

Ida M. Tarbell
120 East 19 Street

"Love Your Neighbor"

'Love thy neighbor
Offer to share his burden
Tell him to say the word 'n'
You will see him through"

Mack Gordon

Last year for the first time in our history the Federal Government gave a huge sum, \$500,000,000 to buy food and fuel for the unemployed. This year it will tax us to the tune of around \$2,000,000,000 for the same purpose. Why is the government asking this of us? Simply because there was no other way to make good its promise "nobody shall starve". It has always been the practice of our states and communities to care for the needy out of local public relief funds. Two years ago they were too poor to carry all the extraordinary load the Depression had brought.

The government decided to help them. Hence these great appropriations, hence a Bureau in Washington to administer them. But note it ^{is} was an Emergency Relief Bureau - its very name limited its life, defined ^s its function. It replaced ^s no established local public relief work, only supplemented ^s it. And it had ^s nothing whatever to do with the great and essential agencies which private funds have established and always supported for caring for Human Needs over and beyond food and fuel.

Inspite of the clearly defined intent of the government, in spite of the established nature of public and private agencies great confusion has cropped up on all sides as to what Uncle Sam is doing and intends to do. Is he not taking full care of all the unemployed? Why should we be asked for contributions to support private agencies when he is taxing ^{us} ~~he~~ so heavily in order that he may give so lavishly.

This and other questions voiceing the confusion in the public

mind in this matter so vital at the moment have already been discussed ably and provocatively in this journal by Margaret Culkin Banning - an article based on long sympathetic personal experience with the problem of meeting the needs of the unfortunate.

What is at the bottom of the present muddle? Two things: - First, the failure clearly to distinguish between emergency and permanent public relief. Second, failure to understand the different objectives of public and private agencies.

Emergencies have a way of driving everything else past and future out of men's minds. They are so imperative that the devices created to deal with them take on a character of permanence, something which has come to stay. The farmer back in the Great War had to be given a premium price for a bushel of wheat to persuade him to give his whole soul to raising enough to feed the armies. But he soon ceased to think of that \$2.25 as a war measure. That was what wheat was worth and he acted often on that conviction in his buying and building, only to find himself flat when the war ended.

At the present moment many people are making the same mischievous mistake about Federal relief. They are beginning to accept it as something come to stay - relieving them from responsibilities they once took for granted, and this in spite of its clear label. It may be a long time before the need of a measure of government aid for relief ^{is} done away with, but let recovery arrive as it will and we will drop it as promptly as we did our baconless breakfast and sugarless coffee at the end of the war.

The government will have bigger business on hand when that day comes. Its work will be to set up machinery for handling the next visitation of unemployment more satisfactorily than it was able to do the present. One thing it can very well undertake is to find out how it has been that one half of the unemployed were never

on the public rolls. Why? How did they manage it? There ought to be something suggestive there. There is unemployment insurance to be studied. There are programs for public and private works to be kept in stock for the return of the slump. A fine challenge this emergency leaves behind it to the intelligence and good will of this people. If it is accepted the result will be worth all it has cost. But that is for the future.

Unluckily it is not the confusion of thinking that has arisen from forgetting the label on the Relief Program which is most serious. It is confounding what the government is doing in feeding people with what we as individuals have been doing for many years now in caring for the sick and the crippled, in protecting children and particularly in holding families together. These great and essential agencies are permanent institutions for preventing and curing social ills. The present government relief funds do not touch them - cannot in the very nature of the grants. They are our private responsibility and today sore as we are over our taxes and distracted as we are over the difficulty of meeting them we are more or less honestly trying to delude ourselves with the notion that the government is supporting them - or ought to be.

Maybe it ought to, maybe the day will come when it will, but that is a far day and has nothing to do with the plain fact that if we do not do it this year the whole social and economic fabric will cruelly suffer.

What are these essential agencies? First our Hospitals, 68% of them are privately administered and operated. The depression has increased the burden on them naturally enough. Shall we let them down now when the emergency makes the need of them greater?

I cannot believe that we will. Where we understand a need we respond to it as a people. We had a beautiful and touching proof

of that a few months ago in the million dollars we so quickly and gladly turned in for Mr. Roosevelt's Georgia Sanitarium for victims of infantile paralysis. It was a fine recognition of Mr. Roosevelt's valiant fight with the dreadful disease but it was equally proof that our will is to help when we understand the need.

