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INTRODUCTION

The movement on a national scale to bring some kind of organization to charity began in the early 1840's. Prior to this time, begging and indiscriminate alms giving had reached major proportions and little concern was shown for institutional care. This resulted in the formation of organizations in the 1840's to improve the condition of the poor and children's aid societies in the 1850's. During the 1870's, economic and social conditions precipitated by the Civil War led to a demand for a scientific approach to charity which was influenced by English Charity Organization Societies. Even the larger societies whose officials were in frequent touch with one another differed considerably in details of methods. The differences, however, were largely due to the efforts to adapt measures to local conditions so that comparisons must necessarily take into account many considerations, e.g., effect of environment on the amount of material relief necessary, differences in cost of living, and resources such as hospitals, sanitariums and public agencies caring for dependents, defectives and delinquents.

The purpose of this study is to present a history of family and child welfare agencies in Baltimore, 1849-1943. In order to do this, it is necessary to deal with these agencies separately in their local setting and place them in their proper perspective. Moreover, one must understand their role in the charity movement on a national level because of the integral part that Baltimore played in advancing the causes of charity(able) organizations and social work throughout the country.

Maryland is a small state, and, compared to Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania where many pioneering charity societies are found, it is not rich. Baltimore city is the center of the mercantile and industrial life of the state. Its geographical location has had an
important bearing on its growth, and as a border state, its influences have been both northern and southern. Even though she remained in the Union during the Civil War, Maryland was deeply divided during the war and the period of reconstruction. In the train of this national crisis, there followed the usual swarm of ills. The Baltimore charity societies, too, found themselves faced with increased demands due to orphans and widows, the disabled and uprooted. Public institutions became overcrowded and the cost of the war was so great fewer funds were available for private and public relief.

Baltimore was not isolated from the rest of the country before or after the war. Like the nation as a whole, it was undergoing a rapid change after the war, a change from a rural to an urban society. Under pressure of similar forces, charity organizations in Baltimore underwent radical changes due to the transformation of social life and the reshaping of old habits and methods. The efforts to adjust to change were not easy and the number of destitute children and impoverished broken homes increased. Because there were no public agencies to give aid to the helpless or the hopeless, it was left to the private agencies to "lend a hand" to the unfortunate. Their early intentions to provide services of a preventive nature and to rehabilitate were soon lost sight of as conditions necessitated giving direct relief.

The recurring economic crises which constantly plagued the Baltimore charitable agencies usually struck hardest people who were at some disadvantage: the unskilled, the poorly trained and poorly educated. Negroes, for example, were especially hard hit. One reason was that they were afflicted by the disadvantage of discrimination which often denied them the opportunity for a good education and job training.

People who sank into the quagmire of poverty found it increasingly hard to get out. The manual jobs that had offered a way out were being eliminated. Those unskilled tasks that remained rated low wages and low prestige. Thus, it became harder and harder to escape poverty. The poor felt trapped by forces they didn't understand. They tended to
become discouraged and demoralized; they lost the hope that had made low living standards more bearable for their forefathers—without hope many were unable to take the first difficult steps of self-improvement that led out of their particular poverty pocket. The poor became increasingly isolated from the heart of Baltimore’s life.

Faced with these conditions, the task of helping was made more difficult for the agencies because of their early failure to cooperate. The “paper programs” and the noblest of intentions were not translated in terms of direct action. The charges and counter-charges which they made against each other reacted against those whom they were supposed to help. The duplication of programs encouraged many persons to take advantage of the opportunity to seek help from as many agencies as possible. However, there were those who recognized these deficiencies and worked to bring about cooperation, an effort which, over a period of time, led to better services for those who were in need.

Baltimore was also fortunate in having individuals in the movement who saw the need for trained and experienced persons in charity work. They stressed the need for these qualities in order to understand the causes and effects of the conditions under which the impoverished existed. Indeed, it was these persons from the Baltimore movement who led in advocating schools to train social workers and who were in the vanguard in making social work a profession.

