The Good Neighbor

SECOND EDITION

RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION
PUBLICATION

The Good Neighbor

in the Modern City

By

Mary E. Richmond

Author of "Friendly Visiting Among the Poor," General Secretary of the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity

Philadelphia and London

J. B. Lippincott Company

1908

Published November, 1907.

Printed by
J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, U. S. A.

THIS little book was begun last summer in the mountains, where I had the encouragement and daily companionship of the best neighbor I have ever known. But before two chapters had been written, God called her, up there among the hills. The whole is now dedicated, most lovingly, to her memory.

PHILADELPHIA, November 1, 1907.

AND behold, a certain lawyer stood up and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? And he said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live. But he, desiring to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbor? Jesus made answer and said:

A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho; and he fell among robbers, which both stripped him and beat him, and departed, leaving him half dead. And by chance a certain priest was going down that way: and when he saw him he passed by on the other side. And in like manner a Levite also, when he came to the place, and saw him, passed by on the other side. But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: and when he saw him, he was moved with compassion, and came to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring on them oil and wine; and he set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. And on the morrow he took out two pence, and gave them to the host, and said, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, I, when I come back again, will repay thee. Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved neighbor unto him that fell among the robbers? And he said, He that shewed mercy on him. And Jesus said unto him, Go, and do thou likewise.

Contents

I

IX

X

The Good Neighbor

in the Modern City

I

Introduction.

A CLERGYMAN who was on his way to address the annual meeting of a large modern charity was warned by one of his parishioners that he had better not mention there the parable of the Good Samaritan.

He retorted pertinently that we were now living in an age when there were wounded travellers at every turning of the way, and still others hidden from our sight so sorely stricken that we should organize search parties to seek them out. The situation was further complicated by the fact that there were also prominently in view, to excite our pity, those who only pretended to be wounded and whose needs were

not oil and wine, transportation and shelter, but a renewed zest for work and for self-help. Under these changed conditions we must still follow the spirit of the Samaritan's ministry, he maintained, if we would achieve the same neighborly result; but we must have more innkeepers, each one doing his special work, if all the real wounds were to be adequately cared for.

The charitable society whose activities were thus defended fell far short of the standard of conduct given us for all time in the parable, but still it had striven honestly to find the wounds of modern society and to heal them. It was then trying to secure a compulsory education law in a State that had none; it was instrumental later in getting little children out of the canneries and the textile mills and making their premature employment illegal; it is now trying to make its own bit of road safer for future travellers by bringing to light city housing conditions that maim the poorer class of tenants. Hundreds of men and women with an impulse to be neighborly had learned, on its district committees, to become friendly visitors to families in distress, to master the more complex

system of inns and innkeepers made necessary by our more complex life, to know the modern equivalents for oil and wine, and they had carried this knowledge, this daily habit of service, back into their church work and their homes.

But the parishioner was a literally-minded man. He was unable to grasp the relation between a legislative committee and the older, simpler expression of neighborliness; he was shocked, moreover, by the society's known objection to the giving of small change to beggars on the street. The clergyman, on the other hand, used the society as the Samaritan used the innkeeper. He recognized that it was able to do certain things that his own duties would not permit him to do continuously, and yet he never made the mistake of throwing the whole task on an organization, believing as he did with all his heart that the ministry of life was a part of the ministry of religion. What he could do well himself he did with that humane touch which is the highest instrument of healing and then, turning to his organized ally, "Whatsoever thou spendest more, I, when I come back again, will repay

thee." The society was only a modern convenience; it was dependent upon the spirit of service that he and such as he poured into it.

Stung, perhaps, by such unjust criticism as that of the parishioner, our modern innkeepers are too apt to undervalue personal and unorganized service. They are too likely to make such statements as the following from Professor Patten's very suggestive and interesting book on "The New Basis of Civilization." Speaking of what he calls service-altruism, the charity of personal contact, and of income-altruism, the charity which makes gifts of money "for public and far-reaching ends," he says,

> The difference is that which separates the old from the new charity. The one crossed the road to help the Samaritan (*sic*) after he had suffered under bad conditions of highway management; the other patrols the road and arrests the wayside thieves before the traveller falls among them. Service-altruism binds the wounds, breathes forgiveness, and solaces the victims of recurring disasters without attacking their causes. Income-altruism hews to their base, for it has the money power to police and to light the road to Jericho.

Money power is here given as the distinguishing characteristic of effective charity. Income-altruism is indeed needed, but without a strong infusion of the service-altruism of which Professor Patten speaks slightingly, it never kept anything policed and lighted, never "hewed to the base" since the world began, and never will. Policing happens to be a particularly unfortunate illustration of income-altruism's power, for combinations between police and robbers are not unknown. Money is a bad master but a good servant; it supplemented the neighborly service of the Samaritan in the parable, but was no substitute for it. And lacking his spirit to-day, we may spend money like water in our campaigns of prevention, and still make little headway.

Another common mistake made by those who write upon social questions in these days is to assume that "cure" and "prevention" are opposed to one another, and that prevention cannot get its just due until we spend less time in curing the ills of individuals. Never was there a more mischievous social fallacy! Prevention and cure must go hand in hand In

winning for the present generation of consumptives, for instance, the kindest and most adequate care, we are cutting out many centers of contagion and at the same time educating the public as to the true means of prevention. This has been the method of modern medicine and it may well be, in future, the method of modern charity. In the office of the country practitioner, in the crowded wards of city hospitals, and on the field of battle, medicine has sought and found, while pushing hard toward cure, the blessed means of prevention.

The means of cure and prevention are not far from each one of us, nor does their use demand a great expenditure of time and effort. Each one, by taking a little thought, can do more than might at first appear without becoming either a trained expert or an income-altruist, and his service will weigh double when it is done, not in the patronizing spirit of the benefactor, but in the democratic spirit of the good neighbor. But the parishioner quoted as objecting to our new-fangled methods is not the only one who is confused by modern substitutions; he is not alone in failing to real-

ize that, when circumstances change, methods must be modified, or else the result will be different and not so good.

Believing, as I do, that a wider recognition among charitable people of this need for modified methods in our dealing with poverty and its causes must precede any great social advance, I have set myself the task in this little book of trying to describe in a simple, straightforward way and, if possible, without technicalities, the various ways in which modern Samaritans may use the inns and innkeepers of today in assisting those who have fallen among thieves. There are many things that the good neighbor cannot safely leave to any agency, and this conviction, which I hold very firmly, would seem to be my chief qualification for the present undertaking.

But one who attempted the larger task of interpreting neighborliness in all its aspects as affected by modern city conditions and not merely in its relation to poverty would encounter many difficulties that I escape. The relations of employer and employee, of the prosperous to the somewhat less prosperous who are their

social competitors, the antagonisms of blood relationship, of creed, of race prejudice—these and other aspects of neighborliness I deliberately turn my back upon. And still the task remaining is more than formidable, for the poor are not a class apart with different characteristics, and any brief discussion of poverty and its treatment must seem to set them apart, must seem to emphasize unduly a bad modern tendency.

As I go in and out of the homes of those of my friends who are not necessarily well-to-do but who are at least in no danger of want, I cannot avoid noticing how cut off they seem from association with any but their own sort of people. Their fathers and mothers came in daily contact as a matter of course with many kinds of people. Unconsciously but very rapidly the children have been slipping away from this varied social experience, in which rich and poor, landlord and tenant, employer and workman, purchaser and tradesman, dwelt together "in visible relationship;" they now live in a stratified world, where their social relations

are sadly impoverished. The trolley-car, the suburban train, the telephone, and the reorganization of our methods of production and distribution, have changed the habits of human intercourse, and what Mr. Wells says of London is equally true in this country: "Our people have overflowed their containing locality; they live in one area, they work in another, and they go to shop in a third. And the only way in which you can localize them again is to expand your areas to their new scale." This was written of the areas of municipal administration, but it applies quite as well to a larger neighborliness. Those who ride live in a larger neighborhood than those who travel afoot, and those who ride by rail or by electricity can have larger community interests than those who ride behind horses, but this is such a recent expansion of opportunity that life has been, for the moment, narrowed thereby.

Things—intervening and ever-multiplying things—are keeping us monstrously busy with the surface. We do not read or crave so much poetry; material comforts are choking within us the very springs of sympathy and compas-

sion. The trolley and the train carry us away from the sights and sounds associated with distress, and we have not discovered that the lines travel both ways, that it is easier than ever to seek out the distressed and to succor them.

Civilization drops every now and then some necessary part of its luggage in this way and has to travel back to pick it up—an awkward process, or one that always seems so to the onlooker. We have had so many houses that we have been forced to rediscover fresh air, and so many cooked dishes that we have been forced to rediscover milk and eggs. How clumsily we have been doing this anyone who knows the details of the crusade against tuberculosis can testify. And now social contact with all sorts and conditions of men—a thing so necessary to our social health and sanity—this lost package also we are recovering, but very clumsily.

The most obvious remedy for this predicament is to seek opportunities for better acquaintance and greater helpfulness in our natural relations with the poor, but the difficulty is that too often no such relations exist. Let anyone think over the list of his acquaint-

ances, the young couples, professional people, who live in the suburbs; the solid middle-aged people who have a town house and a country house; their son back from the technical school who has views about civics and about sports; their daughter who has left college and is beginning to find society a bore, or else who never went to college but came out early and so is growing restless and dissatisfied. They have their charities and their clubs and their "interests," but are they not for the most part hopelessly cut off from real contact with their fellows and with the main stream of our national life? The only poor that they know at all are the parasites who seek them out, and the odd-jobs people who are still in some instances employed by them directly and not through a middleman.

In the second place and side by side with this development of suburban life and of stratification according to income, we have the crowding of the poorer people in greater and greater density into our city streets and alleys. The poor cling tenaciously to neighborly traditions, but when the degree of overcrowding

in a city block passes a certain point the same indifference to neighborly contacts of which I have been complaining develops, though produced now by directly opposite conditions.*

And still a third condition of city life makes against "that sympathetic understanding which alone knits men together." One who has run counter to the standard of a small community—it may be in some rather absurd social convention—will not soon forget the crushing weight of its moral condemnation. Wherever it is a clearly defined unit, the community standard is legislature, judge, jury and penitentiary all in one; the ordinary processes of legal enactment and enforcement seem clumsy by comparison. But in the large city we have not one community standard, we have twenty, each competing for recognition with all the others. The least successful native stock and foreign stocks have flocked in, bringing their own standards of living with them. In every matter which

---

*See for the development of this idea "The Practice of Charity," by Edward T. Devine, p. 21, sq., where a tenement dweller tells the story of her husband's refusal to warn the sleeping inmates of a burning house across the way.

vitally concerns them and should concern us as their neighbors, in the education and employment of children, the sanitation of streets and houses, the making, buying and selling of goods, we have this clash of standards. Hence our more frequent appeal to legislatures, and our laborious efforts to secure the enforcement of beneficent laws that are imperfectly understood.

But to face these difficulties honestly is not to despair. "The twenty-five years just past," said President Eliot at the beginning of the new century, "are the most extraordinary twenty-five years in the whole history of our race. Nothing is done as it was done twenty-five years ago." Set over against this statement the contrasting fact that the road from Jerusalem to Jericho is still unsafe, that robberies have occurred there within the memory of men still living, and we get some conception of the difference between a static and a dynamic civilization. Into our dealings with the evils of a dynamic civilization bring once more the remedy of Christ, the remedy of a larger neighborliness, and the next twenty-five years would be

as wonderful spiritually as the last twenty-five have been materially. To quote Professor Shaler,

> It is evident that while Christ set his face against all the sins of the flesh, He above all opposed the motive of tribal pride and hatred. . . . He saw straight to the center of the ills that beset mankind; saw that they lay in the lack of friendliness for the neighbor of every estate. He sought the cure where we have to seek it, in the conviction that whatever be the differences between men, they are trifling compared with the identities which should unite them in universal brotherhood.

Turning to the details of our subject, we have now to consider the bad conditions and remedial agencies that surround some of our poorer neighbors, including the city children at play, at school, at work, at home and in the city streets; men and women who make the goods we buy; tenants who live in the houses we build and rent; men without homes who stop us on the street; families that have been worsted in life's struggle by accident or death; and

the sick who should have been strong and well. Last of all, the good neighbor himself will concern us, first as a contributor to diverse good causes, then as a member of some church pledged to hasten the coming of Christ's Kingdom upon earth. What untoward conditions that surround the lives of these city dwellers is he in a position to remove? What agencies exist to help him, and how can he most conveniently and effectively use them?

As a practical help, a number of blank pages have been provided at the end of this book for the addresses, telephone numbers and office hours of those specific local agencies which correspond most closely to the charities referred to in general terms in its pages. The local charity organization society or associated charities will always take pleasure in providing these addresses upon application.

II

The Child in the City.

A RECENT writer estimates that seven new citizens are born into the English-speaking world every minute, and he declares that the chief business of every statesman, every social organizer, every philanthropist and every *man* should be to see that the world does its best for these newcomers.

"Doing its best" means different things at different stages of the world's development. Formerly the town council did its best when it permitted the streets to follow the ancient cow-paths, but now, if the council is wise, it employs such experts as Olmsted and Robinson to provide plans of municipal improvement for the next fifty years. There is a wonderful amount of good child-saving work being done in our cities, but too much of it just happens like the ancient paths.