It is not only our sympathy for those who suffer that opens our pocketbook, it is what is coming to be more and more a settled national conviction that we must see to it that ours is a strong clean people tuned to useful activities by its sense of physical well-being. If we are to have this we must have all the varieties of institution which prevent and cure physical troubles. If my wash woman is going to have a baby I want to know that in our community there is a maternity ward for her. If Johnnie around the corner is too crippled to walk I want to be sure there is treatment available to make of him a self-supporting citizen. It is only through these agencies which I ought and want to help support that I can discharge my individual responsibility of making sure that Johnnie and the wash woman will get help in their time of need.

Health means more than Hospital^s, It means nurses and ?-% of the nurses who care for us, if we do not belong to that small group people in the United States who have money enough to pay ~~\$~~\$7. a day^{ly} for a nurse, are supported by private contributions. Take a god-sent agency like the Visiting Nurse Service of the Henry Street Settlement of Lillian Wald in New York City which in heat and cold, night or day, sends trained nurses from tenement to tenement to do what they can to ease the tides of pain which surge through these places. Can the citizens of New York afford to let its work slow up for lack of funds, can any community afford to let its sick go without nursing not only because of human sympathy but because of what soundness of mind and

body particularly among the poor means to the sanity and safety of the community.

High in importance among these Human Service Agencies stand those that guard the family. Idle to argue in these United States that the family is not the most important unit in our social system, the last thing majority will give up - whatever the rebellious tell you. If we could analyse the forces which held us together through recent tormented years I am convinced that the strongest of all has been the family. But in thousand of cases it could not have been preserved, such were the attacks of unemployment, illness, discouragement - with their demoralizing effects, if it had not been for privately supported agencies with their host of trained social workers.

Take the case of Mary B. - "Scrub Lady No. 1" was her official title on the books of the office building where for years she had spent her nights on her knees cleaning floors. One night the watchman found her unconscious. He hurried her to the city hospital where she was pronounced "worn out" "a very sick woman." Half conscious Mary kept up a muttering of about the "children". The nurse knew what to do. She called a social worker. Two days later the children were placed. Four months later when Mary came out that social worker now Mary's friend and patron saint had a place for her better fitted to her strength, care-taker of a modest apartment house and here she still lives. Her children going through school - promising well for the future - a family saved from crumbling.

We can't spare such service in our communities. Nor can we let those activities which serve as auxiliaries to family upbuilding suffer. Think what it means to a family for the boys and girls to have a ^{summer} vacation in the country.

Shall I say my taxes have doubled, quadrupled, my private obligations have greatly increased while at the same time my pro-

essional returns are halved or more, and since this is so I can this year give the \$15. it takes to send Johnnie to camp for two weeks. I know he needs it. I know two weeks with three good meals a day, a cool bed to himself, he who has been sleeping five to a bed, a daily swim, all a camp means, would bring him back with his white face brown, his sunken cheeks plump. I know what it would do for his mother watching him slip down. But not this year. If its got to be done let the government do it - all those millions its collecting.

We cannot get out that way if we face the case. The government won't and can't take the place of those who have through the years built up these agencies we know to be so necessary in making this the kind of country we want. Better we give up something we think we need. It is not only for the sake of Johnnie's body and mind we make the sacrifice it is for our own soul's sake.

And here comes into this gigantic and confused problem of the comparative value of public and private charity a profoundly significant fact - the fact that tax-paying for relief has no spiritual value for him who pays. I don't see how it is possible that it should have. The tax collector gathers up the money. We have no choice but pay. The government administers it. We don't know how or where. We have, I think, a certain pride in knowing that we are partners with the county in carrying out its undertakings. But we also have anxiety about administration. We are often baffled by our inability unless we are "on the inside" to get even a hearing. I teied my best last winter to get from the C.W.A. Bureau in New York City a moment's attention for a group of women who had, so I believe, something useful to offer. I was unable to get even acknowledgement of the letters I wrote or an interview with even an under secretary for the women I wanted to see put at work.

There must have been thousands who because its machinery was a hasty improvisation and its days numbered had no chance with the C.W.A.

I certainly don't lay this up against Harry Hopkins, ~~The~~ Federal Relief Administrator, who dumped the C.W.A. into our laps. Few men could have done as well as he ^{has} in this heart-breaking job of feeding the millions of unemployed who faced the crisis without back-log or training for trouble. What I am saying is that public-
ly administered relief in an emergency particularly has no personal significance and so no spiritual value to those who put up the money.