The insight into changing conditions came in large measure from John Hopkins University and Goucher College. The faculties and students from these institutions illuminated the changing economic and social conditions by studying poverty, its causes and effects. It was from this academic background, therefore, that the Baltimore workers and leaders were able to introduce scientific procedure into the field of charity work. They were also aided by prominent businessmen and old established families of Baltimore City. This gave the Baltimore agencies the opportunity to organize the community forces necessary for success.

Chronologically, the agencies organized were the Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor (AICP) in 1849; the Children’s Aid Society (CAS) in 1860, which became the Henry Watson
Children's Aid Society (HWCAS) in 1871; the Society to Protect Children from Cruelty and Immorality (SPCCI) in 1878; and the Charity Organization Society (COS) in 1881. Because of the manner in which they developed, however, the two family welfare agencies—the AICP and the COS are discussed in that order. In 1902, they merged to form the Federated Charities which in turn became the Family Welfare Association (FWA) in 1919. It was some 23 years later, in 1942, that the FWA and the first of the child welfare agencies, the HWCAS, merged to become the present Family and Children's Society of Baltimore. Then, in 1943, the SPCCI was brought in.

Underlying the dedication and pioneering spirit of those in the charitable movement in Baltimore was the realization that all of the proposals commonly put forth involved heavy costs and risks. But they realized that to do nothing at all involved even greater risks. Thus, to do away with conditions that doomed generation after generation to live out their lives in poverty was the major goal of these agencies.
CHAPTER I

PUBLIC WELFARE AND PRIVATE CHARITY
IN BALTIMORE BEFORE 1849

The early days of Maryland's concern for the poor were little more than a carry-over of the prevailing attitude of the mother country. This is quite evident from reading the first acts of the colonial assembly. The difference, however, came in the way laws were administered. In the Colony, for example, the political unit, the county, rather than the religious unit, the parish, was made responsible for public charity. Moreover, the legislature never established a colony-wide system but "permitted" or "authorized" counties to pass whatever legislation they felt was necessary. The first law on this subject was enacted in 1650.

All maimed, lame or blind persons within the county of St. Mary's not being able to get their living by working or otherwise shall be maintained and allowed by an equal assessment to be levied and brought in with the other levies upon such inhabitants of the county as shall not make a willing contribution out of the charitable dispositions, sufficient compensations and means for the maintenance of all such lame and other persons as aforesaid, according as the Governor and Council shall think fit and reasonable.¹

Vagrancy and begging were among the most serious problems faced by the General Assembly in the latter 17th and early 18th centuries. Despite the attempts to repress vagrancy by statute in 1715, the number of vagrants and beggars in the various counties constantly increased, and the amount expended for this purpose became burdensome to the taxpayer.²

Governor Sharpe, in a letter to Lord Calvert, recommended that workhouses for vagrants and "such as apply for relief" be built in the counties. Lord Calvert approved and Governor Sharpe's advice was
followed. One by one the counties petitioned the General Assembly, requesting permission to build county alms and workhouses.  

The laws authorizing the counties to erect these institutions prescribed in detail how they were to be managed. Five men in each of the counties erecting almshouses were appointed and incorporated as "The Trustees of the Poor" for the county. They were empowered "to make such laws, orders and rules, for the better relieving, regulation and setting the poor to work, for the punishment of vagrants, beggars, vagabonds and other offenders."  

The system of having Trustees of the Poor who had the authority to grant or refuse relief was liable to great abuse. They were responsible to no one, not even the taxpayers, as they were not elected. The money levied for the support of the poor was given to them to distribute as they pleased. In 1805, the Levy Court was authorized to appoint Trustees of the Poor. This same authorization required the Overseer of the almshouse to report regularly to the trustees, who in turn reported to the Justices of the Levy Court. This provision served as a check on the expenditures of the trustees.  

The first Baltimore County almshouse was built in Baltimore in 1773 on North Howard Street, near Madison at a cost of $10,665.66. Two-thirds of this amount, which was loaned by the State, was repaid with interest at four percent, by county taxation. Three years later this building was destroyed by fire but it was rebuilt. However, when Howard Street was cut through dividing the property, the land east of this street was exchanged for adjoining land on the west side. Later, part of this land was leased as building lots. In 1816, the Justices of the Levy Court, who had been given the old powers of the Trustees of the Alms and Work Houses in 1805, were empowered to sell the old almshouse property and purchase a farm not exceeding three hundred acres. Separate quarters were to be provided for vagrants and the poor.  