Part of the difficulty lies with those of us who wish sincerely to be good neighbors. We are

not only hampered by our imperfect recollection of what it means to be little and young, but by our failure to understand the great changes in living conditions in the city since we ourselves grew up in it. Childhood's losses in the last fifty years are very imperfectly realized. Many processes formerly carried on in the home that were both work and play, that were full of dramatic incident and educational interest for the children of the household, are now hidden away in shops and factories. As we shall see later, the shops and factories themselves cannot make up to the child what he has lost; there is no opportunity for him in the gas works or in the woollen, flour or saw mill, that can even partially compensate for the whole process of our domestic industries.*

A generation ago we may not have followed this whole process from the trying of fats to the dipping of the candle, from the raising and shearing of sheep to the plying of the loom, from the grinding of grains to the baking of the loaf,

---

*See "The School and Society," by John Dewey, to whom social workers are indebted for a saner view of this subject.

but we were much nearer to it than we are to-day. Our chances of being country bred, moreover, were two and a half times as great as they are now; the birds of the air, the beasts of the field, and the fields themselves, were two and a half times as likely to have assisted in our education, and we were not half as liable to arrest for playing in the streets in an effort to make up for their loss. Pure milk and pure air, unadulterated foods, physical exercise, early hours of rest—all of these good things were more likely to contribute to our growth, and we were saved from the feverish, unwholesome excitements—the moving pictures, low theatres and gambling schemes—that lie in wait to-day at every turn for the pennies of the city child.

There are many compensations for these losses of the child in the city, and there might be many more; but the compensations are not evenly divided in a place that is badly governed. In a badly governed city the losses fall with crushing weight upon the children of the poor, while the children of the well-to-do are bought off, as is were, from the more obvious effects of mal-administration. If the city's schools are

ill-taught and ill-ventilated, the well-to-do send their children to private schools; if the streets are unclean, the drainage bad, the water impure, they take them away for a number of months in each year, and put expensive filters in their city homes or else buy spring water; if the police department is inefficient, they hire a private watchman; if vice pays tribute for protection, it is at least not permitted to show its head in the better residence neighborhoods.

But children are going to continue to grow up in cities in larger and larger numbers; instead of denouncing the city and all its ways, therefore, it would seem to be the part of neighborliness to begin at once to make it a fit place for all children, including the children of the poorest, to grow up in, and to do this in no spasmodic, panicky way, but steadily and persistently. We know approximately what needs to be done, but those who have most influence do not feel the pressure of this need, and are not imaginative enough to realize vividly the needs of their neighbors.

Aside from the church, whose influence will be considered later, the social agencies that

have most to do with shaping the normal city child, the child with both parents and all his faculties, are the family, the street, the school, the workshop, the bureau of health and the police. Work and health I reserve for separate chapters.

The best and most ancient institution for the care and education of children is the family. I am in entire sympathy with those who hold that changes in modern industry and the removal of many industrial processes from the home make a reorganization of the school necessary. It is indeed imperatively necessary that we give industrial training a more prominent place in our school system and that we lengthen the period of school attendance. But the habit of changing things may become a fever, and in the hurry to readjust these relations of home, school and workshop to the life of the child, there is danger at the moment that the home may suffer—I had almost written irreparable loss, but the institution of the family has survived very formidable foes. We may encourage women to leave their homes and their children for the factory; we may extend

our day nurseries beyond their legitimate use as shelters for the children of those widows or those wives of disabled men who cannot possibly remain at home during the day, and receive in these nurseries any child whose mother wishes to be relieved of home cares; we may develop a hundred agencies for providing children with the necessaries of life, as our ideas about necessities expand; but, sooner or later, we shall rediscover the old truth that we cannot save the children without saving the homes that shape them finally for better or for worse.

So long as family life continues, both the quantity and quality of that life will be controlled far more from within than from without. In the desire to get good results quickly we may repeatedly ignore this, though, if we believe sincerely in the neighborly, one-by-one way of helping, in the retail method of reform, we shall not be daunted by the check that must come inevitably to each wholesale movement in turn as it touches this most fundamental fact of family life. But things that can never be accomplished outside the family by measures the kindest and best intentioned, can be accom-

plished inside the family by contact, by persuasion, by neighborly help and by sympathy. To bring back to each home a new sense of the child's needs, to lift the standard of the whole family slowly but steadily as regards defective vision, hearing, breathing, speech and nutrition, will be more effectual in the long run than any of the short cuts (to take two recent instances) for providing oculists and spectacles free, or for providing meals free to school children without regard to the responsibilities of parents or their ability to meet them.

> If the wage-earner cannot afford to buy glasses for his child, does not something need readjusting beside the vision of the scholar? How regularly would spectacles freely provided be used? How long would they remain unbroken? Why should spectacles be provided for *all* children when dispensaries and other agencies can provide them for the relatively few children whose parents are unable to do so?
>
> If a child comes to school looking underfed, the promptest and easiest remedy is undoubtedly a school lunch, but what if the anæmia persists? What if the child gets the wrong things or noth-

ing at all for breakfast and supper? What if we make it still easier for the woman as well as the man of the family to be away all day and leave all the children, including those below school age, unmothered? Does the lunch meet these other needs or does it only delay the meeting of them a little longer?* Surely the only way of dealing with the real needs of school children is by real remedies, such as those adopted by the New York Committee on the Physical Welfare of School Children, which sends visiting cooks into the homes of children apparently ill-fed, and wins the co-operation of the mother in devising better ways of buying and preparing food, or, where the income is insufficient, seeks through the allied Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor the means of supplementing it. In several cities the experiment is being tried of a paid school visitor, one who has been trained for social work and whose duty it is to act as intermediary between the school with which she is affiliated, the charities, and the homes of the children.

---

* See *Charities and the Commons*, Vol. XVII, p. 1104, "School Lunches in Milwaukee," by Zilpha D. Smith; and the *Yale Review*, Vol. XV, No. 3, "Feeding of School Children," by C. S. Loch.

To approach any relief question from the point of view of the child's welfare only and to consider nothing else, is a natural enough mistake to make, but its effect upon the child's life is disastrous. "It seems to be almost inevitable," says Mrs. Bosanquet, "that the man who accepts a subordinate economic position in the family degenerates into a loafer and tyrant." We may hold the most approved views about family life, and still be actively engaged in breaking it up, when we fail to treat all questions of income and relief as the affair first of the head of the family, of the mother only secondarily, and of the children not at all. School teachers ignore this principle when they collect clothing, shoes and money for relief after hearing only the child's account of the need at home; church and Sunday school workers also ignore it too often in their various relations with needy families.

The same principle applies to other things beside relief. A New England pastor who used to seek eagerly in the poorer streets of his town for children who were attending no Sunday school, and then persuade them to come to his,

adopted a sounder method when he called upon the father of the family and formally asked his permission to invite the children. He found that this little act of thoughtfulness helped to revive a sense of responsibility that had long remained unappealed to in the midst of our bustling benevolences. And what has benevolence to offer in exchange for family affection, for all the beauty and depth of it, rooted firmly as it is in the sense of responsibility?

I have said that the city might be made a much safer and more attractive place for children to grow up in. What might each one do to bring this about?

In the first place, we might, instead of talking so persistently about the importance of keeping them off the streets, talk much more about the importance of making the streets cleaner places, in every sense, for children to run about in. City children must be out of doors often if they are to be kept healthy, and the city's out-of-doors should be well enough policed, lighted, cleansed and protected from illicit traffics of all sorts to be a fit place for chil-

dren to spend a part of each day. We must provide wholesome amusements in plenty and then deal rigidly with the unwholesome remainder. To begin at the other end is to ignore nature's way and to wage a losing fight against the cheap theaters and other immoral shows to which children now flock in great numbers.

The playground movement for providing educational and well-organized play on a scale as extensive as our school systems, is now launched; and no one thing, if it receives the intelligent support of all good neighbors, will do more to make the city a better place for children. Not only the ignorant and careless parent, but the good, conscientious one, if condemned by poverty to a poor environment, must often see the more active and masterful of his children go straight to the bad through the misdirection of their play instincts. Playgrounds, recreation piers, outdoor and indoor gymnasia, boys' and girls' clubs, vacation schools, country outings, school and home gardens, music and pictures and outdoor festivals—what attractive opportunities all of these offer for the good neighbor who wishes to share his capacity for enjoy-

ment! Chicago leads at present with an aggregate annual attendance of five millions in her recreation centers, but if the good people of any city could only realize the vital relation of healthful, honest, well-directed play to citizenship, industrial efficiency and morals, this figure would soon be dwarfed.

The streets and the schools should be everybody's affair, and the condition of the schools —for to these at least we are already fully committed—would be a very fair test of the true neighborliness of a community. If the school houses are some of them so crowded that pupils can be given only half-time instruction, if the buildings are ill-ventilated and unsanitary, if the teachers, janitors and superintendents are subjected to political interference, then we are letting the most helpless members of the community fall among thieves. How can we, as a Christian people, hold up our heads, until for the sake of the children we have taken the departments of education and of health in our cities out of politics?

We can also encourage those educators who are striving to secure the extension of indus-

trial training, and the better physical care of school children through improved school buildings, and through systematic medical inspection; and we can encourage and support all citizens' movements for the betterment of schools, such as the public education association and the parents' association. Without going in the least out of our way, we can aid the school authorities by reporting to the compulsory education bureau all children of school age known to us that are not attending regularly.

And next to our interest in these larger and more normal aspects of child life must come a watchful care for those whose needs are more unusual. Is a child beaten unmercifully, or cruelly neglected, or exposed to grave moral dangers? A day is too long to leave an impressionable child or any child in such surroundings. The more profoundly we believe in the rights and responsibilities of parents, the more quickly we will recognize this, and report the facts to the society to protect children from cruelty, following up our complaints to discover what obstacles, if any, still interfere with a proper enforcement of the law.

Short shrift should be made of tobacconists, saloon-keepers and dive-keepers who trade illicitly with children.

Is there a crippled child, or one with defective sight, hearing, breathing or speech, who is not now receiving the best medical care? We should use our influence with the parents to see that advice is sought promptly, and that the doctor's instructions are carried out. Is there a child whose father or mother complains of his waywardness, perhaps calling him "incorrigible" at the age of eight or nine? He too needs, or more often the parent needs, advice from some child-saving specialist who knows how to deal with the beginnings of waywardness, for both physical and moral defects yield best to treatment in the earlier stages.

Is there a child about to be separated from his parents or his widowed mother because of poverty? The best and most experienced advice is needed here. The neighbors will say, "Put him away," and the charitable, though not using this phrase, will often suggest placing him in this or that institution; but the child's whole future is involved, and the decision

should not depend upon our own convenience or preferences. There are children's aid societies or like agencies that exist to deal wisely with such emergencies. It may be that they can discover ways of keeping the family together.

One of the best organized departments of public charities that I ever saw was in charge of a major of the United States Army in Cuba. The task of his superintendence had been thrust upon him without preparation, only a few months earlier. But he had acquired somewhere the excellent habit of recognizing promptly his lack of knowledge and of seeking out at once the best available person from whom to learn. In all questions concerning the welfare of children, involving as they do a knowledge of recent and vital changes in city life, a knowledge of child psychology, and a knowledge also of the foundations of the family and of the effects of charitable action thereon, we find ourselves in a field requiring more than any other, perhaps, trained sympathy and clear judgment. If we acquire the habit of imitating the army major, of knocking

at the right door and boldly asking questions, we shall all become better and more useful neighbors.

As already indicated, the doors at which we are most likely to need to knock, and with the addresses of which we should therefore be provided, writing them down at the end of this volume or keeping them in some other convenient place, are the doors of the public education association, the parents' association, the department of education, the compulsory education bureau, the playground association, the children's country outing society, the society to protect children from cruelty, the probation officers, and the children's aid society.

III

The Child at Work.

SOME years ago an appeal was made to a millionaire to contribute toward the support of certain training classes for boys newly arrived from Russia who were his co-religionists. He was a humane man and a generous one, but he refused, on the ground that he had made his own way unaided by such instruction when he had come to this country fifty years before, and that the struggle had been good for him.

Struggle is good for all of us, but what would have made the millionaire understand that the industrial start for a boy of ten or twelve is now made with an unreasonably heavy handicap, that the situation is no longer the same? He came to a land where the railroad was just beginning to connect city with city. He started into the country from one of the middle-Atlantic ports with a pack on his back, carrying to isolated farms and villages the goods for which

there was brisk demand. What incidentally did he learn? English, geography, arithmetic, trade, human nature. Perhaps, like Bob Jakin, he had the solace of a dog; certainly he had the free air of heaven, and could there have been a better preparation for the life of that time! The educational values of the whole process were his, whereas now his modern successor, thrust into the factory upon his arrival, without our language, without schooling and without his physical growth, knows only the benumbing effect upon mind and body of an infinitely subdivided process, in which he goes through a few monotonous motions for many hours daily. Or another "dead-end" occupation, as they are descriptively called, claims him and he becomes a bundle-boy. Or perhaps he enters the district messenger service and is sent to disreputable houses late at night, learning as his first lesson the worst that America has to teach.

One who has herself transgressed through ignorance cannot blame the millionaire. I too have legislated in district committees for the generation that I remembered from childhood

experiences instead of for the generation that the committee decisions affected. Self-support at any cost seemed the important thing, and the mill-owner's wife on the committee acted in perfect good faith when she assisted us, in case after case, to get work for the young children of widows and of disabled fathers. But the subsequent history of these families and children, as we followed their careers for a number of years, opened our eyes; continuous care of families has this advantage over spasmodic care, that we learn from our blunders. The thrifty self-reliance that we had hoped to foster did not develop. Some of the working children could not read and write; many others forgot before they were fourteen all that they had learned in school under the ages of ten and eleven; their moral and physical tone was lowered; and gradually we came to see that the best provision for a destitute widow left with a number of children of school age was to assure their entry into industry one by one under conditions that would guarantee to her their *increasing* industrial efficiency. This meant that they must have an elementary school edu-

cation, and that they must not be employed long hours at regular work before the period of adolescence.

Comparison of results in various city neighborhoods brought out the further fact that the illiterate, devitalized working child was not always or even usually the child of the dependent widow or of the disabled father, but that many young children were in the mills, factories and glass houses whose parents were prospering and could perfectly well forego their children's earnings for several years longer. The poorest city neighborhoods had not the largest numbers of working children; those most convenient to the mills and factories, those in which the industrial opportunity was the greatest, were the ones in which families had yielded most easily to the temptation.