Now men and women in a civilisation as preeminantly, materialistic as this, one so given to thinking life can be solved by blue prints and statistics and efficient mechanization, needs mightily to be in personal touch with human beings and their needs, to understand how much more they need than food and that if they are to get it, it is by our individual sacrifices, not forced sacrifice like taxes but those made from choice because we can do no less.

George Eliot says of one of her characters that she sprang as instinctively to help the one she saw in need, as she stretched out her hand to save herself if falling. Is not this exactly the natural, unconscious response each of us would make to need which came our way if we were fully developed, ripely cultivated humans? But we will never develop such instinctive grace of nature by paying taxes alone. The best opportunity the day furnishes us for an education in wise compassion comes in these agencies which our communities have built to succor the sick, guard children, knit together families, build or re-build character.

It does something for us and it does something for those who receive, establish between us a sense of neighborliness, a conscious-

ness that whatever the difference in our social or material position we have a tie, will always stand by each other. Everyone who has helped a neighbor handicapped by poverty through a crisis knows that almost invariably she will never cease to watch for a chance to "do something" for you.

Such activities are too precious to neglect, to let starve. They mean too much to the community, whatever the emergency they must be carried on.

Our situation today is very like that in the Great War. Then everything was given for the armies overseas or on their way. I think it was the Woman's Committee of the Council of National Defense which first realized that in our absorption with war needs we were forgetting home needs, particularly were we in danger of neglecting the agencies for looking after the health, recreation, ^{of children.} As soon as this was sensed the Woman's Committee ^{of} the Council of National Defense called in Julia Lathrop, the chief of the Children's Bureau as an adviser. The organization the Committee had built up was amazing, reaching into every corner of practically every county in the nation. At once we put on a campaign under Miss Lathrop's direction to revive and extend all work for children. Miss Lathrop afterwards said that there had never been done in a year as much to extend the ideals and plans of her Bureau as was done in two months through the ~~the~~ thoroughly aroused national organization of Women.

They saw what they had not realized that to win the war and destroy or let run to seed civilizing home institutions was defeat.

The case today is similar. We must meet the emergency the depression has thrust upon us but when it passes, as it will, we must not allow ourselves to be found with all our splendid creations for caring for human needs wrecked because we have confused the province of emergency and permanent-public and private undertakings for meeting Human Needs. ^{Service}

Ida M. Tarbell
120 East 19 Street

^{Thy}
"Love ~~your~~ Neighbor"

" Love thy neighbor
Offer to share his burden
Tell him to say the word 'n'
You will see him through."

MACK GORDON

Last year for the first time in our history the Federal Government gave a huge sum, \$500,000,000 to buy food and fuel for the unemployed. This year it will tax us to the tune of around \$2,000,000,000 for the same purpose. Why is the government asking this of us? Simply because there was no other way to make good its promise, "nobody shall starve". It has always been the practice of our states and communities to care for the needy out of local public relief funds. Two years ago they were too poor to carry all the extraordinary load the Depression had brought.

The government decided to help them. Hence these great appropriations, hence a Bureau in Washington to administer them. But note it was an Emergency Relief Bureau - its very name limited its life, defined its function. It replaced no established local public relief work, only supplemented it. And it had nothing whatever to do with the great and essential agencies which private funds have established and always supported for caring for Human Needs over and beyond food and fuel.

In spite of the clearly defined intent of the government, in spite of the established nature of public and private agencies great confusion has cropped up on all sides as to what Uncle Sam is doing and intends to do. Is he not taking full care of all the unemployed? Why should we be asked for contributions to support private agencies when he is taxing ^{us} ~~me~~ so heavily in order that he may give so lavishly.

This and other questions voicing the confusion in the public

mind in this matter so vital at the moment have already been discussed ably and provocatively in this journal by Margaret Culkin Banning - an article based on long sympathetic personal experience with the problem of meeting the needs of the unfortunate.

What is at the bottom of the present muddle? Two things: - First, the failure clearly to distinguish between emergency and permanent public relief. Second,^{Xu} failure to understand the different objectives of public and private agencies.

Emergencies have a way of driving everything else, past and future, out of men's minds. They are so imperative that the devices created to deal with them take on a character of permanence, something which has come to stay. The farmer back in the Great War had to be given a premium price for a bushel of wheat to persuade him to give his whole soul to raising enough to feed the armies. But he soon ceased to think of that \$2.25 as a war measure. That was what wheat was worth and he acted often on that conviction in his buying and building, only to find himself flat when the war ended.