In 1817, a change was again made in the administration, when the management of the institution was transferred from the Levy Court to
the five "Trustees of the Poor-House of Baltimore County," who were appointed by the Governor and Council. A supplement to this law the next year provided for the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore City to appoint a manager of the poor in each ward. The managers were given power to administer the laws relating to the poor in their districts, and they could send paupers and other classes of dependents to the county almshouse. According to Griffith, this system increased the number sent to the institution.

Beginning with this period there was constant strife between the City of Baltimore and the county concerning the almshouse. The number of city inmates was always in excess of the number from the county, and from time to time various ways were devised to apportion expenses fairly. In 1822, there were thirty-five county inmates and three hundred fifty-three Baltimore inmates. The same year, seven new Trustees were appointed, four residents of Baltimore City by the Mayor and City Council, and three county residents by the Governor. These trustees were incorporated.

On December 2, 1822, five hundred thirty-three paupers of the city and county were removed to the new almshouse on the east side of Gwynn's Run. A rough stone house had been built on this property and with the addition of two brick wings, it was used as a center building. Most of the land was sold and the funds were used for the institution. Not only paupers, but also those indigent and distressed persons who, according to the dictates of humanity quite properly and necessarily should be placed in the almshouse, were to be admitted to the new building. The inmates were to be responsible for their own support. Until this time, income from the sale of products was credited to the maintenance of the institution, but by a new regulation expressed in Chapter 22 of the law of 1822, each inmate, females under twelve and males under fifteen excepted, was to be charged as a debtor for maintenance, medicine and other necessities at a rate not exceeding thirty cents a day. The work done by each inmate was to be credited to the individual's account, and the Trustees of the Poor were empowered to keep the inmate until his work should pay for the expenses incurred
by his care. If the inmate departed without permission before he had
completed his obligation he could be tried for a misdemeanor and if
convicted sentenced to not more than twelve months labor for the
Trustees of the Poor. The Trustees had the authority to dismiss inmates
who had not paid for their support if they wished.

By 1827, the following departments were maintained: an infirmary
for indigent sick, a lying-in hospital, a workhouse for employment of
vagrants and the poor who were capable of working, an asylum for
destitute children, a lunatic hospital and a medical and chirurgical
school. There were usually about one hundred children in the school,
one-half of whom were taught the rudiments of reading, writing and
arithmetic. The annual per capita cost for inmates for the year 1826
was $37.63. The last year in the old institution before moving to the
new almshouse in 1822, it had been $44.17. The Trustees attributed
the decrease in cost to the use of inmate labor on the farm. In 1830,
the Trustees had one paid agent whose duties were to keep the books,
collect ground rents, and to get information from pensioners and those
desiring admittance to the almshouse. He was also required to visit
pensioners and those bound out as apprentices.

Probably because the Baltimore almshouse was the largest one in
the state, it attracted people from the various counties. The Baltimore
Trustees asked that a more definite settlement law be passed which
would protect Baltimore from the necessity of caring for those who were
not residents of the City. Cases were known where the County Com-
missioners of other counties paid the transportation of paupers to the
Baltimore almshouse.

Beginning in the 1820's the Trustees in their annual reports also
continually complained about the large proportion of the foreign-born
in the almshouse. This led to a law in 1832 requiring the masters of
vessels who brought aliens to the port of Baltimore to register their
names at the customs house. They were also required to pay a fee of
one dollar or give a bond of one hundred fifty dollars for every alien
passenger. If the alien became a public charge within two years this
bond was forfeited. A fine of twenty dollars was provided for each
name that was not registered and a fine of one hundred dollars for each passenger that was allowed to land without the fee being paid or the bond given. The revenue derived from this act was paid to the Trustees of the Poor for Baltimore City and County. Up to 1848, it had averaged $4,169.49 a year. If the Mayor and City Council desired, they could contribute from this fund to the Hibernian Society of Baltimore which had been incorporated as a relief organization for Irish immigrants or to the German Society of Maryland. This act was nullified by a decision of the Supreme Court in 1848 which declared similar laws in New York and Massachusetts unconstitutional. However, an act similar to the one of 1832 was passed in 1849. Then, about 50% of those admitted to the almshouse were foreign-born.