The "widowed mother ghost," as Miss Addams calls it, had figured too largely in our calculations. She tells of one manufacturing town where a school census was taken that showed 3600 children on the census roll but not in the schools. Of this number 1100 were out of school for legitimate reasons, such as attend-

ance at private schools, removal, illness, &c. Of the remaining 2500 only 66 were the children of widows, and of these 66 it was found that 23, or less than one per cent. of the 2500, were contributing to the support of their mothers. Why should these 2500 be permitted to work in order that the 23 widows might continue to be supported by their children? Would not a neighborly care of these few families through private pensions carefully administered—would not this small expenditure of time and money until the children of the 23 were fully able to work, have helped the physical, industrial and moral future of the whole 2500?

Next to the widowed mother argument, we hear most of the street and its dangers as a reason for putting children to work very early. The plea that our schools are overcrowded is irrelevant, as the crowding is in the grades for younger children, for whom even the advocates of child labor would hardly suggest the factory as a substitute. Our compulsory education laws must be enforced, of course, and the child's play time must be turned to account educa-

tionally, as we have already seen. But the street without these rivals and unregenerate as it now is has been found by those who know child life in cities intimately to compare favorably as a school with the glass house, the messenger service and most other occupations open to children. The superintendent of the House of Refuge at Glen Mills, Pa., a school for wayward boys between ten and sixteen, declares that he has very few boys there who were not working boys at the time of or just before their arrest.

To secure the release of a boy of twelve, just recovered from diphtheria and with a tendency to tuberculosis, from illegal employment in a Pennsylvania glass house, where he was working alternate night and day shifts of 9½ and 10 hours each in a superheated atmosphere, required this spring the energetic efforts of three volunteer societies.

After working hard to effect similar rescues, one begins to wonder how long a State will endure an expensive Factory Inspection Department which has no sympathy with the honest enforcement of the child labor law, and continues to keep in office inspectors who violate

ance at private schools, removal, illness, &c. Of the remaining 2500 only 66 were the children of widows, and of these 66 it was found that 23, or less than one per cent. of the 2500, were contributing to the support of their mothers. Why should these 2500 be permitted to work in order that the 23 widows might continue to be supported by their children? Would not a neighborly care of these few families through private pensions carefully administered—would not this small expenditure of time and money until the children of the 23 were fully able to work, have helped the physical, industrial and moral future of the whole 2500?

Next to the widowed mother argument, we hear most of the street and its dangers as a reason for putting children to work very early. The plea that our schools are overcrowded is irrelevant, as the crowding is in the grades for younger children, for whom even the advocates of child labor would hardly suggest the factory as a substitute. Our compulsory education laws must be enforced, of course, and the child's play time must be turned to account educa-

tionally, as we have already seen. But the street without these rivals and unregenerate as it now is has been found by those who know child life in cities intimately to compare favorably as a school with the glass house, the messenger service and most other occupations open to children. The superintendent of the House of Refuge at Glen Mills, Pa., a school for wayward boys between ten and sixteen, declares that he has very few boys there who were not working boys at the time of or just before their arrest.

To secure the release of a boy of twelve, just recovered from diphtheria and with a tendency to tuberculosis, from illegal employment in a Pennsylvania glass house, where he was working alternate night and day shifts of 9½ and 10 hours each in a superheated atmosphere, required this spring the energetic efforts of three volunteer societies.

After working hard to effect similar rescues, one begins to wonder how long a State will endure an expensive Factory Inspection Department which has no sympathy with the honest enforcement of the child labor law, and continues to keep in office inspectors who violate

its provisions. The real difficulty, of course, is in the lack of neighborly contacts. If a thousand good neighbors in my city saw a hundredth of what I am forced to see, no moving appeals would be needed. The plain facts would make their own appeal, and the employment, for wages, of children under fourteen, their employment all night in glass houses and foundries under the age of sixteen, and the employment of foreign-born children under sixteen who cannot read and write English, would become impossible.

Demagogues appeal to foreign voters by declaring that this effort to exclude children under sixteen who cannot write English is a discrimination against foreign labor. It is really a measure in the interests of foreigners, in that it hastens their Americanization, or else encourages them to seek homes away from our congested centers of population. One may have little sympathy with the efforts to restrict immigration to this country, and yet may see the advantage of regulating it by means of effective child labor and housing laws, for no one will profit more directly than the immigrant him-

self when we shall at last come to maintain a good minimum standard of child care and of sanitation in our cities.

Nothing that has been said against the employment of young children, or of those who have had no schooling, should be interpreted as showing a half-hearted sympathy with the employment of older children in our factories and workshops. The crisis in the physical life of the child once past, and the school given its fair chance with him, the factory will, under good modern conditions of organization, give him the discipline and the industrial opportunity that he needs. Factory owners have had to bear more than their share of abuse for labor conditions, because they happen to be the chief offenders in one section of the country. One who has had the co-operation of some of the best of them in more than one child labor campaign can testify that many would welcome an honest and strict enforcement of the laws that exclude children under fourteen from wage-earning occupations.

What can each one do to help in the long campaign, only just begun, for the better pro-

tection of childhood from premature employment? We can help to form an overwhelming public sentiment against dishonest inspectors; we can learn the provisions of the present child labor law; and we can report all children known by us to be working illegally to the factory inspection department, to the compulsory education department (if they are of school age), and to the State child labor committee.

What can we do to help the children who are working legally, or who are about to enter upon work? The choice of work in which there is a fair chance of advancement and an opportunity to acquire real skill is most important. Parents are often glad of advice here; and no little care will be needed, in the present state of industry, to avoid unhealthy and dangerous occupations, and to discriminate between work that prepares for future usefulness and "dead-end" work. Evening courses at technical schools cannot be recommended for the ambitious boy or girl under sixteen who is working all day, but for children over sixteen who are in good health they give, in many of our larger cities, the very chance of advancement that the

daily work does not give, and I am interested to see how many young women who apply to me for positions have supplemented a meagre school training by attending clubs, settlements and colleges that give evening instruction.

Then there is the child just past the school age of fourteen who, having shown real aptitude for study, should be helped to continue in school by a special scholarship, if necessary. The "waste of ability" that comes from our neglect to fit exceptional children for the work they could do best is quite as tragic in its way as physical distress. Ignorance is, indeed, the cruelest of thieves; it robs and wounds us in so many ways, and the wounds are never healed.

Under this section of our subject, we should have the addresses of the State child labor committee, the compulsory education bureau, the factory inspection department, the department of education, the working girls' clubs, the other clubs for boys and girls, the young men's and women's Christian associations, the technical schools, the settlements, and other places having evening classes.

IV

The Adult Worker.

IN an introductory chapter I have referred to that isolation of the relatively well-to-do which is brought about by the multiplication of mechanical contrivances. We shop by telephone and by mail; we consume at one end of the trolley line and railway track the commodities made at the other; and the details of the processes of manufacture and of after-handling are hidden away from our sight and knowledge. But it is in this very part of our daily lives, in the way that we buy and consume both necessities and luxuries, that we still influence most vitally the lives of large numbers of our neighbors. We have no contact with them, we do not recognize them when we pass them on the street, and yet, for good or for evil, we are shaping their lives every day by our choice of goods.

Some cheerful philosophers pretend to believe that this influence is always and inevi-

tably good, that by lavish expenditure—the more lavish the better—we "make work for the poor."

The Bradley-Martin ball used to be one of the favorite illustrations of this form of automatic beneficence. It was assumed that, if not spent on the ball, the money would have been hidden away in the Bradley-Martin stocking; that it could not have been invested in any industry which, beside giving work, produced useful things.

The fact that immediately concerns us, however, is that lavish expenditure is usually capricious expenditure. What the Bradley-Martins had at their ball by way of favors and decorations and a hundred other things were, I imagine, unique, or why all the noise about them? But nothing so demoralizes industry as caprice in buying. Our buying may be on a large scale or a small, but it must have purpose and thought and continuity, or else we rouse hopes that we can never satisfy, we increase the uncertainties of employment, we call a particular form of skill into being only to leave it in disuse.

And a taste for cheapness is equally disastrous. Says Bernard Bosanquet,

> If we will have nasty things, shoddy things, vulgar things, ugly things, we are condemning somebody to make them. If we will have impossibly cheap things, we are condemning somebody to work without proper pay.

There are legitimate bargains, of course. The department stores are teaching us to become more intelligent consumers by offering goods out of the rush season at reduced prices. This is only one way, but a good way as far as it goes, of helping us to realize the advantages to both maker and buyer of planning ahead. It contributes toward the greatest single benefit that could be conferred upon those who toil; namely, the equalization of their work and wages throughout the year.

The demoralization of uncertain income when that income is very small, the temptations of many weeks of idleness followed by weeks of work at high pressure during long hours—we have little realization of what these

things mean in loss of health, temperance, morality and thrift, unless we have known the home life of the intermittent worker.

Occupations dependent upon the weather, such as digging, teaming and water-front laboring, are illustrations of what is meant. In the building trades a wiser arrangement of outdoor and indoor tasks has reduced the length of the dull season very considerably. The clothing trade is, at present, the extremest instance of bad organization. An investigation made among the garment workers of Philadelphia in 1903 showed that "on an average there are thirty-one weeks throughout the year when coat and trouser makers are idle, and there are thirty idle weeks for the vest makers."

Employers with a neighborly spirit can do as much as the consumer to make the lives of workers more endurable, and they owe a special duty to those who are unprotected by trade organizations and trade agreements. They can provide sanitary workshops and safety devices to guard the life and limb of the worker; they can take a proper pride in doing more than the law requires instead of less; but in no way can

they do a greater service than in devising ways, by every possible combination of tasks, to equalize work throughout the year. The superintendent of a gas company, wishing to give the fitters steady work, advertised to sell gas stoves to be paid for during the following summer, on condition that they were to be put in place at the company's convenience. We are only beginning to realize the thousands of ways in which such forethought could be made of benefit to the consumer, to the manufacturer, and, above all, to the worker.

Each one can help. This is the burden of every chapter in this book, but it is peculiarly true here. We are all employers, and life would not be overstrained but cheered and enriched if we could contrive to put more brains and heart into our purchase of goods and of service. If we are going to need furniture-covers, it is unneighborly to wait until everyone needs them before we try to have them made. If our trunks are out of repair, why not send them to be mended just after we return to town, and give the workmen ample time, instead of waiting until just before we leave again and telephoning

excitedly that we must have them at once? Illustrations could be multiplied indefinitely. Planning ahead, sending work back to the home laundress when we are away, saving work that can wait for the dull season, realizing that each life which we touch is a life apart and not merely a convenient appendage to our own—such a daily habit brings its own reward in a more equable temper and in happier human relations.

But rewards are beside the mark; all who work for us are our neighbors. The priest and the Levite were respectable citizens certainly, and busy ones probably, but—they passed by on the other side. That we may avoid doing likewise through any blindness to the plight of our neighbors who toil, the Consumers' League comes to our assistance. Its suggestions are very simple. It asks us to

Do no shopping after five o'clock.

Do no shopping on Saturday afternoons and during the week before Christmas.

Receive no packages delivered after six o'clock without protest to the management.

Deal with Fair Houses giving a ten-hour day;

a weekly half-holiday during two summer months; at least one week's vacation with pay in summer; compensation for overtime; lunch and toilet rooms apart from work-room and from each other; seats for employees and employees permitted to use them; weekly payment of wages; terms of employment such as to enable employee to lead a self-respecting and moral life; obedience to the laws of the State. The League furnishes lists of such houses for various localities.

Ask for underwear made under sanitary conditions and without child labor or sweatshop labor. The League grants the use of its label to manufacturers meeting these conditions.

One of the objections to the sweating system is found in the inability of human beings to compete successfully, by hand or foot power, with steam power. Work that can be done and is done equally well by machines cannot be done by men, and still less by women, without a physical strain that steadily reduces their earning power. When, therefore, work is "farmed out" by manufacturers to be done in tenement shops or in the homes of the workers, the hours are necessarily long and the pay small.

The spread of disease by this method of manufacture is a strong argument against it, but the inevitable effect upon the worker, removed as he is from the protection of the factory laws and from the immediate oversight of his employer, is a still stronger one.

A Philadelphia member of the Consumers' League contracted diphtheria from a visit to a room in which a woman was finishing children's flannel dresses by the bedside of a child who died later of the disease. Into how many houses these little dresses carried the germs of contagion is unknown, but the incident is mentioned here because the woman's earnings were, at the time, 35 cents for a thirteen-hour day.

Before her child was taken ill, she was besought by a neighboring settlement to leave the child at the day nursery, and take up factory work; but home work seemed readier at hand and she refused. After the child's death, she did enter a textile mill, and is now earning $7 a week for five and a half days' work.*

* This does not mean that widows with children should always be urged to enter factories, but that the home industry, if one be found, should not be factory work.

Relief funds cannot be administered wisely without keeping industrial questions continually in mind. Through ignorance of them it is possible for charity to make grievous blunders. If a man with four children can earn only $6 a week as an unskilled laborer in a large city where rentals and other living expenses are high, it is surely better, instead of merely supplementing this income, to spend money and time in seeking for him a new field where his labor is in greater demand and where living expenses are cheaper. A woman works hard and earns $3 a week. Should charity supplement this amount, in order to make it possible for her to live, or should it use every resource at its command to secure for her better paying work, in case she is fitted to do it; or, in case she is not, to train her for better work, and support her entirely during the period of training? The latter is the better course, not only for her sake but for the sake of all independent workers with whom, at a $3 wage, she is coming in competition.

