far these later moves are offspring of those earlier ones. This, nonetheless, we can maintain with assurance: the Industrial Removal Office was a Jewish pioneering venture whose influence extended beyond the Jewish range.

PROTOCOL OF INDUSTRIAL PEACE

14. Next we consider the Protocol of Peace achieved by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union in 1910 at the conclusion of a strike. This protocol provided, among other things, for a Joint Board of Sanitary Control representing employers and workers. It created a Board of Grievances in every shop and, as an ultimate level of appeal, a Board of Arbitration.

Because of various difficulties connected with its operation, the Protocol was, after a few years, discontinued. But its effects have persisted. Its conceptions underlie the National Labor Relations Board, the Railway Mediation Board, as well as the War Labor Boards of the First World War and of the Second World War. Its ideas permeated the New Deal. “The Protocol of Peace,” says Benjamin Stolberg, “was one of the most important charters in American industrial relations.” By it, according to Selig Perlman, “the clothing workers point the way to the rest of the labor movement.”

The Protocol of Peace was indubitably an example of pioneering, and its devising by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union makes it decidedly a work of Jewish pioneering.

INDUSTRIAL EFFICIENCY STUDIES

15. Benjamin Stolberg writes: “In 1913 the New York waistmakers, Local 25, pioneered in industrial efficiency studies at a time when the manufacturer showed not the slightest interest in scientific management.” The waistmakers were all but exclusively Jewish. Hence another piece of Jewish originality.

The movement has survived and borne abundant fruit. In today's industry, scientific management looms large.

WORKERS' EDUCATION UNDER UNION AUSPICES

16. Much has been written about workers’ education. The movement has grown to impressive proportions. While workers' education
comprises training in labor leadership and studies in the history, the plans, and the purposes of the labor movement, it sometimes embraces such subjects as literature, psychology, economics, American history and government.

Classes in workers' education are conducted largely under the auspices of organized labor. The first of the unions to take the step were those of predominantly Jewish membership and leadership, again the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, also the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. The International Ladies' Garment Workers inaugurated their program in 1916, and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers in 1919.

The American Federation of Labor espoused workers' education in 1920 and 1921. Years later, the Works Progress Administration of the federal government expended, on workers' education, millions of dollars. Both the American Federation of Labor and the Works Progress Administration acknowledged Jewish models. The American Federation of Labor embarked on its project only after careful study and explicit endorsement of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' plan, while the basic pattern of the Works Progress Administration's procedure was, according to Benjamin Stolberg, "taken directly from the International, which," for a time, "was intimately involved in those government ventures."

Cooperative Housing by Trade Unions

In 1926, New York State promulgated a law aiming to encourage low-cost housing. An article published six years later mentions, apropos this law, no other projects than those of groups from the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and from the Jewish National Workers' Alliance. The passage reads:

Members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, who have been building cooperative projects in the Bronx since 1927, have demonstrated the usefulness of the law for workers with incomes from $30 to $50 per week. . . . The Amalgamated Dwellings on Grand Street, built in 1930, show that equally fine apartments with almost equally beautiful gardens can be built on the lower East Side. The third cooperative group, the Farband, made up of members of the Jewish National Workers Alliance, was in 1928 the first to demonstrate that automatic elevators are an economic possibility in such houses of six stories high.

In 1947, the United States Department of Labor issued its Bulletin No. 896, Nonprofit Housing Projects in the United States. Listing various of such undertakings, this Bulletin notes that "The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America was the first of the labor unions
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to take an active interest in providing better housing for wage earners at lower rentals through the cooperative method” (page 13). That these Jewish workers influenced others toward similar measures is the conviction of Abraham E. Kazan, head of the Amalgamated Housing Corporation, who writes, in Labor and Nation of September - October, 1949: “Others in New York City and elsewhere are following our example.”

Identical is the view of the United States Department of Labor, whose Specialist in Cooperatives writes, under date of October 31, 1950, “that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers projects have been of considerable influence. Their success has . . . been a factor influencing some of the present-day developments.” This letter then proceeds to mention the apartments under construction by the Meat Cutters and Butchers Workmen of America (AFL) in New York City, by the International Brotherhood of Electric Workers in Long Island City and in Washington, D. C., and by the United Packinghouse Workers of America (CIO) in Chicago.

**Trade Unions Exclusively for Women**

18. Although there are today no trade unions exclusively for women, such unions did exist until recently. Judge Jacob Panken maintains that the first of the women’s unions was started by the United Hebrew Trades about the year 1900. Confronted by the fact that trade unions for women workers had been organized in Lynn, Massachusetts, as early as 1833, and in New York City as early as 1835, Judge Panken rejoins that those earlier moves were only attempts which “did not ‘take.’”