At the present moment many people are making the same mischievous mistake about Federal ^{emergency} relief. They are beginning to accept it as something come to stay - relieving them from responsibilities they once took for granted, and this in spite of its clear label. It may be a long time before the need of a measure of government aid for relief ^{is} done away with, but let recovery arrive, as it will, and we will drop it as promptly as we did our baconless breakfast and sugarless coffee at the end of the war.

The government will have bigger business on hand when that day comes. Its work will be to set up machinery for handling the next visitation of unemployment more satisfactorily than it was able to do the present. One thing it can very well undertake is to find out how it has been that one half of the unemployed were never

on the public rolls. Why? How did they manage it? There ought to be something suggestive there. There is unemployment insurance to be studied. There are programs for public and private works to be kept in stock for the return of the slump. A fine challenge this emergency leaves behind it to the intelligence and good will of this people. If it is accepted the result will be worth all it has cost. But that is for the future.

Unluckily it is not the confusion of thinking that has arisen from forgetting the label on the Relief Program which is most serious. It is confounding what the government is doing in feeding people with what we as individuals have been doing for many years now in caring for the sick and the crippled, in protecting children and particularly in holding families together. These great and essential agencies are permanent institutions for preventing and curing social ills. The present government relief funds do not touch them - cannot in the very nature of the grants. They are our private responsibility and today, sore as we are over our taxes and distracted as we are over the difficulty of meeting them, we are more or less honestly trying to delude ourselves with the notion that the government is supporting them - or ought to be.

Maybe it ought to, maybe the day will come when it will, but that is a far day and has nothing to do with the plain fact that if we do not do it this year the whole social and economic fabric will cruelly suffer.

What are these essential agencies? First our Hospitals, 68% of ^{which} them are privately administered and operated. The depression has increased the burden on them naturally enough. ^{while governmental hospitals have increased the share of the load they carry} Shall we let them down now when the emergency makes the need of them greater?

I cannot believe that we will. Where we understand a need we respond to it as a people. We had a beautiful and touching proof

of that a few months ago in the million dollars we so quickly and gladly turned in for Mr. Roosevelt's Georgia Sanitarium for victims of infantile paralysis. It was a fine recognition of Mr. Roosevelt's valiant fight with the dreadful disease but it was equally proof that our will is to help when we understand the need. *Insert*

It is not only our sympathy for those who suffer that opens our pocketbook, it is what is coming to be more and more a settled national conviction that we must see to it that ours is a strong clean people tuned to useful activities by its sense of physical well-being. If we are to have this we must have all the varieties of institution which prevent and cure physical troubles. If ^{your} wash woman is going to have a baby ^{you} I want to know that in ^{your} ~~our~~ community there is a maternity ward for her. If Johnnie around the corner is too crippled to walk ^{you} I want to be sure there is treatment available to make of him a self-supporting citizen. It is only through these agencies which ^{we} I ought and want to help support that ^{we} (I) can discharge ^{our} (my) individual responsibility of making sure that Johnnie and the wash woman will get help in their time of need.

Health means more than Hospitals, It means nurses and ?-% of the nurses who care for us, if we do not belong to that small group ^{of} people in the United States who have money enough to pay ^(?) \$7. a day ^{each} for a ^{special} nurse, are supported by private contributions. Take a god-sent agency like the Visiting Nurse Service of ^{Lillian Wald's} ~~the~~ Henry Street Settlement ^(of Lillian Wald) in New York City which in heat and cold, night or day, sends trained nurses from tenement to tenement to do what they can to ease the tides of pain which surge through these places. Can the citizens of New York afford to let its work slow up for lack of funds, can any community afford to let its sick go without nursing, not only because of human sympathy but because of what soundness of mind and

body particularly among the poor means to the sanity and safety of the community? Yet government ~~funds available for~~ nursing have ^s actually been decreased by 3% at the very moment when private nursing organizations have had to take on 21% more of the burden.

High in importance among these Human Service Agencies stand those that guard the family. Idle to argue in these United States that the family is not the most important unit in our social system, the last thing ^{the} majority will give up - whatever the rebellious tell you. If we could analyse the forces which held us together through recent tormented years (~~I am convinced~~ ^{we should no doubt find}) that the strongest of all has been the family. But in thousand of cases it could not have been preserved, such were the attacks of unemployment, illness, discouragement, - with their demoralizing effects, if it had not been for privately supported agencies with their host of trained social workers.