The entrance of many women into wage-earning occupations is one of the natural re-

sults of the abandonment of home industries to which reference has been made in the chapter on the Child in the City. For reasons that affect the physical and moral future of our race, that entrance must be safeguarded by special regulation as to hours. The international treaty signed at Berne last year prohibiting night work for women employed in factories and workshops, places fourteen European nations ahead of the United States in their care of the health and welfare of mothers. If, as some claim, the regulation of women's hours of employment by statute would be unconstitutional in this country, it would be a very patriotic thing to amend the constitution to meet a condition undreamed of when it was framed.

There is one other industrial handicap that the good neighbor must never forget—the handicap of race and national prejudice. The parable of the Samaritan is so supremely significant just because the rescued man was a Jew and his rescuer was of an alien people. The group that surrounded Teacher and questioner on the day that this tale was first told felt with

all the intensity of their pride of race the dramatic contrast, but too often we miss it altogether and the meaning of the parable beside, interpreting it quite comfortably to teach us that we must be kind to one another even at some personal inconvenience.

A charity that publishes appeals for individual families in the daily papers (without names, of course) has discovered that appeals for money to pension a German or an American widow with children meet a ready response, but that an appeal for an Italian widow usually brings no money whatever. The latest immigrant group, and the one condemned to do the heaviest and poorest paid work, is usually the one against which, unconsciously, we allow ourselves to take this antagonistic attitude. Quite apart from our opinion as to the wisdom or unwisdom of the immigration laws, we owe a neighborly duty to those whom we have allowed to enter.

Around industrial questions and their solution the social unrest of our time seems to center. Unneighborliness on both sides has been the rule rather than the exception, and still I touch

upon the subject only in so far as it concerns the handicapped. The topic has no limitations, but the book and its author have very definite ones, making any adequate treatment in this place of the relation of employer and employee impossible.

V

The Tenant.

IN one of Miss Edgeworth's incomparable tales of Irish life, the hero returns after many years' absence to his own country, and, in a fit of generosity, builds a new cottage for his old nurse. But she is far from happy in her model quarters. Missing the smoke to which she has been accustomed, she finds the place cold; partitions are soon torn down for firing, and "the whole is transformed into a scene of dirt, rubbish and confusion."

The moral might be drawn from this that the Earl of Glenthorn had been too kind; that improved housing for ignorant tenants is always foredoomed to failure. But a truer moral is based on the Earl's many years of absentee landlordism. As he had pursued his own pleasures in London, he had been oblivious for so long a time to the real condition of his tenantry that his kindness had come too late.

Absenteeism is not the only cause of bad hous-

ing conditions. The thrifty foreigner is a newer type of landlord who often puts his savings into a house which he sublets, living himself in two or three of its rooms, and greedily exacting for the rest the highest possible rentals for the fewest possible conveniences. But this is the landlord with a low standard of living. The landlord with a higher standard, who used to collect his own rents or, at least, personally superintend the repairs, was rarely a hard man. Contact had developed his neighborly side.

It is generally supposed that New York is the only city with a tenement house problem. Under the accepted definition of a tenement house this is not true, though it is true that New York is the only city in this country that has a majority of its total population in houses erected for a number of families each, houses of the six-story, narrow-airshaft variety; and in this regard her housing conditions are peculiar.

I shall not attempt to tell here the story that has been told many times before of her determined fight for better conditions; of the successful campaign, beginning in a committee of the New York Charity Organization Society,

continuing through a State-appointed commission, through the creation, later, of a new tenement house department with wide powers, and still carried on to-day through the active interest of many friends of the poor in the work of that department. I turn instead to the cities in which it is confidently asserted that there are no tenements, that "this is a city of homes." The reports of housing investigations in two such places lie before me as I write. They are filled with reproductions from photographs of the most revolting conditions.

What is a tenement? It is a house occupied by three or more families living independently of each other and doing their cooking on the premises. In nearly all large cities said to be free from the evils of bad housing there are thousands of these houses, built for one family and occupied by three or more.

Conspicuously bad features often found in these dwellings are inadequate water supply and sanitary accommodations; broken and defective plumbing; surface drainage; wet cellars; yards piled with rubbish; live stock kept within the

houses; overcrowding of sleeping rooms; lack of privacy; no proper provision for the disposal of garbage; and insufficient light and air due to the erection of a second building on the same lot.

Another problem of such cities is the alley house. One long double row of alley houses presenting a rather homelike aspect in the report (little houses, however unwholesome, are apt to do this in pictures) is said by the Board of Health to have had at least one case of tuberculosis in each house, and, during the year 1906, eight deaths from tuberculosis had occurred in families there that were known to the Federated Charities.

Why, it may be asked, do tenants endure such conditions? The reasons are many. Migration to cities creates a great demand for living quarters that are convenient to work and, in the case of foreigners, near one's compatriots. The increased demand for tenements sends up rentals and makes it easy for real estate agents to dismiss tenants who demand repairs or report nuisances. Accordingly, the patient or indifferent tenant stays and conditions deteriorate.

But always, as a contributing cause, we have the modern habit of loss of contact, and the administration of properties by middlemen.

A modern charity organized on the district plan became aware of some of the inconveniences of delegated ownership when it took charge, in a poor neighborhood, of a district office that had been in other charitable hands. The society's paid visitor was sickened by the foul odors of the place, an old vault was found to be leaking into a cellar at the rear, and the cellars of the rear houses were flooded by each rainstorm. Examination of the city plan showed that the street had never been underdrained. After some months of unremitting effort this was accomplished. Whereupon the real estate agent ordered the charity to vacate the premises, saying that it had caused him more trouble and expense in six months than the former tenant had caused in sixteen years. This was quite true, but the tenants in the rear houses were very grateful for dry cellars and sweeter air, even at a slightly advanced rental; and when an appeal was made from the real estate agent to the lawyer who hired him and who was, in turn, hired by the owner, the

society was permitted to remain. It took time and influence to accomplish this improvement; the charitable society's neighbors had neither.

Administration by middlemen will continue, of course, but owners, in the last analysis, are responsible for any injustice or lack of consideration of which their agents may be guilty, and to the owners of property all who love their fellow men have a right to turn for redress, when housing conditions become intolerable.

What is the very least that a landlord who is also a good neighbor should know about his properties in poor neighborhoods? First of all, he should have *seen* them with his own eyes. Many estates are administered by trust companies who employ local real estate agents for the poorer properties. Often the owner does not know what he owns nor where. The very least that one who receives income from a house inhabited by poor tenants can do is to visit it, go all over it and assure himself personally that no part of his prosperity rests upon the insecure foundation of conditions dangerous to health and life itself.

The landlord without much experience of housing conditions who makes such a visit of inspection will sometimes be deceived by the effects of paint and whitewash. These change the superficial aspects of a property, but they do not cure its fundamental structural and sanitary defects. "It is not unusual," writes a correspondent who has been interested in housing reforms, "to hear visitors condemn in unqualified terms houses which are in very fair structural and sanitary condition, but which may, at the time of their visit, have lacked paint or had cluttered yards or dirty rooms." The important things to look for on a first visit are insecure foundations, dangerous or dark stairs and hallways, leaky and insecure roofs and walls, wet cellars, defective plumbing, inadequate water supply, dark rooms and overcrowded sleeping apartments. The minimum standard of cubic air space for each adult sleeper is 400 cubic feet.

This inspection might well be preceded by an examination of the local building laws, and the visit itself should make clear whether their provisions are being obeyed.

For the landlord who is moved, by this personal contact with bad conditions, to seek remedies, the following more detailed suggestions about tenements, compiled after correspondence with several housing experts, may be found useful. I am indebted to Mrs. Alice Lincoln of Boston, to Mr. Lawrence Veiller and Miss Emily W. Dinwiddie of New York, and to Mr. Wallace Hatch formerly of Washington and now of Philadelphia, for the great pains with which they have answered my questions, though they must not be held responsible for the result as here given:

1. *Cellar* clean and free from rubbish. Where soil is contaminated from leakage of privy vaults, defective house drains or any other cause, a concrete floor is needed. The main pipe carrying waste to the street sewer should be trapped and provided with hand-holes for cleaning purposes. An unobstructed house drain and a sanitary, well-ventilated cellar are of the first importance because the cellar air is drawn up through the house.

2. *Plumbing*. The owner should ascertain whether a sewer runs through the street and whether the house drain is properly connected

with it. There should be running water on every landing and, if possible, in every apartment. There should be at least one water-closet for every two families, and these closets should be kept locked. Cleanly tenants often suffer unjustly from the filthy habits of others. The interior plumbing should be tested, and the repairs should be made by a competent plumber.

3. *Halls and Rooms.* If the stairs are dark, an effort should be made to light them by means of glass panels in doors or windows, by transoms over doors, or by a skylight. Every living room should be light throughout and adequately ventilated from the outside air.

4. *Roof, Yard, etc.* Roof clean and free from leaks. There should be a sufficient yard, free from rubbish, in which to dry clothes. If no yard can be provided, the roof should be made available for this purpose. Cans for ashes and garbage should be furnished. Separate bins for each family should be provided in the cellar, large enough to hold at least half a ton of coal. The legal provisions for protection against fire and for escape from fire should be carefully observed.

5. *Occupancy.* Conditions of immorality, overcrowding and dirt among present tenants

should be ascertained. Those who remain stubbornly incorrigible should be removed. The practice of subletting should be strictly prohibited. The presence of animals on the premises, other than dogs, cats and small pets, should not be permitted.

It may be objected that, though attention to details such as these are well enough when tenants are cleanly, they are worse than wasted on tenants of the type of the Earl's nurse, who are by preference careless and untidy. But the experience of volunteer rent collectors who have worked systematically to change living conditions proves that even here a little patience and skill can accomplish wonders.

Forty-three years ago this plan of collecting was begun in London by Miss Octavia Hill in the management of certain bad tenement properties in a rough Marylebone court. It is pleasant to associate with this first venture in philanthropic rent collecting the name of Ruskin, who furnished the capital for an undertaking that has gradually come to have such far-reaching and beneficent consequences. "I find it easy

enough to raise the house," said Miss Hill to an American visitor, "but if you raise it too rapidly the tenants fall out through the bottom." Her plan, in brief, has been to exact regular payments and to collect rentals weekly through a volunteer rent collector who becomes well-acquainted with the tenants and slowly but steadily uses her influence to secure their co-operation in all improvements. Writing of the management of her first London court, Miss Hill says,

> I had been informed that the honest habitually pay for the dishonest, the owner relying upon their payments to compensate for all losses: but I was amazed to find to what extent this was the case. Six, seven or eight weeks' rent was due from most tenants, and in some cases very much more; whereas, since I took possession of the houses (of which I collect the rents each week myself) I have *never* allowed a second week's rent to become due. . . .
>
> As soon as I entered into possession each family had an opportunity of doing better: Those who would not pay, or who led clearly immoral lives, were ejected. The rooms they vacated were

cleansed, the tenants who showed signs of improvement were moved into them, and thus, in turn, an opportunity was obtained for having each room distempered and painted.

And writing thirty-three years later, after this plan had been tried in many London neighborhoods, in other parts of Great Britain, and in this country, Miss Hill says of the volunteers working under her direction: We have tried, so far as possible, to enlist ladies who would have an idea of how, by diligent attention to all business which devolves upon a landlord, by wise rule with regard to all duties which a tenant should fulfil, by sympathetic and just decisions with a view to the common good, a high standard of management could be attained. Repairs promptly and efficiently attended to, references carefully taken up, cleaning sedulously supervised, overcrowding put an end to, the blessing of ready money payments enforced, accounts strictly kept, and, above all, tenants so sorted as to be helpful to one another. These and many other duties devolve on a lady who manages houses as distinguished from an ordinary district visitor.

Americans who have studied under Miss Hill have introduced her plan of managing tenement

properties into the United States. The Octavia Hill Association of Philadelphia was started in this way. There are also, working on another plan, associations for building model tenements, like the City and Suburban Homes Company in New York. And crusades for improved housing regulation have been organized in some cities by the charity organization society, in others independently. The chief sources of local information about housing are the board of health, the committees or associations formed to secure housing reforms, and the philanthropic building companies.

VI

The Man on the Street.

WE have seen that "thy neighbor is thy fellowman when thou and he are near," whether this nearness be geographical, social, industrial, economic or civic, and that no strained interpretation of the parable of the Good Samaritan is necessary to make this clear. But the most obvious application of the words of the Master and the one with which we are most familiar is to the relief of physical distress.

One often hears charitable people say that they would rather help ninety-nine unworthy than let one worthy man go unhelped, and they think that they are quoting the Scriptures when they say this. But it was one that was lost in the parable of the sheep and not ninety and nine at all. Nowhere in the Bible is this division of those who claim to be in distress into "worthy" and "unworthy" ever made, and the division itself has no practical

value. One of the hardest crosses that a worker in a charity organization society has to bear is the popular impression that all his efforts to secure more adequate and intelligent care for the needy are only so many clever devices for protecting the tenderhearted from imposition by discriminating for them between the "deserving" and the "undeserving." It is true that discrimination is necessary, but for quite another purpose. We are all deserving of something and all undeserving of something else; and when we are in trouble, from the least to the greatest of us, or even only think that we are, the one practical thing is to discover what will get us out and keep us out.

What is the truth about giving? It has never been expressed better than by Phillips Brooks, who says,

> I want to give the poor man what is mine. It is my duty and my wish to give. What shall I give him? If I have got no further into the idea of property than the first stage, I am satisfied when I have filled his empty hands with dollars. But if I have gone further than that, I cannot be content till I have bestowed on him

by personal care something of that which dollars represent to me, and without which they would be valueless, the noble and ennobling circumstances which civilization has gathered round my lot. But if I have gone deeper still and learned to count truth the one precious thing in all the world, I shall feel that I have "spared to think of my own" to give him, till I have at least tried to provide not merely for the body but for the mind. And then, to take once more the final step, as soon as I have come to think of character as the one only thing that I can really call my own, my conscience will not let me rest, I shall think all my benefaction an imperfect, crippled thing until I have touched the springs of character in him and made him a sharer of that which it is the purpose and joy of my life to try to be.