May we add trade unions for women to our catalogue of Jewish innovations? It is at least an open question.

**Unions of Social Workers**

19. Hardly debatable is the Jewish parentage of unions for social workers. The unionization of social workers began among those engaged by the New York Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies. This event was preceded and promoted by a series of discussions at the meetings of the National Conference of Jewish Social Service. “The reports of its Committee on Employment Practices and Relationships, discussed and finally adopted in 1934, constitute probably the first formal statement by social workers of standards covering wages, hours, leaves, economic security and so on.” To these demands has been added the quest for ampler relief grants to clients.

There is little reason to deny that these Jewish social workers were pathfinders. That new-born union promptly entered “the main stream
of the labor movement." Early in its career, the New York Association of Federation Workers obtained a charter from the American Federation of Labor. Later that Jewish association engendered the National Coordinating Committee of Social Service Employees Groups. That signifies not only subsequent imitation by others but also aggressive missionarization by the originators to win others to the cause.

The Social Work Year Book 1949 records that about 70,000 professional employees of non-governmental agencies belonged, at that time, to the locals of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, an affiliate of the CIO. The twenty locals, approximately, of the Social Service Employees Union are among them.

**FARM LOANS**

20. Notwithstanding the Jew's dominantly urban habitat, considerable Jewish pioneering is to be found in the sphere of agriculture. The Jewish Agricultural Society originated our thriving systems of farm loans, of agricultural credit cooperatives, and of agricultural fire insurance cooperatives.

For almost thirty years before the federal government established its Farm Credit Administration, with its Land Bank Commissioner loans, the Jewish Agricultural Society had been extending loans of that type. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., one of the directors of the Jewish Agricultural Society and, for a time, its vice-president, "was named by President Roosevelt to organize and head the system" when the Farm Credit Administration was formed.

**FARM CREDIT COOPERATIVES**

21. As introducers of agricultural credit cooperatives, Jews are explicitly recognized by writers on the subject. These cooperatives are patterned after the Raiffeisen system which had previously operated in Germany. Jewish pioneering consisted, therefore, not in the invention of something new, but in the introduction of something of which American agriculture was in sore need. For this contribution, the Jews have received cordial non-Jewish praise.

**AGRICULTURAL FIRE INSURANCE**

22. In 1913, the Jewish Agricultural Society brought into practice Cooperative Agricultural Fire Insurance which, like the Farm Loan system and the Cooperative Credit system, has widely spread.

**SUBSISTENCE HOMESTEADS**

23. During the depression, the federal government fostered subsistence homesteads. The subsistence homestead has been described as:
“settlement on farms of small acreage within commuting distance of cities where a moderate but appreciable amount of farming can be carried on by the farm wife and the farm child while the wages of the head of the family continue to come in.”

Furthermore, “the family head devotes his time to farming before and after working hours, week-ends, vacations and at slack periods.”

When the aspiration of the New Deal to generate subsistence homesteads was at its height, the Bureau of Jewish Social Research commented “that the Jewish Agricultural Society is to be credited with being the pioneer of experiments now carried out throughout the country.” The Jewish Agricultural Society had started such a project near New Brunswick, New Jersey, in 1928; but Jewish workers elsewhere had entered upon such attempts prior to 1928. At an early stage of the government’s program, one of its subsistence homesteads was definitely planted at the suggestion of some Jewish needleworkers and other interested Jewish persons.

While all the various federal projects have long ago been liquidated, the Jewish agro-industrial projects at Bound Brook and at Highland Park, New Jersey, are still functioning.

**Altro Work Shop**

Sheltered employment is not of Jewish inception, but a unique type of sheltered employment is of Jewish inception. Opened in 1915 by the Committee for the Care of the Jewish Tuberculous, the Altro Work Shops of New York City have been aiding tuberculous persons who have reached convalescence. Income at needlework is provided under conditions in which the prime consideration is the worker’s health. The chief members of the staff are the physician and the nurse who restrain the worker from overexertion and direct special periods of nutrition between meals. Recently the program was enlarged to accommodate cardias.

The endeavor has not been duplicated anywhere in the United States, although Dr. Louis I. Dublin of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company has taken the National Tuberculosis Association to task for its failure to advance similar undertakings.

**Child Guidance Home**

The Child Guidance Home at Cincinnati has been described as “a diagnostic institute conducted by the United Jewish Social Agencies in cooperation with the Jewish Hospital for the study and observation of subnormal, defective, psychopathic and behavioristic children from ages 4 to 14 years.”
Dr. Louis A. Lurie, the founder and, for many years, the director of the Child Guidance Home, maintains that, so far as he knows, this was the first residential diagnostic center to be started anywhere. Dr. Lurie further reports that, in the past fifteen years, similar homes have been contemplated or established in various parts of the country.

