

Rough Notes on Miss Tarbell's MS for Scribners

The author's thesis: demoralizing effects of federal relief. Alternative: local administration of social work emphasizing rehabilitation.

Ignores - Possibility of federal action being constructive - working in fields other than temporary relief - preventing causes of deterioration.  
 Fails to admit local inability to cope with wholesale disaster like depression.

Still True - Local interest and leadership to make federal activities sound and adaptable are needed in whole field of security as well as in relief. Such leadership only slowly developing in public field but is available through private agencies.

## Social Security Bill:

Looks toward a) prevention of dependency caused by unemployment and unemployability - b) restoration of accepted governmental services cut by depression.

Has little bearing on plight of man now out of work and out of funds. Makes no allowance for personal difficulties, adjustment of individual, building up of character and power to manage one's own life acceptably. Needs guarding against political manipulation just as relief program does.

Note that Social Security Bill calls for cooperation with private welfare organizations. Also that standards to be met in maintaining high quality of work to be done with federal money depend largely on quality of local leadership in private health and welfare organizations.

## Special Notes:

- p.2 -a) Better concede that economic disaster on a large scale is beyond power of individual to cope with or local community to adjust.
- b) Was federal relief forced on communities? Better mention unemployment as cause.
- p.6 -7 ) Is the issue now solely that of withholding contributions to private agencies because of public relief - or can't social security bill be mentioned here too as part of issue? *yes*
- p.7 ) Change paragraph 2 to a more inclusive and accurate statement of tax-supported functions. E.g. nurses - more than half the public health nurses are now employed by tax-supported organizations, but private organizations supply most of the bedside care.

*on second thought: The statement about Federal taxes is substantially correct. It could be expanded to say that such Federal taxes as may be needed to carry out the Social Security bill will not change the primary local obligation to support hospitals, nurses, & organized charities.*

3-1  
5-1

Statistics to be Used on Page 5

The most striking comparison to be made is not that between the increase of employment and the increased number of persons on relief rolls, but between increased employment and amounts of money spent for relief. As a matter of fact, the number of families in the United States on public relief was less during the fall of 1934 than in March 1933, so far the high water mark. It is suggested that the last two sentences of the middle paragraph on page 5 be restated as follows:

\* " A point and emphasis is given to such complaints by the disconcerting fact that while there has been a substantial increase in employment since the low level of March 1933 there has been a much greater increase in the amount spent on public relief. It was estimated that in September 1934 the first stood at 40%, the second at 76%." ~~(For October the percentage of increase for the latter would have been 95% but no employment figures are available at the moment to compare with the amount of relief).~~ *our*

Certain figures are given below which seem to us the most pertinent in this connection.

Employment in Manufacturing Industries	% of Normal
March 1933	88.8
Sept. 1934 (50% increase)	75.8

(Monthly Labor Review)

Unemployment in United States	
1932	12,000,000
1933	12,000,000
1934 (drop of 16%)	10,000,000

(Commission on Economic Security)

Relief	Number of Persons	Families
March 1933	<i>not available</i>	4,560,000
Sept. 1934	18,410,334	
Oct. 1934	18,450,567	
Nov. 1934	19,017,815	4,235,074 (FERA Reports)

(N.Y. City Dec. 1934 751,250 (Jan. 1935 220,000 (all time record)) (New York Times)

Amount Relief in U.S.		
March 1933	\$81,205,631	) increase 76%
Sept. 1934	143,227,846	
(Oct. 1934	156,747,867	increase 95%)

Digital Images, 2010. The Ida M. Tarbell Collection. New York College Pelletier Library.

186,493  
45,601  
518,710

~~1-1~~

and the disparity. has continued to increase  
in November 1934 there were 1,017,815  
persons on relief rolls - according to FERT  
reports on 600,000 more than in September  
and the increase in money spent for relief  
rolls which we started in 1933 - the peak  
of our distress - was 93% per cent on B

The most striking comparison to be made is not that between the increase of  
employment and the increased number of persons on relief rolls, but between  
increased employment and amounts of money spent for relief. As a matter of  
fact, the number of families in the United States on public relief was less  
during the fall of 1934 than in March 1933, so far the high water mark. It is  
suggested that the last two sentences of the middle paragraph on page 3 be  
restated as follows:

"A point and emphasis is given to such complaints by the disconcerting fact  
that while there has been a substantial increase in employment since the low  
point of March 1933 there has been a much greater increase in the amount spent  
for relief." (The first sentence of the middle paragraph on page 3)

Statistics to be Used on Page 3

Month	Number of Persons	Amount Relief
March 1933	4,580,000	\$81,208,631
Sept. 1934	18,410,384	148,227,946
Oct. 1934	18,480,597	156,747,867
Nov. 1934	19,017,815	
Dec. 1934	20,250	
Jan. 1935	220,000 (All time record)	