Here we have the progressive stages of giving: (1) Money or its equivalents, (2) more ennobling circumstances, (3) character. "Sometimes," writes the great preacher in another place, "the higher gift may be so directly given that the type is needless. Sometimes the modern benefactor may say like Peter at the temple gate, 'Silver and gold have I none,

but in the name of Jesus rise and walk.' " Often, however, the money help is needed, and how can the busy men and women to whom this book is addressed, how can they, occupied with many other duties, be persuaded that the money help which is given without providing at the same time for better circumstances and better contacts, hinders its recipients cruelly?

Less than one-tenth, probably, of those who need our charitable consideration are beggars or vagrants, but this class is ten times as much in evidence as all the others and receives, therefore, ten times as much attention of a mistaken and demoralizing but well-meant sort from the charitable public. It is to the homeless, therefore, that one naturally turns in considering the treatment of distress.

What of the man who has slipped from under, who leads a vagrant life and no longer claims a neighborhood or neighbors or the privileges of neighborliness? Some will see in him the expression of that rebel side of us which longs to be off with the gypsies. Some will recognize and sympathize with that gaming instinct which prompts him to find in the very

uncertainties of the road its chief attraction—a run of bad luck to-day, a golden harvest to-morrow, all won, every cent of it, by a skilfully played game. Some will see in him the victim of a clumsy and mistaken industrial order. Some will welcome him, be the cause of his outstretched palm what it may, as a convenient object for the development of their own charitable impulses. And some, though their number is not yet many, will long to know the whole truth about him—the complex, baffling, difficult truth—in order that they may no longer unwittingly help to manufacture his kind, and in order too that they may win him away from his poor, mistaken, unneighborly, anti-social self.

The vagrant needs more help, more sympathy, more thought and care than he now receives; and I feel that it would be almost a crime to discourage the giving of small change on the street, at the house-door and back gate, or in the business office, to this class, unless at the same time givers were shown a better way of helping. The way has been pointed out in its progressive stages, (1) money or its equivalents, (2) more ennobling circumstances,

(3) character. Money and nothing more sends him back into the vicious circle of his present life, among circumstances that are less and less ennobling, that are made more actively degrading, indeed, by our alms.

"The two conditions of human happiness," says Charles Booth, "are work and affection. And these conditions are best fulfilled when a man works hard for those he loves." This points the way of reform for the vagrant. We do any man, rich or poor, a great wrong, when we help to make it possible for him to live without human ties and without occupation. Upon the provision of work immediately, and upon the restoration of home ties whenever possible, all effective aid for the man on the street must be founded.

But the man on the street applies to thousands, and hundreds of these have some impulse to help him. How can each give him the equivalent of money in work, plus more ennobling circumstances, plus character? To do this ourselves for all who apply obviously is impossible. It is far easier to undo what some one

else is already striving to do by giving what is asked for instead of what is needed.

To avoid this endless duplication and also to provide work and better surroundings promptly for each applicant, a modern institution comes to our rescue as effectively as the inn came to the rescue of the rescuing Samaritan. The wayfarers' lodges or municipal lodging-houses that are provided in some places have become our best modern substitute for the innkeeper, though they are most useful in dealing promptly with an appeal for help and serve only as a first step in effective relief. Every householder and every business house should be provided with free tickets to these shelters, and no such place should be used unless there is a work-test of some sort attached to it, so that wayfarers may at once come under the wholesome influence of employment. This work should be such as can be easily adapted to varying physical capacities. We should further assure ourselves that the work-shelters are kept at a high standard of cleanliness and sanitation. A bath should be compulsory, and there should be proper provision for the destruction of vermin

and the fumigation of clothing. The food provided should be plain, plentiful and good of its kind. These inns for wounded travellers are sometimes so carelessly managed, so uncleanly, that the victim arrives with one disease and leaves with another; and it is unfortunately true that those proclaiming their successorship to the Samaritan the loudest are often the worst offenders. It is neighborly to assure ourselves by personal visit, if necessary, of the kind of care provided, and then to use the selected shelter *systematically* in helping homeless men or women.

> A good shelter is not only cleanly and provided with an adequate work-test for all comers; we should also expect it to inquire into the particular problems and needs of each inmate, in order to seek a way of throwing around him the "more ennobling circumstances" of regular work and renewed human ties. Work in the labor market, which is always better than temporary and "made" work, should be sought for the able-bodied and for the handicapped who are not too crippled or infirm to do special work adapted to their capacities. Younger men should be

brought in touch once again with their own people. The aged often have relatives able to care for them, and these should be sought out. The diseased should receive prompt and adequate medical care.

And all of this programme, leading up at last to the supreme gift of character, needs at every turn our neighborly help. Institutions for the homeless are relatively inefficient unless they have learned to interest young men in the churches, in individual inmates whose greatest need is to be sure that some one else cares; unless also they are able to interest business men who can "lend their brains out" in the search for industrial chances. And for every household there is some natural and easy way of helping. Some can buy the product of the institution's labor or woodyard, some can furnish clothing to aid in a plan of helping a man upward, some can give odd jobs. No one need feel that the old impulse of helpfulness has been checked or chilled by this adjustment to modern needs.

The charitable impulses of the servants of the household should also be carried over into

the new plans. A director of a model institution for wayfarers was sadly bewildered when he discovered that one of his own housemaids was feeding all comers at his back gate. One institution for which he was responsible, namely, his home, was defeating the object of another institution to which he was giving much time and thought. But maids are human: they will not be converted by the maxims of political economy nor by the simple word of command. The positive side of the new policy must be carefully explained to them and then patiently illustrated. One householder always explains to her maid the result of each application for help received at the door. "You'll never get to Heaven by giving away your mistress's things," said a clear-sighted priest to his servant-girl congregation. The truth was so pithily put that it stuck. The truly neighborly household will cultivate in its servants good habits of neighborly service.

It has been said that a few of those who are striving to aid the homeless not only long to know the whole truth about them as the best

way of getting them out of their troubles, but also crave this knowledge in order that they may discover ways in which our modern communities may avoid the manufacture of an increasing army of vagrants, tramps and beggars. This is not the place in which to dwell upon the larger preventive and repressive measures that must be advanced side by side with the education of householders in their contact with the homeless; but, as the householder can influence the policy of police departments and State legislatures, here are a few of the suggestions made in a recent study of "Vagrancy" by Orlando F. Lewis of the Joint Application Bureau, New York, which should be borne in mind. The police will show more intelligent interest in the enforcement of the laws against begging when they find that citizens are intelligently interested.

(*a*) Vagrants trespassing on railroads should be arrested and imprisoned at hard labor, and the press, the police, and the magistrates should push to secure pro pt enforcement of the laws against trespass.

(*b*) In cities troubled with beggars there should be least one special mendicancy officer in plain

clothes, and arrests should be followed by the prompt punishment of habitual offenders.

(*c*) Lodging-houses maintained by charitable bodies should be models of their kind. Missions giving food or lodging to the destitute should require a reasonable amount of work in return. The mission's function is spiritual regeneration. Any method that renders a large proportion of the recipients hypocritical or slothful is obviously wrong.

(*d*) At least one compulsory labor colony for habitual vagrants, with indeterminate sentence, and one hospital for inebriates, should be established in each State.

Turning from the homeless to resident beggars, anyone applying at the door who can give a city address should be told that no help is ever given at the door, but that some one will visit promptly and try to help in the applicant's own home. The name and address should then be telephoned or written to the charity organization society or associated charities, together with any details that have been gathered from the applicant. The society will visit within twenty-four hours, if told that the need is urgent, and emergency distress will be relieved at once without waiting for any formality whatever.

Plans are then set on foot for the more adequate relief of the whole family by methods that are described in the next chapter.

Three types of beggars may be mentioned here very briefly; namely, begging letter writers, deformed beggars and child beggars.

Old stories that have served their turn with slight variation for generations are still the stock in trade of the beggar. Their very antiquity seems to give them a sanctity in the eyes of many. The begging letter writer has the disease from which you have just recovered, or his youngest child is named after you, or he needs just so much (almost always the same sum) to put him beyond the need of charity forever, or a mutual friend has referred him to you, or he had a great admiration for a near relative of yours who has recently died, or he has dreamed you would help him, or a hundred other equally improbable things. If he can convince his correspondent that he has written to no one else, he is fortunate. But such communications should be carefully followed up and their writers helped on the basis of their real needs instead of their alleged needs.

Of another class, less skilled but more successful in their appeals, the blind and crippled, it is necessary to speak frankly. Every human creature hides deformity by instinct. When we tempt the man with a withered hand to exhibit it in order to excite our sympathy, we degrade him, and it is quite true that we often find the deepest moral degradation among those beggars who are also physically deformed. Industrial homes for the blind testify that men leave these institutions to beg on the streets because they can make more money and have more free time for debauchery. "Blind beggars," writes the head of a large school for the blind, "are a real menace to the success of our work, for their existence renders the independence of self-respecting blind people more difficult to maintain." It is not enough to deny the blind our alms, we must push on to secure their better industrial training and to secure for them individual chances of employment,* but when we do not interest ourselves in this thor-

* Those who are interested in the adult blind will find a valuable article on their industrial aid in *Charities and the Commons*, Vol. XVII, p. 405, sq.

ough way, we are too apt to hinder all who do by giving our small change at the door or on the street. An offer to double whatever he might earn and to train him to earn it was indignantly refused by one blind man known to me, and he still parades the streets with his wife, attracting crowds on the corners.

Cripples are almost always employable unless their deformities are very unusual. One, who claimed never to have slept in the same place for more than two nights in succession in twenty years, has now earned his living and slept in the same place—a cleanly place—for months. The local charity organization society will usually try to find work for any cripple who can be persuaded to accept it.

It is difficult to speak without bitterness of the practice of giving money or goods to children who beg at the door or on the street. Behind every such appeal there are a hundred needs to be met, not one; and they are not met, they are only more successfully hidden, by the help of the moment.

No charitable society that is worthy of the name seeks to substitute its machinery for

personal charity. Charity cannot be too personal, but, on the other hand, it must be co-operative and intelligent. "After I had come to avail myself of this society," said a New York clergyman, speaking of the New York Charity Organization Society,

> there came to me one of those cases "I knew all about" and it was not necessary for me to investigate it at all. When he came and asked me for ten dollars and a month or so later for five, in a dreadful emergency, and again and again for ten, I went on giving it, feeling that I was acting as a special providence to relieve genteel poverty; until, after a year or two, a missive came that somehow or other excited my suspicion, and I said, "I will go to the office of the Charity Organization Society," and I went, half despising myself for suspecting these people I "knew all about." And after applying to one of the ladies in charge and putting her under bonds of secrecy, finally I said, "Will you tell me whether you have this name anywhere on your list?" She vanished and in the course of a little time came in and brought me some letters —about half a peck, I should think—that were very nearly facsimiles of the one I had in my

> hand, written by the same person; and I never realized before what a circle I moved in. So after that I concluded I had better make some inquiries in reference to those cases I "knew all about."

The addresses of the wayfarers' lodge or municipal lodging-house, of the charity organization society, and of the missions having a good work-test, will be needed in order to help applicants at the door effectively. In some cities homeless women are provided for at the lodges, and in others there is a shelter under other management for them. For the care of stubborn offenders, who are known to make false pretenses or to give false addresses, police headquarters should be called up. Many persons are discouraged from trying to get the names and addresses of resident beggars because so often, when these are reported to the charity organization society, they prove to be false; but the practice should be continued, for the cumulative evidence thus gathered sometimes makes it possible for the society to stop the begging and help the beggar. It is not safe to assume that anyone in need, however

well educated and respectable, is unknown to the society, which treats all classes and guards the confidence of its clients with great care. No visit will be paid by the society if requested not to visit, but it is always well to inquire whether applicants are registered at its central office.

VII

The Family in Distress.

A WORKER in a large city charity that deals yearly with thousands of families in distress looks back with no small degree of envy upon the time when the place was simple and village-like. Deeds of charity were then relatively easy and natural, for the best way to help people is to know them before they need help, to know them as employees, neighbors, fellow church members and fellow citizens who have duties and pleasures in common with ourselves.

But the village grew into a town, wealth and poverty grew with it, funds were created to take the place of the old neighborhood help—soup funds, fuel funds, clothing funds—and these dole charities, relatively safe at first when the numbers were still small and conditions easily within the understanding of a few volunteer dispensers, became veritable engines of destruction to the poor whom they were intended to help, when village changed from

town to city, and the city became a great magnet drawing many workers away from the country districts and away from overseas. Relief that keeps casual laborers in the city when there is no steady demand for their labor is not neighborly; relief that makes it possible for them to work for less and so underbid the man who asks no help is not neighborly; relief that encourages a weak woman to leave her son's home and come down into the furnished room and saloon district on a long debauch is—not neighborly; relief that helps a man to come and go at will as the whim seizes him with the assurance that his family will be cared for meanwhile is not neighborly. But often the funds that work this mischief were created before the days of sharp industrial competition, before the days of the Tenderloin and of railroad vagrancy; and their trustees continue unchanged the methods of what may be called the "town period" of relief, they go on distributing fuel and grocery orders during the winter months to applicants with whose real circumstances and real needs they have very slight acquaintance.

What is the remedy? It is found in a return —laborious and awkward at first, it may be, but still a return—to the village ideal. To relieve distress the city must be broken up into workable districts, small enough to be known and understood thoroughly by charity workers selected for their devotion and intelligence. Whenever a case of family distress previously unknown comes to light, whether through an application to a church, a private residence miles away or a down-town business house, the matter should be reported at once to the district office in which the family lives; and the citizen so reporting should be assured that a visit will be paid from that office to the home of the applicant within twenty-four hours without fail, that prompt measures will be taken to meet the immediate need, and that then without a moment's delay connection will be made with those who knew the family before they were in need. This may require visits widely scattered; it may require correspondence with San Francisco, or Georgia, or Maine; it may require careful planning on the part of a good many different people and the calling

in, for unbefriended cases, of a charitable stranger who will undertake to visit regularly and be neighborly (what is called a friendly visitor); but it is only the old-fashioned village ideal translated into modern terms and adapted to city conditions.