The Child Guidance Home of Cincinnati has, for financial reasons, ceased to be exclusively diagnostic and has now become a treatment center for emotionally disturbed children.

**Union Health Center**

26. The predominantly Jewish membership of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union justifies our crediting, to Jewish initiative, the Union Health Center established, at the instance of that union, by the late Dr. George M. Price, in 1913. To the 200,000 members of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and their families, residing in New York City, the Union Health Center has reduced, to a minimum, the cost of medical care. "The average member of the Union is entitled to $30 worth of medical credit from his local." For services costing more than $30, there exists a moderate schedule of charges. As "the income derived at the scheduled fee rate does not cover the expenditures of operation," the difference is provided by the union's funds for health and welfare. Since 1945, these funds have been supplied by the employers. The attention and the equipment are of the very best that medical science has devised. During 1949, no fewer than 2,700 services were furnished daily. In the course of that year, the Center filled no fewer than 123,567 prescriptions. At present the Center is being served by 175 physicians. The project has definitely increased the working days, the working years, and, consequently, the earnings of those who have come under its provisions.

In "the fact that it was conceived and operated by a labor union" lies "the difference between the ladies' garment workers' health program and others."

The undertaking has been copied not only in such Jewish circles as that of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, but also by workers at Fall River, Mass., by the hotel trades of New York City, and by the Labor Health Institute of St. Louis.

**Hospital Home Care**

27. Under its present director, Dr. E. M. Bluestone, Montefiore Hospital, in New York City, has pioneered in the plan enabling patients to dispense with hospital sojourn by obtaining hospital care in their own homes. For suitable cases, especially of long-term illness,
the routines and the services of the hospital are, through a well
regulated system of visitation, transferred to the patient's abode. This
not only reduces the expense; it also enhances the patient's comfort
and calm. At the same time, the plan releases hospital beds for such
as can not be treated in any other way. 156

This Home Care program, initiated on January 1, 1947, is still in
the experimental stage. Adoption by other organizations has not yet
been reported.

APARTMENTS FOR THE AGED

28. The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds cate-
gorically denies that the New York Home for Aged and Infirm He-
brews pioneered in the construction of apartments specially designed
for the aged. The Council for Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds
contends that such apartments, known as the Tompkins Square House,
had at an earlier date been erected by the Community Service So-
ciety of New York City. 157

However, the New York Home for Aged and Infirm Hebrews does
insist upon having pioneered, about the year 1939. 158 An article writ-
ten on the subject by a non-Jew and published in 1946 does not men-
tion the Tompkins Square House, but does mention the apartment
houses of the New York Home for Aged and Infirm Hebrews. 159

Here, also, our inquiry as to Jewish origin will have to remain
inconclusive.

RECREATION FOR THE AGED

29. The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds like-
wise denies that any Jewish group was the first to experiment in
recreation for the aged. It ascribes precedence to the Hodson Commu-
nity Center founded by the New York City Department of Welfare. 160
The non-Jewish writer to whom we have just alluded also designates
the Hodson Center, but refers, in the same breath, to “the National
Council of Jewish Women’s Club for Older People.” 161

The National Council of Jewish Women does indeed assert some
kind of priority. Its representative writes: “We are the first national
membership organization to develop a program on a national scale.
Also, insofar as we know, the New York Section’s program was the
first to be established by a volunteer organization on a planned basis.”

Once more we confront uncertainty. Recreation for the aged may
or may not have been, in some sense or other, a species of Jewish
pioneering. 162

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Our survey of Jewish pioneering in American social welfare has
covered twenty-nine different topics. These have, without announce-
ment, been grouped in six divisions and arranged in the following
sequence: 1) Fund Raising, 2) Family Welfare, 3) Labor Relations,
4) Agricultural Ventures, 5) Health Projects, 6) Projects in Behalf of
the Aged.

But diversities in addition to these interpenetrate these. Of the
initial Jewish undertakings, some survive; others have disappeared.
Some have exerted an impact on non-Jews; others have been less
effective. The products of non-Jewish acceptance have, in some cases,
proved enduring; in some cases, evanescent. With some, Jewish nas-
cency was unmistakable; with others, subject to query. Every new
thing in the world embodies material from older things, until it
sometimes becomes dubious where the new begins and the old ends.
In modern social welfare no less than in medieval Jewish theology,
creatio ex nihilo poses a problem. Now and then we paused to ask
whether a resembling activity of non-Jews fared forth in response to
some Jewish lead or burgeoned independently.163 Negative features
as well as positive features emerge. A grading would seem to be indi-
cated somewhat as follows:

1. Community Chest
2. Visiting Housekeeper
3. Transportation Rules
4. Industrial Efficiency Studies
5. Cooperative Housing by Trade Unions
6. Farm Loans
7. Agricultural Fire Insurance
8. Union Health Center
9. Protocol of Industrial Peace
10. Farm Credit Cooperatives
11. Workers' Education under Union Auspices
12. Unions of Social Workers
13. Industrial Removal Office
14. Subsistence Homesteads
15. Aid to Dependent Children
16. Religious Sanction of Birth Control
17. Integration of Birth Control with Family Welfare
18. Religious Endorsement of Aid to Dependent Children
19. Welfare Funds for Non-Local Needs
20. Altro Work Shop
21. Social Service Bake Shop
22. Hospital Home Care
23. Elevation of Relief Standards
24. Charity Chest of the Fur Industry
25. Child Guidance Home  
26. Social Case Work for a Fee  
27. Apartments for the Aged  
28. Recreation for the Aged  
29. Trade Unions Exclusively for Women

The topmost three are placed there not only because they have survived and because they have been widely copied, but also because of the extent to which they have come to be known. The five at the bottom stand there because their source is uncertain. Other rankings are induced not only by such factors as duration, fruitfulness, and notedness, but also by the consideration of greater warrant or lesser warrant for imputing Jewish origin.

It needs no telling that these assignments offer vast room for disagreement. That many would rate these items differently goes without saying. And yet, when all has been accounted for, does any doubt remain that the Jews have pioneered, and significantly pioneered, in American social welfare?

**Notes**


5. Ibid., p. 69. Also Resolution of the Cleveland Federation of Charities passed at the time of the death of Mr. Marks and published in the *Cleveland Social Work Year Book* 1916. Likewise, William I. Ong, "Five Million Two Hundred Thousand Dollars for One Hundred and One Agencies Plus the United Service Organizations," in *The Clevelander*, a Monthly Journal Published by the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, October, 1948, p. 6.


7. Letter of July 14, 1950, from Henry L. Zucker, Executive Director of the Jewish Welfare Federation of Cleveland. Letter of July 24, 1950, from Herman Moss. In a letter of August 2, 1950, Mr. Zucker reports the impression of Samuel Goldhammer, who has been the Executive Director of the Jewish Federation of Cleveland for forty-three years, and whose incumbency must therefore have coincided with the beginnings of the Cleveland Federation for Charity and Philanthropy.


9. Ibid., pp. 50, 52, 53, 62. In a letter of April 6, 1936, Allen T. Burns, Executive Vice-President of Community...
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Chests and Councils, writes: "We know nothing including community budget making earlier than the Cleveland attempt. All other efforts of which we know were more or less of the character of a united campaign, each agency putting in an uncensored amount and drawing out the results in proportion to its original request." Maurice J. Karpf, *Jewish Community Organization in the United States*, New York, 1938, observes: "Community Chests . . . are the outcome of the Jewish Federations and were profoundly influenced by them" (p. 107), and that "The Jewish federation has stimulated the creation of the Community Chest" (p. 177).

Norton, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

Minutes of the Welfare Federation of Cleveland, January 27, 1913, supplied by Edward D. Lynde, Executive Secretary, June 18, 1950. In the letter mentioned supra, note 10, Allen T. Burns declares: "The Jews really should have the credit of inventing Community Chest principles. They saw the advantage of a central budget as a basis of a united campaign. We think nothing can really be called a Chest that does not involve this principle. Cleveland was the first community of which we know to apply the principle to a community-wide effort . . . . The real proposer of the Cleveland ideas was Mr. Martin Marks. He was chairman of a special committee of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce to study the whole matter. He derived his ideas from Jewish Federations." It may be well once more to quote Norton, *op. cit.*, pp. 68, 69: "Just as Darwin is not the originator of the theory of evolution, so is Cleveland not the originator of federation. But Darwin compiled the evidence on evolution and became its first great press agent. And Cleveland founded its federation on a wealth of evidence, planted it in extremely fertile soil and promptly announced it to the world. Its federation succeeded from the start: it prompted a dozen cities to do the same thing; and it deserves to be known as the originator of the modern movement."

Communication of July 19, 1950, from Lyman S. Ford, of Community Chests and Councils, 155 East 44th St., New York 17.

The first of the Jewish Welfare Funds was started in 1925 (*Social Work Year Book* 1949, p. 261). A Jewish Welfare Fund is a type of organization which, existing in numerous American Jewish communities, provides joint solicitation, once a year, for a large group of Jewish benevolences mostly non-local; that is to say, national agencies such as the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives at Denver, and overseas agencies such as the Hebrew University at Jerusalem. A Jewish Welfare Fund sometimes includes a few local Jewish benevolences which, for one reason or another, do not qualify for admittance into the interdenominational community chest. In a recent year, the Jewish Welfare Fund of Cincinnati served 33 extra-local agencies and 13 local agencies.