Take the case of Mary B. - "Scrub Lady No. 1" was her official title on the books of the office building where for years she had spent her nights on her knees cleaning floors. One night the watchman found her unconscious. He hurried her to the city hospital where she was pronounced "worn out", "a very sick woman." Half conscious Mary kept up a muttering ~~of~~ about the "children". The nurse knew what to do. She called a social worker. Two days later the children were placed. Four months later when Mary came out that social worker - now Mary's friend and patron saint - had a place for her better fitted to her strength, ^{as} care-taker of a modest apartment house, and here she still lives, Her children going through school, promising well for the future - a family saved from crumbling.

We can't spare such service in our communities. Nor can we let those activities which serve as auxiliaries to family upbuilding suffer. Think what it means to a family for the boys and girls to have ^{some} a vacation in the country.

^{Perhaps you} shall I say ^{your} ~~my~~ taxes have doubled, quadrupled, ^{your} ~~my~~ private obligations have greatly increased while at the same time ^{your} ~~my~~ pro-

professional returns are halved or more, and since this is so I cannot this year give the \$15. it takes to send Johnnie to camp for two weeks. ^{you} I know he needs it. ^{you} I know two weeks with three good meals a day, a cool bed to himself, ^{after months of} ~~he who has been~~ sleeping five to a bed, a daily swim, all a camp means, would bring him back with his white face brown, his sunken cheeks plump. ^{you} I know what it would do for his mother watching him slip down. But not this year. If it's got to be done let the government do it - all those millions it's collecting.

We cannot get out that way if we face the case. The government won't and can't take the place of those who have through the years built up these agencies we know to be so necessary in making this the kind of country we want. Better we give up something we think we need. It is not only for the sake of Johnnie's body and mind we make the sacrifice, it is for our own soul's sake.

And here comes into this gigantic and confused problem of the comparative value of public and private charity a profoundly significant fact - the fact that tax-paying for relief has no spiritual value for him who pays. ^{How is} ~~(I don't see how)~~ it is possible that it should have? The tax collector gathers up the money. We have no choice

but pay. The government administers it. We don't know how or where.

We have, ^{no doubt,} I think, a certain pride in knowing that we are partners with the county in carrying out its undertakings. But we also have anxiety about administration. We are often baffled by our inability unless we are "on the inside" to get even a hearing. ^{one of us her} (I) tried ^{my} best last winter to get from the C.W.A. Bureau in New York City a moment's attention for a group of women who had, so ^{she} (I) believe, something useful to offer. ^{she} (I) was unable to get even acknowledgement of the letters (I) ^{she} wrote or an interview with even an under-secretary for the women (I) ^{she} wanted to see put at work.

There must have been thousands who because its machinery was a hasty improvisation and its days numbered had no chance with the C.W.A.

This is not a charge
(I certainly don't lay this up) against Harry Hopkins, The Federal Relief Administrator, who dumped the C.W.A. into our laps. Few men could have done as well as he ^{has} in this heart-breaking job of feeding the millions of unemployed who faced the crisis without back-log or training for trouble. What ^{we are} (I am) saying is that public-
ly administered relief, in an emergency particularly, has no personal significance and so no spiritual value to those who put up the money.

Now men and women in a civilisation as preeminently, material-istic as this, one so given to thinking life can be solved by blue prints and statistics and efficient mechanization, needs ^{it} mightly to be in personal touch with human beings and their needs, to understand how much more they need than food and that if they are to get it, it is by our individual sacrifices, not forced sacrifice like taxes but those made from choice because we can do no less.

George Eliot says of one of her characters that she sprang as instinctively to help the one she saw in need, ^{just} as she stretched out her hand to save herself if falling. Is not this exactly the natural, unconscious response each of us would make to need which came our way if we were fully developed, ripely cultivated humans? But we will never develop such instinctive grace of nature by paying taxes alone. The best opportunity the day furnishes us for an education in wise compassion comes in these agencies which our communities have built to succor the sick, guard children, knit together families, build or re-build character.

It does something for us and it does something for those who receive, establish ^{es} between us a sense of neighborliness, a conscious-

ness that whatever the difference in our social or material position we have a tie, will always stand by each other. Everyone who has helped a neighbor handicapped by poverty through a crisis knows that almost invariably she will never cease to watch for a chance to "do something" for you. *Insert*

Such activities are too precious to neglect, to let starve. They mean too much to the community. ~~Whatever~~ the emergency they must be carried on.