The population of Baltimore in 1800 numbered 26,514 and increased rapidly each decade afterwards. In 1810, it was 46,555; 1820, 62,738 and in 1830, 70,620. The various foreign nationalities and ethnic groups were beginning to differentiate their several social and charitable activities. Racial and ethnic ties attracted and bound the various small groups of foreigners into small communities, and the more unfortunate began to receive help from the hands of their fellow countrymen. Therefore, in the first two decades after 1800, several societies were organized for the specific purpose of caring for their own or their descendents.

It was also quite evident by 1800 and even before, that separation of inmates in the Baltimore almshouse was inadequate. In their reports the trustees had been deploring the necessity of keeping paupers, vagrants and the insane in the same building. Strangely, the by-laws of 1847 instead of separating the inmates on the basis of their needs or conditions, separated them by sex and color. The former, of course, was helpful; the latter, unnecessary. A report of the same year described the wretched condition of the insane, one hundred twenty three crowded in miserable dark quarters where there was no possibility of having them cured.
In 1851, Baltimore City and Baltimore County became separate political units.²¹ The County’s interest in the almshouse was sold, and until provisions for a new one in the county were made in 1872, the County contracted for the care of its inmates in the city institution. A visitor from the County was appointed to look after the welfare of the County inmates.²²

In 1868, all titles to the property held by the Trustees of the almshouse of Baltimore City were transferred to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore. The Mayor and City Council were given the power to appoint the Trustees of the Poor and describe their duties. In 1898 the name of the Trustees of the Poor was changed to the Supervisors of City Charities.

This same period prior to 1849 also saw the organization of two other forms of relief for the poor, one for indigent widows and the other, soup kitchens. On January 7, 1802 the first regular meeting of the Impartial Humane Society for the relief of indigent widows was held at the home of Bishop Carroll and was incorporated in 1811. The object of the society was to give employment to destitute widows and thus "help them help themselves." Through private contributions a depository was provided where women were given work under the supervision of a paid woman superintendent. The society extended its benefits only to widows and women whose husbands were infirm, sick or disabled, or whose husbands had deserted them, and only then to those who could give references.²³ The work progressed and the beneficiaries of the society were able to be self-supporting as long as they could work. When they became too old to continue working, the society met the need by the founding of the Aged Women’s Home in 1851.²⁴

There is no record of the first soup-house established in Baltimore, but soup is one of the oldest forms of relief in Baltimore City. It is recorded that due to the extraordinary severity of the winter of 1804-5 and the extreme suffering of the poor, it became necessary to hold a public meeting and to appoint visitors to solicit contributions to help relieve the conditions of the poor. To their alarm these contributions were soon exhausted and Mayor Thorogood Smith was successful in
soliciting one hundred dollars for the establishment of a soup-house and appointed a committee to put the plan into execution. The soup-house was opened on the 23rd of January, 1805 back of number 27 Harrison Street near the Centre Market, and in time it was mainly supplied by donations from the market people. A thousand quarts of soup and the same number of loaves of bread were distributed from this house. Tickets were given upon which holders received the quantity to which the size of their families entitled them. 25

In 1819, due to another severe winter and the dullness of business, it was necessary to resort to the same method to relieve the poor. A letter was addressed to the Mayor, Edward Johnson, calling his attention to the benefit that had been derived from the soup-house in 1805, and suggesting a similar plan. The Mayor called a meeting where it was determined to establish a regular society, to be called the "Baltimore Soup Society." And at a meeting of this society at the Mayor's office on the 6th of November, 1819, by-laws were adopted and a superintending committee was appointed. The superintending committee was authorized to establish a soup-house in the vicinity of the Centre Market and elsewhere as they might think best. In January, 1920, the manager of the society established a pay-house in a part of an old auction store on the corner of Frederick and Second Streets in addition to the free ones in operation. This was for those who would not make use of the free houses but could satisfy their laudable independence by procuring soup and bread at a more moderate price than elsewhere. This form of relief was continued in Baltimore City by individuals and private groups. 26