A National Fund has been recommended outside of the Jewish sphere by Ray Johns, *The Cooperative Process Among National Social Agencies*, New York, 1946, pp. 243, 244, 256. This book could be criticized for overlooking the Jewish welfare funds, which are strikingly relevant to its subject. A national Health Fund has been recommended by Selskar M. Gunn and Philip S. Platt, in *Voluntary Health Agencies*, New York, 1915, p. 223. The organization known as Community Chests and Councils (155 East 44th St., New York 17) has been promoting "the idea of state chests for non-local appeals in peacetime" (Letter of October 25, 1950, from Community Chests and Councils; also their mimeographed publication, *State Chests in Peacetime*, January 10, 1950). Wayne McMillan, *Community Organization for Social Welfare*, Chicago, 1945, pp. 346, 440. Lyman S. Ford, in
an article, "Whither Federation?" in the Survey of September 15, 1948, urges (pp. 277, 278, 279) extending "the principle of federation to these so-called 'non-local' appeals." It is hard to explain how it happens that these writers, who should have known about the Jewish Welfare Funds, seem to be uninformed.

18 An Evil of the Fur Trade and How It Will Be Overcome, The Charity Chest of the Fur Industry of the City of New York, Michael Hollender, Chairman Campaign Committee, 224 W. 30th St., New York City. Issued by the Publicity Committee, Samuel N. Samuels, Chairman.


19 These statistics are from "Five Years of the Trade Chest" (supra, note 18).

20 Letter of February 23, 1937, from David Citron, Executive Director of the Chest and Foundation of the Fur Industry of the City of New York. By this time, the organization had ceased to make allocations to benevolence and had become a mutual aid body assisting none but its own members. According to a letter of October 16, 1950, from its secretary, that was still the nature of the organization.


22 A copy of these rules can be found on p. 33 of The Transportation Problem in American Social Work, Jeffrey R. Brackett, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1936.

23 Proceedings of the National Conference of Jewish Charities, 1900, p. 19.

24 Brackett, op. cit., pp. 11, 12.


26 Ibid., p. 17.


28 Ibid., p. 2.


30 This service has now come to be extended to the care of the aged, the blind, and the chronically ill (Social Work Year Book 1949, p. 231).


34 Salome S. C. Bernstein, "The Visiting Housekeeper," Jewish Social Service Quarterly, May, 1925, p. 11: "On the fifteenth of October, 1923, the first two housekeepers were sent to families and the experiment was actually under way."

Lurie in *Hospital Social Service Magazine* (supra, note 35), p. 327.

Ibid., p. 330.

Letter of August 2, 1950, from Virginia C. Frank, Executive Director of Jewish Family and Community Service, Chicago. The service was still functioning in June, 1933, when Miss Frank spoke before the Round Table on Birth Control at the conference in Detroit.


Bailey B. Burritt, in the foreword to the Lurie article in the *Hospital Social Service Magazine*, mentions the existence of something similar in London, financed by Jewish philanthropists, though serving on a non-sectarian basis (p. 328). However, in the *Jewish Social Service Quarterly*, December, 1926, pp. 20, 21, as well as in a letter dated August 28, 1950, Mr. Lurie states that “the new feature developed in Chicago was the service extended both to the wife and to the husband.” Virginia Frank also alludes to this feature, then unique, of enlisting the husband’s participation. This could not, however, have been the only new feature because, in the same letter, Mr. Lurie writes: “The birth control counseling service was the first of its kind in the programs of family service and relief agencies,” which is identical with his published statement of 1931, pp. 327, 330.

A sample of literature on the subject is *The Case Worker and Family Planning*, published in 1949, by the Planned Parenthood Federation of America (501 Madison Ave., New York 22).

This refers, of course, to modern sanctions in the modern world. This has nothing to do with the Jewish traditional attitudes expounded by Jacob Z. Lauterbach, “Talmudic-Rabbinic View on Birth Control,” *Yearbook Central Conference of American Rabbis*, XXXVII (1927), 569-584.


*Birth Control Review*, May, 1930, p. 149. In *Moral Aspects* (supra, note 43), the year is given as 1931.


*BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW*, April, 1931, p. 102. The Committee on Marriage and the Home consisted of twenty-eight persons. Twenty-two favored the statement, three opposed it, and three were neutral. According to the superscription, “Protestants Endorse Birth Control” (p. 101), the administrative committee of the Federal Council of Churches endorsed this conclusion.
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influenced by the rabbis' prior action. We are reminded of what C. C. Carstens (infra, note 52) says about Mothers' Pensions: "As is common in other forms of invention, the beginnings of this movement are discovered in a number of places almost simultaneously" (p. 7).