In our efforts to deal thoroughly with applications for help from strangers the use of an agency working on this plan involves no delay or suffering. The society for organizing charity or charity organization society or associated charities, as it is variously called in different cities, may have developed somewhat different methods of work in different places, and in some the district system will have been better developed than in others, but everywhere such a society guarantees a prompt visit and adequate care. Emergency distress is relieved at once from the nearest grocery or coal bin without waiting to report to the inquirer, and then larger plans for help are developed in which those who referred the applicant will be asked to bear and usually will bear a part.

That kodak charity which says in effect, "Subscribe to us and we'll protect you from the poor, we'll do the rest," is still working in

the sordid "town period" of charitable development. It is anti-religious in the sense that it acts as one more barrier where there are already too many between the well-to-do and the poor. The agency that seeks to divide charitable burdens wisely, on the other hand, using each citizen's capacity for affection and neighborliness and using it to the best advantage, wins its way back at once to everything that was best in the old "village period" of relief.

Such an agency will not attempt to replace the church in any way. Wherever church relations have been severed it will seek to restore them; wherever several churches of several denominations are working at cross purposes without knowing it, and dealing with the same family, it will seek to bring them together and secure either concerted action or a shifting of the burden to the right shoulders. And in all this it will avoid proselytizing.

There are four indispensable features of the district system of aiding families.

(1) An efficient district superintendent or secretary, who gives his or her whole time to the work.

(2) A live district committee or conference, meeting weekly and having in its membership those who are also actively connected with the church charities, the medical charities, and the other agencies dealing with family distress in the district. Such a conference, when well organized, combines neighborly interest with a wide variety of community knowledge. It is willing to think hard about what ought to be done for A and B and C, and no problem that concerns a human being's welfare seems to it trifling or unimportant. The more kinds of people represented on such a committee, the more valuable its judgments become.

(3) Volunteer or friendly visitors serving on the committee and also visiting individual families in which the committee's plans can only be carried out by continuous and friendly contact.

(4) Closest relations between all these district workers and the central society, which should connect the neighborhood needs and the neighborhood points of view with the larger needs of the community, and then work persistently for the legislative and administrative reforms that are found in all this careful, detailed service to be practical.

Such a society cannot prosper without a truly neighborly spirit among both its paid and volun-

teer workers. The older type of charity agent sat at a desk and divided the poor into the "worthy" and the "unworthy," giving the former small grocery orders and sending the latter about their business. The new type of worker, whether serving as a church or charity visitor, is sympathetic, ready and willing to work hard with the so-called undeserving; resourceful in cases where material relief alone is not enough; knowing like a book the district in which he or she works—its schools, its doctors, its clergymen, its industrial opportunities, its charitable people; and quick to use all of these in giving poor people a lift upward.

Several years ago a school teacher applied to me for training looking to a district superintendency. She was advised to write to an old college friend who was engaged in charity organization work in another city. The reply was so helpful that part of it is given here.

> . . . . About the work. I have found it most interesting and inspiring—a splendid opportunity for a useful, happy life, and a better opportunity to grow myself and to learn all sorts of valuable lessons. The work differs in different cities, so

> I cannot give you any specific advice about Philadelphia; I can only tell you about my own experience. . . . . You must make up your mind before you go into the work that you can like or learn to like both rich and poor, and Catholic and Protestant, and Jew and Gentile, for you will have them all to deal with. You must be ready to work also with unpleasant and pleasant people, and, above all, your own faith in the beneficence of God's way in the world must be so strong that you will not easily be discouraged and bowed down with all the misery you will see. You must be able to see the good through it all. I do not want to frighten you—it is a strenuous life, but, at the same time, a wonderfully satisfying life. . . . . In many ways it is broader than teaching can ever be, for we deal with all ages and classes, and all sorts of problems, physical, spiritual and mental.

This is a high standard of professional service, but it has been my privilege to know many who have lived up to it, and such professional charity agents inevitably attract around them volunteer workers of a very high grade.

Some of these volunteers come as beginners, as friendly visitors to two or three families,

feeling somewhat strange, at first, not sure of a welcome and shrinking a little from sights to which they are unaccustomed. But the late Professor Shaler has pointed out a very encouraging fact about human beings. He tells us that

> The revolt we feel at the sight of a man who is grievously wounded, or has any sore affliction which makes him appear abnormal, passes away as soon as we lay a helpful hand on his body. Something of this dissipation of the instinctive prejudice to the apparently inhuman nature of the neighbor will take place when a person of well-trained sympathies . . . . vigorously goes forth to the sufferer by an exercise of the will.

Contact is indeed the cure for many wounds and for many prejudices, and one who has had the privilege for years of introducing friendly visitors to families at some time of crisis or especial distress can testify that in the permanent relation thus often established the healing and help are never all on one side. "If we could only make people realize," wrote a volunteer visitor recently in a letter,

> that the work of friendly visiting is so arranged that one can do a little and have one's efforts

count, and that it offers an opportunity at our very doors to do something for someone else in the best possible way without interfering with any other interests one may have!

One fine thing about doing such work in connection with a charity organization society is that the visitor starts out upon her relations with the family upon such a sure basis. I cannot think of an instance where anything but cordiality existed from the start. Then do you think that people realize what a field there is for purely friendly relations after the professional charity worker has done everything she possibly could? You know of so many families where excellent work is done that I hate to take a minute to give a special instance, but no efforts, I am sure, except those of friends could have kept the B. family together. It took two of us, one in New York and one here, but the family is still together and doing well at last, even weathering a trip West after the possibility of a second desertion on the part of the father.

It takes neither money nor worldly goods of any kind to become such a visitor, and people of very diverse social experience are able to do the work well. The next five extracts, for in-

stance, are taken in turn from the letters of friendly visitors, two of whom are married women, two spinsters, and one a widow.

> Perhaps it has not occurred to you how great an influence this "friendly visiting" work may have in the home of the visitor. For years we as a family have talked and planned concerning the families I have called upon, and besides getting us acquainted with the best methods of helping others it has had a broadening effect upon our own lives. My husband has been instrumental in reclaiming the drunkard whom I have spoken of in this letter.

I think one of the great helps of visiting is that it gives one a truer sense of proportion. This is especially true of mothers of young children who are apt to think the world revolves around their own individual child. My family consists of a widow and nine children, and it is very inspiring to me in coping with my four children to see how wonderfully the widow with every handicap manages her nine.

The work is peculiarly fruitful to the childless person, for it brings love and the dependence of little ones into her life.

> I am as proud of my little girls' progress in school as if they had been my own! While, when my friends moved into a better house where the sun really found them, and bought with their savings an $18 set of furniture, I felt as if I had come into a fortune myself! Then, when my friend was ill, and all her poor, hard-worked neighbors gave of their scant time and means to help her, as many of my friends would not have done for me in like case—I realized more what real sympathy meant and learned another lesson.
>
> What have I gained by the work, and what has it meant to me, you ask? It has broadened my whole life; it has given me work to do when a personal sorrow claimed my thoughts. And it has gained for me, I know, one very loyal friend among the poor.

And these two must close citations that might be indefinitely extended from letters in my possession:

> I have done enough visiting, and for years enough, to have reaped the veteran's exceeding great reward. I have seen results, I have watched pauper-born children develop into good citizens.
>
> My chosen families are now in the third generation and look after *me*.

Who could hope to develop any but the most artificial and unfruitful relations with a family, it may be asked, when the introduction is made through a society? It is indeed deplorable that any families should be friendless, and that any visitors should be without natural opportunities for making friends among the poor under conditions self-respecting for both; but an introduction through a district committee has the advantage that a good reason is always found for the initial visits, that no one will be sent to families already overvisited, and that workers of more experience stand ready to advise and help. There is absolutely no "pushing in," and the friendliest, most attractive relations are often formed. The best argument for such visiting is in the practical help to the visited, though the help is very far from being all on their side.

"Why," said a judge to a woman who had just told her tale of long-endured abuse from a brutal husband, "why didn't you come to me before?" "Because," said the woman, turning to her friendly visitor, "I never had a friend till now." An Italian is in the habit of bring-

ing to his visitor, who speaks his language, all his compatriots in distress, in the simple faith that there is no difficulty too great for her to solve. "Won't you go and see Mrs. ——?" wrote a poor woman, removed to another city, to her former visitor. "I have just heard that she has lost her husband, and you used to do me so much good when I was in trouble." And of this same visitor an elderly cripple said, "It makes me feel better just to see her come in."

This thorough, patient treatment of each individual case of distress, this bringing to it an open mind, an open heart, and a willingness to follow wherever the facts clearly lead, though they lead to the ends of the earth, develops many new and larger ways of helping. At first we think that we are dealing with a family in temporary distress; soon we discover that the distress is caused in part by bad sanitation, and still more by the community's neglect of the feeble-minded, of cripples, or of working children; we have picked up one end of a tangled skein and almost before we know it we are involved in a local or even a national campaign for the eradication of a whole group of pre-

ventable causes of distress. It is in this way that societies organized on the district plan for the more effective treatment of families in need have become the promoters of health crusades such as those for pure milk and against tuberculosis, have been the pioneers in securing better tenement laws and better inspection, have worked hard for compulsory education and against child labor, and are thoroughly committed to the advancement of a number of other practical reforms growing directly out of their first-hand experience with distress and its causes.

It may seem a far cry from this complex arrangement of district offices, district superintendents, district committees, friendly visitors, housing reform committees and sanitary committees, to the simple story of the robbed traveller, the Samaritan, and the innkeeper. But, rightly understood, these changes are made necessary by our changed living conditions; results are still the same. The whole duty of the Samaritan could not be delegated, nor can ours. He touched the wounded man, ministered to him, was truly neighborly; and then,

where his own personal resources failed and his own personal affairs made renewed demands upon his time, he sought the co-operation of the innkeeper. The charity organization society is one of the modern innkeepers, and one of the most useful of them.

The most important addresses in connection with this chapter are those of the central office of the charity organization society and of its nearest district office. A St. Vincent de Paul Society is usually organized in each Roman Catholic parish; there are societies for the relief of various nationalities, often a general relief society also, and a Hebrew relief society to which Jewish applicants should be referred.

VIII

The Invalid.

ONLY those who have been brought to very close quarters with distress realize how large a part is played by disease in the tragedy of the poor. There would be something heroic about the patience with which physical ill-being is accepted by them as the common lot if this were not a part of a larger fatalism. They have had no vision of health, no realizing sense of what a condition of well-being means. Every other cause of poverty in the long and dreary list brings sickness in its train. This would be an overwhelmingly depressing thought if the means of curing and preventing disease had not been multiplied a hundred-fold during the last fifty years.

A passage in one of Dr. Osler's addresses quotes John Henry Newman as saying. "Who can weigh and measure the aggregate of pain which this one generation has endured from birth to death? Then add to this all the pain

which has fallen and will fall upon our race through centuries to come." In sharp contrast to the mood of the great cardinal, the great doctor asks us to turn this about and consider how much pain has been prevented by the discoveries of medicine in the last fifty years. He even ventures to declare that the aggregate of pain which has been prevented outweighs in civilized communities that which has been suffered. This seems at first reading a too optimistic view, but when one considers the use of anæsthetics, the control of epidemics, the wonderful advances of aseptic surgery, and the beginnings of effective sanitation, it is not the statement that seems so much at fault as one's own imagination, which cannot grasp the facts at first in all their cheering significance.

Sin causes disease and will continue to cause it, but disease also causes sin, and in a world from which, through the heroism of many unheralded students, much of the preventable disease shall have been eradicated, spiritual forces will for the first time in this earth's history be able to do their work of healing in a free medium.

During the next fifty years, therefore, no aspect of neighborliness can be more important than that which seeks to improve the health of the people. One who would hasten the coming of Christ's Kingdom upon earth should strive to realize the many roads by which health, in its largest meaning, may be brought into the homes of the lowliest, and won at last to dwell there not fitfully but as an abiding blessing. "I am come," said the Master, "that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly." That such life may flow abundantly over pain-racked nerves, transforming suffering into the gateway of Heaven, we have seen and know. But pain destroys more often than it quickens; the compassionate heart of the Good Samaritan knew this and hastened to bring oil and wine and the shelter of the inn to the wounded man.

Between those simple means and the elaborate contrivances of modern surgery the art of healing has travelled a long way; but still, as one goes in and out of the courts and alleys, their inhabitants often seem as cut off from the means of succor as though they lay wounded

in the wilderness of Judea, for near as this means often is in the modern city their ignorance and ours still cuts them off. So little are available resources understood and turned to account that Samaritans are still sadly needed to make the connection.

Everyone can help and that without going more than a few steps out of his way, by keeping at hand in this little book or elsewhere the few addresses that are needed to secure prompt succor for the sick. The dispensary, the hospital, the visiting nurse, the sick diet kitchen, the modified milk station, should all be within call when it falls to the lot of any one of us to make the connection, and where we are puzzled to find just the best fit in any given case there is always the charity organization society to help us.

In so far as we have any influence with invalids, we may use it to see that the earlier symptoms of illness are promptly heeded, that quack remedies and inefficient doctors are avoided, and that the sick do not return to work too soon. Our present medical resources are often quite adequate to effect a cure, but they are so unintelligently used that many times

they are wasted. Prompt use of the best resources may save weeks and years of ill-health. And when the hospital or dispensary has brought the patient to convalescence, we cannot do a more neighborly thing than to see that, instead of permitting him to return to work prematurely, his health is established by good convalescent care, preferably in the country. Two weeks' board on a farm or in a home for convalescents will make every difference in a working man's or woman's chances of complete recovery.