One other organization administering to the needs of the poor was the Dorcas Benevolent Society organized in 1840. This Society was possibly the first to give to all nationalities and denominations, the only requirements for relief being "the circumstances of distress and moral character." The funds of the organization were supplied by private contribution and the annual sale of articles made by members of the association. The methods of relief were possibly more advanced.
than others at that time. The agents visited in the homes, kept diaries with full description of visits, and gave relief only in the form of groceries, fuel and clothing. 27

It should be noted that the period from the early 1800's to the late 40's was responsible more than any other for the largest growth of pauperism in the City's history. The village days when a man knew his neighbor had passed and a community of comparative strangers had succeeded. 28 Also in this same period, Baltimore was twice visited by serious epidemics—the plague of yellow fever in 1820 and the great plague of Asiatic Cholera with which the city was stricken in 1833. These events increased the needs beyond the normal demands for aid to the poor and needy which further explains why societies for relief multiplied more rapidly during this period.

We also should be cognizant of certain conditions that existed at the time in Baltimore City. There was no cooperation in or coordination of charitable endeavor. Each organization worked as an independent unit, and the only limit to the profits of mendicancy were the beggar's ability to present a plausible excuse. The growth of pauperism had reached such a state and had become so pronounced, serious men began in the 1840's to view it with alarm. From this time until 1849 frequent references were made in the columns of The Sun and The American to this growing evil. This sentiment was crystallized in 1849 and marked a new epoch in Baltimore's charity, making this year stand out as a pivotal one. The slow change from waste to conservation and the organization of charitable effort took some definite form. 29

One of the most common forms of relief collection in Baltimore City prior to the 1850's would take place at the ward meeting usually held late in the winter. After an incomplete and inadequate collection, a small quantity of wood and fuel was bought, when prices were highest, and distributed without questioning to the first and boldest beggars. With this the public considered its duty done while the modest poor got little or nothing and the severest of suffering was experienced at the beginning of every winter by the poor before any steps were taken for their relief. It was after the severe cold weather had set in that the
Mayor usually called ward meetings at the places where elections were held. For the most part these meetings were very thinly attended and in many instances no organization took place. It was the custom of the Mayor after the collections had been taken up, to call a second meeting of the collectors and distributors in order to devise the best plan for giving prompt relief to the poor. It was the practice to place the funds collected into a common fund and divide it equally among all the wards, which caused a great deal of dissatisfaction. Some wards made no collection for the poor, but they received the benefits from the work of those that did. It was found that at times only twelve or fourteen wards out of twenty had made any collection for the poor. In wards where collections were made, the names of the distributors and the places where the poor were to apply were not published. Letters to the Baltimore American protested this inefficiency, and also pointed to the haste in distribution, without the necessary information, in many cases, as to the character and claims of the applicants.  

A person using the pen name "Howard," wrote with great depth on this subject in the Baltimore American. "Howard" had outlined a clear plan of organization on October 24, 1849 in the American. He first proposed that a public meeting of citizens be held at a central place for the purpose of organizing a permanent society to be called "The Society for Out-door Relief of the Poor of Baltimore." He also advocated dividing the city into four wards with an agent in charge of each, and a general secretary located at the Central Office to supervise the entire city and keep the registration books and necessary records. The duties of the agents, according to this plan, were to examine carefully each case and report the information to the Central Office for record.  

In an effort to avoid giving unnecessary relief "Howard" advised that the agents keep in mind the possibility of sending applicants to the alms-house, hospitals or other institutions; the need at times of breaking up the home and placing the children; the frequent need of employment or medical attention instead of constant relief; and especially the help of police and the rigid enforcement of the Vagrant Laws. In a further attempt to eliminate indiscriminate alms "Howard" proposed
the distribution of tickets of reference among the contributors that they
might give the tickets instead of relief to the beggars at the door and
thus direct them to the source of relief if necessary. "Howard" esti-
imated the cost of the administration and office expense of such an organ-
ization at $3,000 a year--$500 a year for a general secretary and four
agents, and $500 a year for rent and incidentals. He proposed raising
the entire budget of the Society by private contributions and offered to
be one of thirty to promise to raise $1,000 each. He further advocated
the securing of a charter, that the Society might receive endowments.