52 C. C. Carstens (Public Pensions to Widows With Children, Publication No. 31, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1913) mentions San Francisco as preceding Kansas City in granting tax-provided pensions to indigent widows with children (pp. 7, 8, 9, 11). Emma O. Lundberg (Public Aid to Mothers With Dependent Children, Children's Bureau Publication No. 162, Washington, 1926) mentions not only San Francisco but also the State of Oklahoma as preceding Kansas City in tax-provided aid for widows with children (p. 2). Nonetheless, a careful reading of these pages will disclose that what prevailed in California and in Oklahoma was distinctly different from that which obtained in Kansas City and thence swept the nation.

Under the California law, the state paid for the maintenance of children in private institutions. After the earthquake of 1906, these institutions became overcrowded and had to be supplemented by placement in private homes (Carstens, p. 8). Sometimes it happened that the private homes selected would be the homes of the necessitous children themselves. Sometimes such homes chanced to be fatherless by reason of death, desertion, or imprisonment. The Oklahoma law of 1908 "provided for 'school scholarships' to be paid by counties upon the recommendation of the school authorities to children whose widowed mothers needed their earnings" (Lundberg, p. 2). By way of adjustment to child labor legislation?

Carstens himself states that the California plan was "not based on a statute directly establishing widows' pensions" (p. 9). Emma O. Lundberg also affirms: "The first definite legal provisions of aid to mothers of dependent children were passed by the Missouri Legislature in 1911" (p. 2). A discussion of Mothers' Pensions before the National Conference of Charities and Corrections in 1914 (Proceedings, pp. 442 ff.) mentions Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts, but not California and not Oklahoma. One of the sentences reads: "Many of the states West of the Mississippi soon followed the example of Missouri and passed laws that in language and methods of enforcement were practically identical."


54 L. A. Halbert, "The Widows' Allowance Act in Kansas City," The Survey, XXXI (February 28, 1914), 675. Perhaps the role of Kansas City with relation to Mothers' Pensions was analogous to that of Cleveland with relation to the Community Chest as viewed by William J. Norton (supra, note 12).

55 Letter of August 17, 1950, from Washington University, St. Louis.

56 Letter of July 29, 1938, from Jacob Billikopf.

57 This is Article 13 in the Social Justice Platform of 1918 (Yearbook, XXVIII [1918], 102).

58 A Statement on Social Unrest adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, June 12, 1919, and, by the same body, A Statement on Social and Industrial Problems, June 10, 1920.

59 Bulletin No. 29 of the Social Service Committee of the Northern Baptist Convention. A search for other Christian pronouncements on this theme has thus far proved unsuccessful.

60 Mrs. Sidney J. Eisman, "An Experi-

61 Mrs. Eisman, op. cit., p. 257.


64 Abba Hillel Silver, discussing the Hexter paper (supra, note 63), urged: “If there is a movement toward standardization within the group controlling the community fund, then it is the duty of the Federation not to leave that Board but to stay there and aggressively to assume leadership pointing the way toward a standardization upward, instead of a standardization downward.”

65 The *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, March 15, 1936, p. 6, column 2. Grossman was not influenced by Silver. He was not aware of Silver’s idea until it was brought to his attention by the present writer more than twenty-four years later. Grossman professes to have been prompted by his personal experiences as Chairman of the Cuyahoga County Relief Committee (Letter of October 11, 1950, from Marc J. Grossman).

66 The *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, March 15, 1936, p. 6, column 3.

67 For these accomplishments, Grossman received the Distinguished Service Award of the Cleveland Community Fund (Cleveland Plain Dealer, December 18, 1938).

68 In Cleveland itself, a reversion to the earlier niggardliness was threatened when, in 1936, the Ohio Legislature passed the Metzenbaum Bill. This led Grossman to resign in protest from the county relief committee (Cleveland Plain Dealer, March 15, 1936, p. 1).


70 *Social Work Year Book* 1949, p. 194.


72 *Social Work Year Book* 1949, p. 194.


77 Davidson, op. cit., p. 22.

78 Davidson, op. cit., p. 19.


81 Joseph, ibid.

82 Davidson, op. cit., p. 22.


84 Ibid., p. 197.

85 *Social Work Year Book* 1949, pp. 92, 957.