A neighborly care for the health of the whole people may well begin in one's own household. To take the simplest illustration, stagnant water, even in an old can, breeds mosquitoes and mosquitoes spread disease. Care about garbage disposal and about the cleanliness of our own street, whether we are away in the dustier seasons or not; a determination to pollute neither the air nor the water by home processes or by those commercial processes for which we are responsible; the provision of well-ventilated sleeping rooms for our servants —a nice sense of the relation of all these homely

things to patriotism and to religion is the basis upon which the welfare of our neighbors finally rests.

Among the diseases that we now know how to prevent—dysentery, typhoid, yellow fever, &c.,—the one that has caused the greatest suffering and mortality is tuberculosis. The crusade against tuberculosis illustrates admirably the fundamental difference between the effectual and the ineffectual way of dealing with distress. We have seen that the period of many funds, the "town period" of relief, touched no cause of poverty without aggravating it. It encouraged child labor, overcrowding, and all the social evils that cause tuberculosis; it then cared for the tuberculous patient and his family in such a way as to spread the disease, or else it sent him away to a more healthful climate so inadequately provided with means to assure rest and treatment that he soon died.

We learn slowly and then still more slowly we apply what we learn. As early as 1839, an English physician advocated nutritious food, fresh air and constant supervision in the treat-

ment of consumption; Koch discovered the tubercle bacillus in 1882; but not until 1902, when the New York Charity Organization Society organized its Committee on the Prevention of Tuberculosis, did we begin in this country an active popular campaign to secure adequate treatment looking to cure for poor consumptives, and to impress upon all the people the communicable and curable nature of the disease.

The crusade thus begun is going to educate our countrymen in habits that will prevent not only tuberculosis but many other forms of disease.

> Before long, the town or country house will seem badly built that does not provide upper porches for sleeping outdoors, and that does not secure the greatest possible allowance of sunlight for living and sleeping rooms. We shall learn to give preference to those fabrics that do not catch or hold the dust. We shall make short shrift of the board of health that passes diseased cattle or impure milk. We shall give larger powers to such boards in order that they may not only control the movements of tuberculous patients who

> are careless in their personal habits, but may provide places for their proper care. We shall insist upon the prompt disinfection of all rooms in which such patients have lived. We shall learn to seek expert advice in the earliest symptoms of the disease, and shall secure healthful employments for those who have been cured. We shall learn the value of the simplest foods. We shall learn that these things are far more important than medicines, though a great physician declares that man is the only animal born with a thirst for drugs.

And most of this newly acquired wisdom will bring increased well-being to those who are not sick. When it does, let them remember that they owe their new blessings to those who strove to imitate the Good Samaritan and succor the wounded traveller. Anything done now to help this particular cause, which is a battle not yet won but soon to be, is a contribution toward the welfare of the whole human race.

The newly aroused interest in all matters affecting health suggests that upon this side we might find our best means of attacking some of the other evils that beset our neighbors.

One of the greatest of these is intemperance. Next to licentiousness it still stands as the personal habit that causes most poverty and degeneration, not only in the victim himself but in his offspring. Might we not attack both of these causes more effectively if we sought and followed the leadership of courageous physicians who could tell the truth about alcoholism and licentiousness plainly, but fairly and dispassionately? On the health side too we need many more facts and studies as to the social cost of child labor. We know that its cost to the individual and to the community is very heavy, but we need many more details than we now have.

Advocates of a large group of other undertakings for social betterment could probably find, in the present state of public sentiment, their most effective appeal in emphasizing the relation of each to the public health. I refer to the betterment of the physical welfare of school children, the making of organized play co-extensive with our school system, the systematic study of dangerous occupations and of the occupations of married women and girls, the better sanitation of

factories and workshops, and the application of strict sanitary tests to newly arrived immigrants. All of these have a very direct relation to public health, and on this side the people are most willing to listen and to act.

But our city and State governments have much to answer for, and so have we who permit them still to tamper with such vital questions as the water and milk supply, sewage disposal, housing conditions, contagious diseases, and food adulteration. Whenever, as voters, we neglect these questions for partisan or personal considerations, we "pass by on the other side."

No one will undertake, probably, to gather the addresses of all the agencies in a large city for the relief and treatment of the sick. Those that will be found indispensable will be the bureau of health, the larger hospitals and dispensaries, the anti-tuberculosis society, the visiting nurses, the sick diet kitchens, the modified milk stations, and the homes for convalescents.

IX.

The Contributor.

IN seven successive chapters, we have followed the fortunes of the city neighbors of the good neighbor. We have seen them as children, as toilers, as tenants, we have seen them as vagrants and as the victims of unavoidable misfortune and disease. The good neighbor himself now concerns us, first as the faithful steward of the fortune, be it large or small, that has been entrusted to his keeping, and then as a member of some Christian church, and as one pledged, therefore, to a larger neighborliness.

Every genuine advance has brought with it certain drawbacks during the period of readjustment. The new crusades against contagion made people unduly timid for awhile about contact with tuberculous patients who were well-trained in so caring for themselves as to protect others; this worked real hardship to individual consumptives who were excluded

from hotels, boarding houses and workshops unnecessarily. The newer charity has been made an excuse by those who seek excuses for not giving. It has brought to light ten real needs that could be met effectively, has revealed ten chances of giving for every one that it has shut off, yet the timid giver has undoubtedly been made more timid by its habit of truth-telling.

The time has come to point out that one of the evils of the "town period" of relief was its niggardliness. People gave little for fear of pauperizing the recipients, and this little (usually the same amount to each) given to many tided them over into next week's misery, but kept them in a state of wretchedness. Large gifts have at least one advantage over small, that they are likely to have a greater educational value. In giving large sums, we are usually careful to know beforehand what we are about, and having given, we are more likely to observe the result. To spend $100 in $1.50 or $2 grocery orders, given at irregular intervals during a long period of time, is seldom helpful either to the giver, the receiver, or the inter-

mediary. There is a result, of course, but it is seldom positive and definite. To spend the same sum of money in a lump, in setting some member of the family up in business or in removing all of them to a different environment, or in securing special care for an invalid, is a challenge at once to the one who gives, the one who receives, and the one who devises the plan and undertakes to see it through. It may fail, but at least the reason for failure will appear, and the experience won will be helpful in future dealings with the particular applicant and with all others. The applicant will escape, too, that speculative attitude, that waiting for something to happen, which is part of the pauper habit of mind and the natural result of small doles.

When we turn from this direct giving to individuals in need—which is the very best kind of giving so long as it is based upon a knowledge of real conditions and seeks to remove the causes of distress—when we turn from the consideration of the good neighbor's direct giving, and think of him as a contributor to diverse causes, the most obvious fact is that,

whenever his goodness is at all well known, he is simply overwhelmed with appeals by circular, by personal letter, and by visitation from collectors paid and unpaid. The most unneighborly thing that he can do is to refuse all, for some at least are the true successors of the Samaritan and of the innkeeper. The next most unneighborly thing that he can do is to give to all, or to give and refuse at random, to

> Let twenty pass and stone the twenty-first,
> Loving not, hating not, just choosing so.

In this way he will hamper good work by supporting bad work, and will be giving a new lease of life to the stupid, the reactionary, and the actively vicious.

What should the contributor know before he contributes? The Chicago Bureau of Charities suggests the following list of questions, answers to which may be taken as the minimum of information necessary for an intelligent decision:

> Is this charity genuine or fraudulent?
> Does it meet a real need in the community?
> Is it well managed?
> Does it employ approved methods:

Are its financial affairs conducted in a business-like manner?

Does it resort to extravagant methods of raising money?

Does it account properly for all income and expenditure?

What are its sources of income?

How much income does it require?

What commission is paid to the agent who asks the contribution?

If tickets to an entertainment are offered for sale, how large a proportion of the proceeds will actually reach the charity?

The Bureau also offers to find the answers to these questions about any charity in Chicago. A few other charity organization societies furnish confidential reports to members concerning any local charity

> Commercial agencies have been organized in some cities to make reports not only upon charities but upon appeals from educational concerns and upon advertising schemes. In so far as these agencies attempt to report upon charities, their work, as it has come under my personal observation, is far from satisfactory. The presence of influential names upon a directorate or upon an

advisory board, for instance, seems to paralyze them, though the most fraudulent of promoters are usually able to secure respectable backing. I have known these reporting agencies to make favorable reports about very doubtful undertakings. The tests that they are intelligent enough to apply, moreover, are elementary; a charity might meet them all and still be doing great harm to the poor. It would seem best, therefore, to confine their work to its legitimate field of reporting upon business enterprises, and to seek advice about charitable undertakings from charitable experts who are known to be both courageous and fair-minded.

It takes courage to tell the truth about charities that are well-intentioned but mistaken, for good intentions (though we have authority for believing that they are chiefly useful as paving material) have yet a certain sanctity in our eyes.

Heavily endowed charities that are independent of public opinion and whose managers have grown lethargic cannot be influenced by the intelligent criticism of contributors, but all charities appealing annually for support can be still further demoralized or else greatly improved

by the contributor's attitude. He can hold them up to a high sense of professional responsibility; he can show his contempt for the charity that does more for the applicant with a wealthy patron than it does for the applicant without such influence; he can frown upon large commissions to collectors and upon tickets for expensive entertainments; he can discourage the tendency to bid for support by working for figures; he can discover what proportion of the expense is borne by directors who are able to contribute, and, more important still, whether they really direct the policy of the charity or are mere figure-heads; he can ask of every hospital or dispensary not merely the number of patients treated, but the quantity and quality of care given in each case; of a relief society, not the number of tons, pounds or yards of stuff it has dispensed, but the number of families that it has made really better off; of every charity he can demand to know not so much the amount spent in salaries as the quality of work done by those to whom the salaries are paid.

This question of salaries is an important one. Considerable sums may be wasted on ineffi-

cient employees who are in demand nowhere else, and much larger sums may be well spent upon those who serve the poor with intelligence and devotion. When we pay to provide the poor with a district nurse, we do not say that we are spending our money on salaries provided the nurse is a good one, we say we are spending money on the poor. When a society has anything to do with relief work, contributors immediately begin to figure the cost of "giving away a dollar," and will charge against that dollar the cost of every other task that it undertakes, from the rescue of working children and the punishment of wife deserters up to the most difficult remedial measures.

When people manufacture shoes, do they charge up the cost of all the labor that goes into their making to the administration account? What is spent in the office of a charitable society on a bookkeeper, on a collector, on office rent, on gas, on heat, should be charged to the administration account; but what is spent on the labor of devoted men and women who give their lives to mending the broken fortunes of the needy, doing for them every con-

ceivable service from the lowliest to the highest, surely to charge all that against the cost of "giving away a dollar" is to do a very stupid thing. And yet people are guilty of it everywhere, and everywhere does the plain statement of work done serve as the best defense.

During a secretary's first year in charge of a large charity organization society, some of her directors, fearing that she might be a bit of a fanatic, urged upon her the importance of seeing that the poor were kept warm and had enough to eat in winter, for that was, after all, the most important thing.

But two or three years later, when one of these same directors read a record that she showed him of a poor tuberculous woman who, with her little boy, had lived in a wretched lodging and received a seventy-five cent grocery order every week from a relief society, he acquired a new set of convictions. All references in another city proved false, but the charity agent happened to ask the boy what school he had attended there, and this one clue had brought out a most interesting and strange story of a well-to-do home, a feeble-minded daughter wandering away from it

with her one child six months before, tuberculosis contracted by exposure and lack of food, and a vain search for her in many cities; finally—forty-eight hours after the inquiry—the daughter was re-established at home with a trained nurse, the boy was back in school, and the ugly, distorted conditions of their two lives were righted. Which was better, the grocery order or the adequate care?

A few weeks after reading this record, the director was told by an acquaintance that his society spent too much money on salaries and not enough on relief. The remark made him rather warm, and he retorted with vigor that the kind of service that this agent had rendered was just the thing of all others that the poor needed, and that such service was in no wise inconsistent with adequate relief; that strangely enough the champions of merely feeding and warming people and doing nothing more for them had never done even that adequately, and that it had remained for societies such as his to raise and spend large sums on individual cases.

The advance in really helpful benevolence has been so great, and opportunities for the useful expenditure of money are now so plentiful—expenditures paying dividends in better

health, better morals, better earning power, better citizens—that the encouragement of fraudulent and mistaken charity by careless givers is more inexcusably careless now than it ever was before.

But every new form of effective philanthropy has its fraudulent imitations. One such, claiming to be a national crusade against tuberculosis, was engineered recently by a mere adventurer who knew how to get up attractive circulars. He obtained the backing of a man of science, of the wife of a bishop, of a prominent physician, and of many others, collected several thousand dollars and then moved out in the night to avoid paying office rent. One very disgraceful concern, claiming to support day nurseries in several cities by the sale of a paper, still operates through its canvassers in the business sections of some of our large cities despite repeated exposures. The evidence required in false pretense cases is such that it is very difficult to secure the conviction of this type of criminal.

The contributor should also be on his guard against self-appointed missionaries, founders of

charities who are their chief executive officers, and professional promoters. The self-appointed missionary and almoner, who makes a practice of soliciting and dispensing the alms of others, may be honest, but often he is not, and there is no possible check upon his operations. He is placed in the awkward position, moreover, of having to put a valuation upon his own services. Founders of charities who select a board of directors who in turn go through the form of selecting the founder for superintendent, chief executive officer and financier, are also placed in an awkward position, and the institution so organized will sometimes bear watching. "Professional promoters" are those who make a business of getting up entertainments for the benefit of charities. Well-dressed women, sometimes passing for directors or friends of a certain charity, go to business houses and homes to sell tickets. No check upon sales is possible, and very unscrupulous men and women have been employed in this business. Two rules will protect the contributor: Never buy tickets for charitable entertainments except from those personally known to you. Threaten to with-

draw support from any charity that authorizes professional promoters to trade upon its name.