Our situation today is very like that in the Great War. Then everything was given for the armies overseas or on their way. (I think it was the Woman's Committee of the Council of National Defense which first realized that in our absorption with war needs we were forgetting home needs, particularly were we in danger of neglecting the agencies for looking after the health, ^{of children} recreation, ^{As soon as this was sensed} the Woman's Committee ^{of} the Council of National Defense called in Julia Lathrop, the chief of the Children's Bureau as an adviser. The organization the Committee had built up was amazing, reaching into every corner of practically every county in the nation. At once ~~(we put on)~~ ^{was begun} a campaign under Miss Lathrop's direction to revive and extend all work for children. Miss Lathrop afterwards said that there had never been done in a year as much to extend the ideals and plans of her Bureau as was done in two months ^{of the war} through the ~~the~~ thoroughly aroused national organization of Women.

They saw what they had not realized, that to win the war and destroy or let run to seed civilizing home institutions was defeat.

The case today is similar. We must meet the emergency the depression has thrust upon us but when it passes as it will we must not allow ourselves to be found with all our splendid creations for caring for human needs wrecked because we have confused the province of emergency and permanent, public and private, undertakings for ^{Service} meeting Human Needs.

Ida M. Tarbell
120 East 19 Street

"Love Thy Neighbor"

"Love thy neighbor
Offer to share his burden
Tell him to say the word 'n'
You will see him through."

Mack Gordon

Last year for the first time in our history the Federal Government gave a huge sum, \$500,000,000 to buy food and fuel for the unemployed. This year it will tax us to the tune of around \$2,000,000,000 for the same purpose. Why is the government asking this of us? Simply because there was no other way to make good its promise, "Nobody shall starve." It has always been the practice of our states and communities to care for the needy out of local public relief funds. Two years ago they were too poor to carry all the extraordinary load the Depression had brought.

The government decided to help them. Hence these great appropriations, hence a Bureau in Washington to administer them. But note it was an Emergency Relief Bureau - its very name limited its life, defined its function. It replaced no established local public relief work, only supplemented it. And it had nothing whatever to do with the great and essential agencies which private funds have established and always supported for caring for Human Needs over and beyond food and fuel.

In spite of the clearly defined intent of the government, in spite of the established nature of public and private agencies great confusion has cropped up on all sides as to what Uncle Sam is doing and intends to do. Is he not taking full care of all the unemployed? Why should we be asked for contributions to support private agencies when he is taxing us so heavily in order that he may give so lavishly.

This and other questions voicing the confusion in the public mind in

this matter so vital at the moment have already been discussed ably and provocatively in this journal by Margaret Culkin Banning - an article based on long sympathetic personal experience with the problem of meeting the needs of the unfortunate.

What is at the bottom of the present muddle? Two things: - First, the failure clearly to distinguish between emergency and permanent public relief. Second, the failure to understand the different objectives of public and private agencies.

Emergencies have a way of driving everything else, past and future, out of men's minds. They are so imperative that the devices created to deal with them take on a character of permanence, something which has come to stay. The farmer back in the Great War had to be given a premium price for a bushel of wheat to persuade him to give his whole soul to raising enough to feed the armies. But he soon ceased to think of that \$2.25 as a war measure. That was what wheat was worth and he acted often on that conviction in his buying and building, only to find himself flat when the war ended.

At the present moment many people are making the same mischievous mistake about Federal emergency relief. They are beginning to accept it as something come to stay - relieving them from responsibilities they once took for granted, and this in spite of its clear label. It may be a long time before the need of a measure of government aid for relief is done away with, but let recovery arrive, as it will, and we will drop it as promptly as we did our baconless breakfast and sugarless coffee at the end of the war. #

The government will have bigger business on hand when that day comes. Its work will be to set up machinery for handling the next visitation of

unemployment more satisfactorily than it was able to do the present. One thing it can very well undertake is to find out how it has been that one half of the unemployed were never on the public rolls. Why? How did they manage it? There ought to be something suggestive there. There is unemployment insurance to be studied. There are programs for public and private works to be kept in stock for the return of the slump. A fine challenge this emergency leaves behind it to the intelligence and good will of this people. If it is accepted the result will be worth all it has cost. But that is for the future.

Unluckily it is not the confusion of thinking that has arisen from forgetting the label on the Relief Program which is most serious. It is confounding what the government is doing in feeding people with what we as individuals have been doing for many years now in caring for the sick and the crippled, in protecting children and particularly in holding families together. These great and essential agencies are permanent institutions for preventing and curing social ills. The present government relief does not touch them - cannot in the very nature of the grants. They are our private responsibility and today, sore as we are over our taxes and distracted as we are over the difficulty of meeting them, we are more or less honestly trying to delude ourselves with the notion that the government is supporting them - or ought to be.