86 Ibid., p. 362.

87 Ibid., p. 562.

88 Benjamin Stolberg, *Tailor's Progress*,
Garden City, N. Y., 1944, p. 65.
89Ibid., pp. 67, 68. Selig Perlman, A History of Trade Unionism in the United States, New York, 1922. According to Prof. Perlman, this Joint Board of Sanitary Control "wrought a revolution in the hygienic conditions in the shop" (p. 20).
90Perlman, ibid.
91Stolberg, op. cit., p. 70.
92Stolberg, op. cit., p. 78.
94Stolberg, op. cit., p. 91.
95Ibid., pp. 69, 207, 208.
96Ibid., p. 91.
97Perlman, op. cit., p. 220.
98Stolberg, op. cit., pp. 68, 96, 202. Perlman, op. cit., p. 20. David J. Saposs, "The Role of the Immigrant in the Labor Movement," The Amalgamated Illustrated Almanac (Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Education Department), New York, 1924, p. 152. Mr. Saposs adds: "To the needle trade unions also goes the credit of being the first to wage successful campaigns for the 44-hour week."
101Stolberg, op. cit., p. 293.
102Ibid., p. 287.
103Marius Hansome, "The Development of Workers' Education," in Brameld, op. cit. (supra, note 100), p. 57. Selig Perlman, "Workers' Education," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, XV, 485. The Workers' Education Bureau of the American Federation of Labor was founded in 1921 after the educational projects of the trade had gotten well under way. John D. Connors, the director of the Workers' Education Bureau, therefore errs when he says, in a prospectus of that Bureau, that "the modern American Workers' Education movement . . . really began in 1921 with the establishment of the Workers' Education Bureau of America." Connors claims that Workers' Education had its inception in 1828. These sporadic projects, however, initiated prior to 1916, were not of trade union inception and auspices like the Workers' Education undertakings of today. The present status of Workers' Education in the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union has elicited an enthusiastic article on the subject by Beulah Amidon in "Union Teacher," the Survey, December, 1950, p. 549.
105Stolberg, op. cit., p. 291.
106Ibid., p. 292.
107Ibid., p. 291.
108Ibid., p. 292. Although Stolberg (p. 290) reports that, for various reasons, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union had practically given up workers' education, the movement has nonetheless continued to be fostered in labor circles. The Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences reports that the ILGWU resumed workers' education upon the advent of the New Deal (XV, 485).
110Letter of July 29, 1950, from Elisabeth Christman, former secretary-treasurer of the National Women's Trade Union League.
York, December, 1938, English Section, p. 50.


113Letter of October 16, 1950, from Judge Panken.


115Ibid., p. 233.


117Maurice Taylor, ibid.

118Ibid., p. 234.

119Ibid.

120*Social Work Year Book 1949*, p. 518.

121Davidson, op. cit., pp. 104, 122.

122Joseph, op. cit., pp. 143, 146. Davidson, *op. cit.*, pp. 45, 46. These credit unions began business on May 1, 1911, in the states of New York and Connecticut. "They were the first credit cooperatives on American soil" (p. 45). The Federal Security Agency issued, as of December 31, 1949, statistics of Federal Credit Unions operating among members of the National Grange. This, of course, does not include the agricultural credit unions outside of the federal program.


125Ibid., p. 117.


132Joseph, ibid.


135Davidson (*op. cit.*, pp. 157, 160, 161) mentions projects started, between 1929 and 1940, near Chatham, near Plainfield, and near Bound Brook, New Jersey; also one near Peekskill, New York.

136This project was known as "Jersey Homestead, Inc." (Davidson, *op. cit.*, p. 160), but was better known as the Hightstown, New Jersey, project (*Notes and News*, December 31, 1933, p. 25. *Jewish Daily Bulletin*, March 23, 1934). The Hightstown project was sponsored by the Provisional Committee for Jewish Land Settlement in America. The Subsistence Homestead Division of the federal government's Department of the Interior agreed to grant a loan of $500,000. On December 31, 1933, this undertaking was in process of organization. At Hightstown, "among the structures will be a clothing factory," in conjunction with the farms (*Jewish Daily Bulletin*, March 23, 1934, p. 5).

137Letters of January 27, 1948, and Au-
Edward Hochhauser, "Objectives of Sheltered Workshops," Jewish Social Service Quarterly, June, 1949, Vol. XXV, No. 4, p. 541. The Joint Tuberculosis Committee was formed in December, 1913, by Montefiore Hospital, the Social Service Department of the Free Synagogue, and the United Hebrew Charities (Life and a Living, Report of the Committee for the Care of the Jewish Tuberculous, 71 W. 47th St., New York City, 1936, p. 17).

The periodical literature on the Alto Workshops is copious. Samples are: By Edward Hochhauser, "Rehabilitating the Tuberculous—a Successful Experiment" (The Modern Hospital, XXXVI, No. 4, April, 1931); "A New Place in Industry for Sheltered Workshops" (Better Times, May 28, 1925, p. 14); "Industry's Practice in the Employment of Ex-Patients" (The American Review of Tuberculosis, Vol. XL, No. 4, October, 1929, pp. 437-444); "The Sheltered Workshop—its Place in the Rehabilitation of the Tuberculous" (Hospitals, July, 1942); "Are We Meeting Case Work Needs of the Tuberculous Patient and His Family?" (National Conference of Social Work, May 23, 1946). By Louis E. Siltzbach, "The Sheltered Workshop in the Rehabilitation of the Tuberculous" (Milbank Memorial Quarterly, Vol. XXI, No. 1, January, 1943, pp. 80-100); Clinical Evaluation of the Rehabilitation of the Tuberculous (National Tuberculosis Association, New York, 1944).