He who seeks wise counsel before giving and who follows up the result sympathetically after giving can double the pleasure of his gift. He can quadruple it by becoming actively interested in some good cause. I know few happier people than those who spend their money liberally in furthering some benevolent object with which they are personally identified, and who follow this up by spending their time liberally in making the gift effective. But it is not always possible to command the free use of one's time and money both together, so that gift by will must still remain a favorite way of rendering neighborly and helpful service.

Testators are usually actuated by the best of motives, but still they can do harm, or their gift can cease to do good as circumstances change. In England, the classic instance is Betton's bequest of £22,000 for the redemption of British slaves in Turkey and Barbary. The wisest in our day will be rash if they assume that they can forecast the future better than

Betton did. The capture of British sailors off the Barbary coast ceased many years ago, and other social changes quite as great and greater are sure in the future to make our present testamentary endeavors seem foolish.

> A citizen of Philadelphia in the borough of Southwark, who was a member of the American or Know Nothing party, died in 1849 leaving enough money to purchase about 1450 tons of coal annually. This was to be distributed to widows "born within the limits of the United States of America whose husbands shall have died within the present defined boundaries of the district of Southwark." But Southwark has now become the center of Philadelphia's foreign population, and widows whose husbands have died there in recent years have not usually been born in this country. In another twenty years it may become impossible to fulfil the conditions of this trust, although the gift is a pure dole and widows in good circumstances may and do claim their share.

The remedy for these evils is in the testator's hands. Beyond a period of twenty-five years the intelligent giver will not impose rigid condi-

tions, he will understand that if he is competent to frame a bequest wisely for this generation and the beginning of the next, his representatives in future times will also be wise enough, probably, to adapt it to changed circumstances.

In another class belong the bequests that were ill-advised from the beginning, such as those to create new institutions where institutions already existing were doing their work well but needed further support. Our cities become burdened with too many small and inadequately supported charities for the accomplishment of the same set of objects. It is well to consult the published directories of charities before deciding on the creation of any new agency; it is better still to consult some person who knows the city's resources thoroughly. In most American cities, two classes are still very inadequately provided for, the aged poor and convalescents. The better endowment of existing homes and the creation of new ones for both of these classes of dependents is needed.

Many donors have a long list of charities to which they are in the habit of giving a fixed sum annually. If the list is made out with care

and revised frequently, to make sure that the present management of each charity on the list is meeting present needs, this is an excellent plan. One practice of the charitable giver needs amendment, and that is the habit of giving the same sum to everything; the amount given should bear some proportion to the service rendered. It is not quite fair to give $25 annually to a little shelter that cares very inadequately for sixty transients a year, and the same amount to the largest unendowed charity in the city.

After all these cautions have been duly set down, however, the great fact about giving is that we double our riches by sharing them, and the rediscovery of this truth, running parallel as it does with the greed for acquisition which also characterizes our times, is the most encouraging single fact in the story of twentieth century neighborliness.

X

The Church Member.

ARRIVED at the last stage in this superficial survey of charity on its neighborly side, I am forcibly reminded of one who was called from this earth some years ago, but whose ministry in a large city church still remains an inspiration to many. His creed and mine differed widely and I seldom heard him preach, but there was no public task with which I was associated that did not show the influence of his daily endeavor to apply the Gospel of Christ to the life of the city in which we both worked. The city's great network, with its tangles here, its gaps there, its complex of relations, political, educational, industrial, social—this huge net and its motley contents he saw largely and sanely, but with an intense compassion for the spiritually undernourished that were caught within its mesh.

Some clergymen who feel this "call of the city" fling themselves unselfishly into its life,

but dissipate their strength by becoming directors of many boards, attending many meetings, and making many addresses on a great variety of topics. This was not his way. Having in mind always that the exercise and development of the members of his own congregation in the Christian life was his highest duty, he set himself the task of studying first the needs of the city in which they lived; then the possibilities both social and spiritual of the many agencies created to meet these needs; and last, the aptitudes and capacities of his people. The city was their workshop, and into it he fed them freely, associating them with every uplifting work that was going forward. Some of his men visited prisons and became volunteer probation officers in charge of individual boys, others founded an equitable loan company for the poorer sort of borrowers, and many worked hard in municipal campaigns. The women of his church visited families in distress under the best guidance that he was able to secure for them, and gave efficient aid on hospital committees and in children's work.

The church had no group of charitable

buildings, no new charities to which it could point with pride; it was the city as a whole that bore eloquent witness to the power of his preaching. But in however many places outside church boundaries his people may have made that power felt, all the work that they did was religious work; they always so regarded it, and their first loyalty was always to their church and its leader. Sometimes it seemed to me, an onlooker, that he played upon the community as upon a great organ, drawing from it new and inspiring spiritual harmonies.

This is not the only way in which a church may illustrate in the lives of its people the parable of the Samaritan; there are many ways, of course, varying with the capacities of clergymen and of congregations, but this one way gave a whole denomination new dignity in the eyes of those who saw the far-reaching results.

Consider for a moment a different church situation. A young clergyman is called to a well-established city church in which there are many charitable activities, including a ladies' relief society. He has high ideals of what a church should be and do. Denominational

rivalries seem to him petty; to start an orphanage or a diet kitchen or a mothers' meeting because the Baptists or the Presbyterians have started one in the same field is, in his opinion, hopelessly to confuse the church's true aim. What are some of the hindrances to the work of such a minister? In the first place, he must overcome the inertia of the men and women in his own congregation. The natural selfishness of the human heart is best overcome by encouraging every little flickering flame of desire to do good to others, and charitable activities assume a new importance in his eyes when, having shaken his people out of their smaller selves by his preaching of the Gospel, he realizes the necessity of giving them ample opportunity for the exercise of a newly awakened impulse.

He turns to the relief society and other charities of his church, and here, more often than not, is the beginning of his troubles. Our minister is a busy man. He is generous of his time and sympathy. In addition to the exacting duties of his church services, the sick, the tempted, and the stricken of his flock make heavy de-

mands upon him. It is not humanly possible for him to guide each stumbling beginner in charity to solid ground, and soon he discovers that, in the absence of experienced leadership, the benevolent intentions of his good people are being exercised at the expense of the church's poor or, too often, of some other church's poor, who are growing more and more dependent; instead of having heart put into them for the struggle of life, they are becoming less willing to struggle at all. He becomes sick at heart as he sees the results of that promiscuous dosing of social diseases which passes in his church for charity.

It is unnecessary to tell the stories of children seven times baptized in other churches, of rent paid five times over, of Protestant fuel and Catholic groceries supplied, while the family earnings go in drink and in Sunday picnics. The waste of money and of time would be a small matter, if so many helpful ways of dealing with these same families were not set aside, and if the moral effect on his own people and on the poor were not so bad. Each has a distorted view of the other, and these unnatural

relations of the dependent poor to careless givers have gone on so long that any sane and right relation is difficult to establish. On one point he is clear: He knows that his people will never win Heaven by making other human beings less human. The problem given him is how to turn this desire to do good, this initial charitable impulse, which is so hopeful an impulse in itself, into useful channels.

Do I exaggerate the difficulty? Many churches are fortunate enough to have in their membership, or else to secure, workers who are familiar with living conditions among the poor in the modern city, and who are able to give the time to teach beginners in the church's charitable activities to do their work thoroughly and well. But lacking such aids (and many churches do lack them) our clergyman should be able to find among the city's charitable societies and institutions a sympathetic understanding of his needs and a willingness to meet them. Too often he will find instead a short-sighted devotion to their own aims. But from those charities to which he decides to detail some of his parishioners for experience and

training he has a right to demand knowledge and skill in charitable work, and complete indifference as to who gets the credit, the church or the charity, so long as the work is well done. If workers who have been sent from the church to engage in school visiting under the public education association, or in institution visiting under a hospital superintendent, or in family visiting under the charity organization society, or in club work under a settlement, become very efficient and yet leave to take the leadership in some church work, the charity that loses them should count it clear gain if they are continuing to do good work elsewhere.

In the relation between the church and the secular charities, the church should not be expected to do all the giving, though she should learn to interpret the term "religious work" broadly. The church supplies the motive; the charities should supply the method. Sometimes, in her absorption in even more important tasks, the church has failed to accumulate and systematize the experience that is now available about social diseases and their cure.

But method and motive have need of each other. Any assumption of a monopoly of wisdom on the part of the secular charitable agencies is absurd—as though the city's water-pipes and reservoirs should grow vain and think themselves the sources of supply! For centuries charity has looked to the church and must continue to look to it as the uncontaminated spring in the hills, the source of its power. The church, on the other hand, will find the charitable agencies—those described in this book, for instance—a modern convenience, if no more.

There is a development in charitable work that it has often cheered me in times of depression to dwell upon, but I mention it here because it bears a close relation to the development of church work. Let us stand aside, for a moment, and strive to see the forces of our civilization forever remoulding the objects and methods of charity.

Looked at in the large, the process seems to show a perpetual inflowing on the one side of new interests and new aims, and on the other a

perpetual absorption of whole groups of charitable activities back into the community life. To take one illustration out of many: Our charitable concern for children satisfied itself, at one time, by establishing foundling asylums, orphanages and charity day schools. The schools met so vital a need that they were absorbed into the normal life of the community and became a part of greater educational systems, all of which had been of charitable origin. But no sooner had charity relinquished control of our schools than we find her discovering new needs and annexing new territory—the protection of children from cruelty; their care in private families and in kindergartens; their physical training and welfare; their protection from premature employment. And these new objects or a part of them will, in time, be reabsorbed into the daily life of the whole people. Savings banks, in another department of charitable work, began as charities, but have been so completely absorbed that few know their origin as a part of Hamburg's relief system; hospitals have been partly absorbed; and a host of other useful institutions

illustrate in their development this same process. So that we find charity occupying a shifting ground—forever exploring, annexing, and relinquishing.

The church member, as he watches this movement, so full of promise for humanity, will often be puzzled to fix the exact relation of the Christian church to the process. The relation cannot be clearly defined indeed; no one should attempt to dogmatize about it, no one can prophesy how far the secularization of charity may go, or how soon it may be checked by a reaction in favor of church control. In certain fields requiring concerted action on a large scale, denominational differences stand stubbornly in the way of a reaction. It would not be possible, for instance, to secure within church lines the needed compactness of organization for an effective crusade against child labor, or tuberculosis, or bad housing; and yet no one of these campaigns can succeed without the sympathy of the church.

Is not this question of the relation of charity to the church a part of a larger question? Do we not discover, in the church itself, though

upon a far grander and more impressive scale, the same process of exploration, annexation and relinquishment that we have noted in charity? The priests of old were the first physicians, the prophets were the first statesmen, the religious teachers were the conservators of learning through ages that would have been dark indeed but for the flame that they nourished. And yet, one by one, wholly or in part, the church has relinquished control of these functions of healing and governing and teaching. Few will question that her spiritual life has been strengthened thereby.

And what of the relinquished activities? What of medicine, statecraft, education?—how have they prospered? Speaking for our own country alone and more especially for its cities, their growth reveals some great lacks, and the greatest of these is the lack of spiritual power. The time seems ripe—and here and there religious leaders are realizing it and rising to the opportunity—not for a return of the church to the old control, but for a return to these secularized fields of endeavor through the pathway of service.

What we win through authority, we lose; what we win through influence, the influence of understanding and caring, we keep. Every now and again one has a vision of the church moving forward in this way to larger achievements, annexing no temporal kingdom this time but a spiritual kingdom, winning the minds and hearts of men the world over through a larger, a more inclusive neighborliness, which shall break down, in the field of social service at least, the old division between religious and secular.

I have said that there are spiritual lacks in medicine and statecraft and education. The wisest of our doctors are beginning to realize that, before they can succeed in the treatment of a large group of diseases, they must win a larger social and spiritual outlook. Politics in our large cities—can we doubt it?—needs religion far more than it needs any other one thing.

We are dodging the issue of religious instruction in our schools; denominational differences make its solution difficult. But nowhere could the church do a larger work of neighborliness

than in fostering a deeper interest in the condition of school children.*

And in so far as charity has been secularized, there too—in what is coming to be so important and formative an influence in our large cities—we need the quickening of the religious spirit, we need the more active participation of church people. Turning over the pages of the more recent books on social work, one is saddened to find how largely it is taken for granted that things are to be made better by legislation and by generous expenditures of money, by these two things alone. "Just because it is important," says Rev. Clement Rogers, "for Christians who differ fundamentally on points of doctrine to keep rigidly separate in matters of worship and religious organization, it is important that they should co-operate on the neutral ground

---

* A friend sends me this quotation from Bishop Westcott: "With the schoolmasters, I believe, more than with the clergy, rests the shaping of that generation which will decide in a large degree what the England of the future will be,—turbulent, divided, self-indulgent, materialized, or quickened with a power of spiritual sympathy, striving toward a realization of a national ideal, touched already with that spirit of sacrifice which regards every gift of fortune and place and character as held for the common good."

of social work, and on every occasion where no principle is sacrificed by so doing." This from the side of the church, but the social work itself needs that spiritual quality which devoted church members and they alone can bring into it.

When Christ, replying to the lawyer, gave that perfect picture of neighborliness in which "each phrase is a separate gem," He addressed himself not merely to answering the question, evasively asked, of Who is my neighbor? He had in mind the first and wider question of What shall I do to inherit eternal life? Thus did He relate the humblest duties of our daily life to the deepest need of the spirit. Only half of the law is fulfilled in love to God, and "he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

Addresses, Hours, and Telephone Numbers of the Local Charities Recommended in this Book for the Use of the Good Neighbor.