Maybe it ought to, maybe the day will come when it will, but that is a far day and has nothing to do with the plain fact that if we do not do it this year the whole social and economic fabric will cruelly suffer.

What are these essential agencies? First our Hospitals, 68% of which are privately administered and operated. The depression has increased the burden on them naturally enough, while governmental hospitals have decreased the share of the load they carry. Shall we let them down now when the emergency

makes the need of them greater?

I cannot believe that we will. Where we understand a need we respond to it as a people. We had a beautiful and touching proof of that a few months ago in the million dollars we so quickly and gladly turned in for Mr. Roosevelt's Georgia Sanitarium for victims of infantile paralysis. It was a fine recognition of Mr. Roosevelt's valiant fight with the dreadful disease but it was equally proof that our will is to help when we understand the need.

It is not only our sympathy for those who suffer that opens our pocket-book, it is what is coming to be more and more a settled national conviction that we must see to it that ours is a strong clean people tuned to useful activities by its sense of physical well-being. If we are to have this we must have all the varieties of institution which prevent and cure physical troubles. If your wash woman is going to have a baby you want to know that in your community there is a maternity ward for her. If Johnnie around the corner is too crippled to walk you want to be sure there is treatment available to make of him a self-supporting citizen. It is only through these agencies which we ought and want to help support that we can discharge our individual responsibility of making sure that Johnnie and the wash woman will get help in their time of need.

Health means more than Hospitals. It means nurses and ?-% of the nurses who care for us, if we do not belong to that small group of people in the United States who have money enough to pay for a special nurse, are supported by private contributions. Take a god-sent agency like the Visiting Nurse Service of Henry Street Settlement in New York City which in heat and cold, night or day, sends trained nurses from tenement to tenement to do what they can to ease the tides of pain which surge through these places. Can the citizens of New York afford to let its work slow up for lack of funds, can any community afford to let its

sick go without nursing, not only because of human sympathy but because of what soundness of mind and body particularly among the poor means to the sanity and safety of the community? Yet government nursing has actually been decreased by 3% at the very moment when private nursing organizations have had to take on 21% more of the burden.

High in importance among these Human Service Agencies stand those that guard the family. Idle to argue in these United States that the family is not the most important unit in our social system, the last thing the majority will give up - whatever the rebellious tell you. If we could analyse the forces which held us together through recent tormented years we should no doubt find that the strongest of all has been the family. But in thousands of cases it could not have been preserved, - such were the attacks of unemployment, illness, discouragement, with their demoralizing effects, - if it had not been for privately supported agencies with their host of trained social workers.

Take the case of Mary B. - "Scrub Lady No. 1" was her official title on the books of the office building where for years she had spent her nights on her knees cleaning floors. One night the watchman found her unconscious. He hurried her to the city hospital where she was pronounced "worn out" "a very sick woman." Half conscious Mary kept up a muttering about the "children." The nurse knew what to do. She called a social worker. Two days later the children were placed. Four months later when Mary came out that social worker - now Mary's friend and patron saint - had a place for her better fitted to her strength, as care-taker of a modest apartment house, and here she still lives, her children going through school, promising well for the future - a family saved from crumbling.

We can't spare such service in our communities. Nor can we let those activities which serve as auxiliaries to family upbuilding suffer. Think what

it means to a family for the boys and girls to have a summer vacation in the country.

Perhaps you say your taxes have doubled, quadrupled, your private obligations have greatly increased while at the same time your professional returns are halved or more, and since this is so you cannot this year give the \$15. it takes to send Johnnie to camp for two weeks. You know he needs it. You know two weeks with three good meals a day, a cool bed to himself, after months of sleeping five to a bed, a daily swim, all a camp means, would bring him back with his white face Brown, his sunken cheeks plump. You know what it would do for his mother watching him slip down. But not this year. If it's got to be done let the government do it - all those millions it's collecting.

We cannot get out that way if we face the case. The government won't and can't take the place of those who have through the years built up these agencies we know to be so necessary in making this the kind of country we want. Better we give up something we think we need. It is not only for the sake of Johnnie's body and mind we make the sacrifice, it is for our own soul's sake.