We believe very strongly in a production wage equal to the union rate or to the pay of the best concerns doing similar work" (Edward Hochhauser, "A Recovery Act" for the Handicapped," in Occupational Therapy and Rehabilitation, Vol. XIII, No. 5, October, 1934). "Our wages have been maintained steadily at high levels" (Life and a Living, supra, note 138, p. 54).

131Life and a Living, pp. 41, 42. "The doctor is boss" ("Objectives of Sheltered Workshops," supra, note 138, p. 543).


143Some duplication is reported to have occurred in England, in Switzerland, and in France (Edward Hochhauser, "Post-Sanatorium Care of the Tuberculous," Hospitals, November, 1936). These are not exact replicas, nor can there be any predication of influence (Letter of July 19, 1950, from the Committee for the Care of the Jewish Tuberculous). The parallel effort at Papsworth, England, is mentioned also in Altro Becomes of Age (Invitation to the Dedication of the New Alto Work Shops in New York City, December, 1924).

144Louis I. Dublin, "Altro Fights for Rehabilitation," The Modern Hospital, June, 1944.

145During the first ten years of its existence, the institution went by the name of the Psychopathic Institute. Some published references are the following by Louis A. Lurie: "Treatment of the Subnormal and Psychopathic Child," Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 67, May 21, 1921, pp. 1386-1389; The Mental Hygiene Program of the United Jewish Social Agencies, Cincinnati, February, 1923, p. 5; "The Subnormal and Psychopathic Child as Exemplified in Special Clinic," Journal of the

146 Social Service Directory of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Research Department of the Cincinnati Community Chest, 1947, p. 125.

147 Letter of July 22, 1950, from Dr. Louis A. Lurie.

148 Ibid. The Cincinnati Child Guidance Home was established in July, 1920, under the name of the "Psychopathic Institute." The priority of the Cincinnati Child Guidance Home might be questioned on the basis of a statement in the September, 1944, issue of the Quarterly Bulletin of the Managing Officers Association published by the Department of Public Welfare, State of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio, and referring to the Ohio State Bureau of Juvenile Research. This statement (p. 7) reads: "The Bureau has been located at 2280 West Broad St., Columbus 4, Ohio, since January, 1920. The present facilities enable the Bureau to have in residence about one hundred twenty children who remain for extensive and intensive observation and study." These sentences do not contradict the claim of Dr. Lurie. They do not assert that, as early as 1920, children would "remain for extensive and intensive observation and study." Dr. Lurie writes, on November 14, 1950: "The Child Guidance Home was the first inpatient facility for the study and treatment of behavior disorders of children and which employed the Orthopsychiatric team of psychiatrist, psychologist, and psychiatric social worker as its operating unit... to the best of my knowledge, it was the first of its kind in the world."

149 Interview with Dr. Lurie, October 21, 1950.

150 Triennial Report, 1947-1949, the Union Health Center, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

151 Leo Price, M.D., in "Union Plans," Archives of Industrial Hygiene and Occupational Medicine, September, 1950, p. 256. It is well known that the late Dr. Lee K. Frankel originated the health program of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

152 Home Care, a collection of reprints and other articles issued by Montefiore Hospital, New York City, 1949, pp. 17, 22. E. M. Bluestone, "Social Medicine," in the Modern Hospital, August, 1950.

153 Letter of December 17, 1941, from Kurt G. Herz, Research Associate of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.


156 Letter of Kurt G. Herz (supra, note 157).

157 John P. Dean, op. cit., footnote 6.

158 Letter of August 10, 1950, from Mrs. Ruth Solomon, Head of the Community Welfare Department, National Council of Jewish Women.

159 Duplication need not indicate influence or imitation. A memorable example was the resolution adopted by the Rabbinical Assembly of America on May 3, 1933, in which the passage occurs: "The world has risked so much for war. Let it risk as much for peace." On July 2, 1934, the British Society of Friends issued a "Call to Complete Disarmament" which contains the words: "We take risks in war—we can take risks for peace." Inquiry of the person who led in the formulation of the Quaker document brings the
reply that, to the British Quakers, the action of the American Conservative Rabbis was entirely unknown and that the parallel was, in all probability, a pure coincidence. A letter of August 18, 1950, from the London Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends reads: "It seems unlikely that anyone on our committee knew of your resolution."
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