And here comes into this gigantic and confused problem of the comparative value of public and private charity a profoundly significant fact - the fact that tax-paying for relief has no spiritual value for him who pays. How is it possible that it should have? The tax collector gathers up the money. We have no choice but pay. The government administers it. We don't know how or where. We have, no doubt, a certain pride in knowing that we are partners with the country in carrying out its undertakings. But we also have anxiety about administration. We are often baffled by our inability unless we are "on the inside" to get even a hearing. One of us tried her best last winter to get from the C.W.A. Bureau in New York City a moment's attention for a group of women who had, so she

believed, something useful to offer. She was unable to get even acknowledgment of the letters she wrote or an interview with even an under-secretary for the women she wanted to see put at work.

There must have been thousands who because its machinery was a hasty improvisation and its days numbered had no chance with the C.W.A.

This is not a charge against Harry Hopkins, the Federal Relief Administrator who dumped the C.W.A. into our laps. Few men could have done as well as he has in this heart-breaking job of feeding the millions of unemployed who faced the crisis without back-log or training for trouble. What we are saying is that publicly administered relief, in an emergency particularly, has no personal significance and so no spiritual value to those who put up the money.

Now men and women in a civilization as preeminently materialistic as this, one so given to thinking life can be solved by blue prints and statistics and efficient mechanization, need mightily to be in personal touch with human beings and their needs, to understand how much more they need than food and that if they are to get it, it is by our individual sacrifices, not forced sacrifice like taxes but those made from choice because we can do no less.

George Eliot says of one of her characters that she sprang as instinctively to help the one she saw in need, just as she stretched out her hand to save herself if falling. Is not this exactly the natural, unconscious response each of us would make to need which came our way if we were fully developed, ripely cultivated humans? But we will never develop such instinctive grace of nature by paying taxes alone. The best opportunity the day furnishes us for an education in wise compassion comes in these agencies which our communities have built to succor the sick, guard children, knit together families, build or re-build character.

It does something for us and it does something for those who receive, establishes between us a sense of neighborliness, a consciousness that whatever the

difference in our social or material position we have a tie, will always stand by each other. Everyone who has helped a neighbor handicapped by poverty through a crisis knows that almost invariably she will never cease to watch for a chance to "do something" for you.

Is not this the reason why one tune sung and played and whistled everywhere of late is so popular? "Love thy neighbor" is as timely today as ever and reminds us that sharing his burden and seeing him through is still our instinctive response when our neighbor is in trouble.

Such activities are too precious to neglect, to let starve. They mean too much to the community. Whatever the emergency they must be carried on.

Our situation today is very like that in the Great War. Then everything was given for the armies overseas or on their way. It was the Woman's Committee of the Council of National Defense which first realized that in our absorption with war needs we were forgetting home needs, particularly were we in danger of neglecting the agencies for looking after the health recreation of children. As soon as this was sensed the Woman's Committee of the Council of National Defense called in Julia Lathrop, the chief of the Children's Bureau as an adviser. The organization the Committee had built up was amazing, reaching into every corner of practically every county in the nation. At once a campaign was begun under Miss Lathrop's direction to revive and extend all work for children. Miss Lathrop afterwards said that there had never been done in a year as much to extend the ideals and plans of her Bureau as was done in two months of the war through the thoroughly aroused national organization of women.

They saw what they had not realized, that to win the war and destroy or let run to seed civilizing home institutions was defeat.

The case today is similar. We must meet the emergency the depression has thrust upon us but when it passes as it will we must not allow ourselves to be

found with all our splendid creations for caring for human needs wrecked because we have confused the province of emergency and permanent, public and private, undertakings for Human Service.

We are now facing what this country is going to do in the winter of 1934-5. When we shall have done our best it will still be "a winter of discontent" at least in this sense: that the feeble and the sick will need care and nursing, and that character will be forming in several million boys and girls under conditions all too likely to start young trees in twisted, if not crooked, directions. The question is what are we going to do about it and what are we going to do about it now.

The burden which the Federal Government is already carrying and planning to carry reaches no part of this load. It has always hitherto been borne by private philanthropy. A few years ago, great sums were given to these causes by a few greatly rich individuals, but now the power of wealth has changed hands. There are fewer rich people and they are far less rich than they used to be. Clearly the only answer to this situation is that communities must accept as their own responsibility these ministrations of mercy and the protection of the future of society, which can no longer be sustained by the willing hands of a generous few.

We can postpone the answer as to what we shall do with these institutions ten years from now, or even five years from now, but we cannot postpone answering the question what we shall do with them this year. To the extent that we do this year's inescapable task adequately, we will have rebuilt the possibilities of American manhood and womanhood for millions of people. To the extent that we neglect or fail in this task, we will have planted and nourished seeds of social disease with pitiful, if not dangerous, consequences.