This plan was followed by others, among them one of November
8th, signed "N.U.," expressing an earnest hope that no plan of aid of
the poor would be adopted by the citizens without a careful examination
of the origin and operations of the New York Association for Improving
the Condition of the Poor.

Therefore, it was as a result of agitation in the daily newspaper,
and the protest of those who strongly felt the existing modes of relief
were inadequate and injudicious that Mayor Elijah Stansbury issued a
proclamation in the Baltimore American on October 31, 1849. The
Mayor called the citizens to meet in their respective wards on November
5th to appoint five delegates from each ward to meet with him on the 8th
of November at City Hall to take into consideration the growing prob-
lems of relief.

In pursuance of the call of the Mayor, a meeting of the delegates
appointed by the different wards for the purpose of taking efficient
steps for the relief of the poor was held at the City Hall. Mayor
Stansbury acted as chairman, the object of the meeting was stated and
James H. Carter offered the following preamble:

Whereas the existing system or mode of administering relief
to the poor is not only defective and inadequate to the
honest discharge of the highest obligations imposed on us
by the relations of society, but is in itself radically vicious,
producing in many instances pauperism, idleness and vice,
whilst in many others it fails to reach the homeless and
helpless widows and destitute orphans, the really poor and
needy,

"Be it resolved, that in the opinion of this meeting a
remedy for the evil of the present system of Poor Relief is
loudly and imperatively demanded and that such a remedy
can be found only in a regular organized and permanent Association possessing and employing efficient means for ascertaining who are the poor, the proper subjects of charity as well as for the effectual relief when ascer-
tained.

"Resolved further:-that with a view to the accomplish-
ment of this object, an Executive Committee to consist of twenty members be appointed by the Mayor who shall have charge of the whole subject and that said Committee be authorized and instructed to collect all information in their power to call a public meeting of citizens that the question may be fully discussed and acted upon."31

The following men, established leaders in the charity movement, were chosen to serve on the Executive Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Wilson</th>
<th>Otis Spear</th>
<th>George R. Dodge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Brown</td>
<td>Edward Larogue</td>
<td>David Creamer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Carter</td>
<td>T. N. Toneiden</td>
<td>William G. Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Guiteau</td>
<td>Charles Lucas</td>
<td>John W. Randolph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. S. Frey</td>
<td>William McKinn</td>
<td>Joseph R. Kelso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William G. Baker</td>
<td>Joseph King</td>
<td>Thomas Kelso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Bond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the meeting of the Committee on November 20, 1849, the sub-
committee made the following report:

Your Committee, in the prosecution of their duty, have aimed at the development of a plan, the foundation of which should be as broad and as deeply laid as the humanities which bind man to his fellows and based on the reorganization of the truth that the calamities of poverty are an incident of our race, to which all are liable and that "the poor shall never cease out of the land." They have aimed at the organization of a system, which while it relieves the destitute, will have pro-
minently in view the social and physical elevation of that class of society usually calling for the interposition of charitable aid, and the discouragement of pauperism and vagrancy. A system free alike from national or sectarian partialities, prej-
udices or purposes and commending itself by its comprehensive-
ness and efficiency to the favorable judgement and cheerful support of a human and enlightened community.

Your Committee after the most serious reflection, have come to the unanimous conclusion, that the system adopted and now in use in New York, with some slight modification, suggested by local causes, is the one best calculated for the present at least to attain the results at which we aim. They accordingly beg leave to recommend its adoption and the establishment of a Central Office for the concentration and diffusion of all informa-
tion pertaining to its objects and the employment of a competent
General Agent, who in connection with a Board of Managers shall have charge of the interests and business of the Association. Your Committee has drawn up a Constitution based upon and embodying in it their views which they here-with present as part of their report.

On November 30th a meeting of the delegates of the different wards was held at the City Hall. Mayor Stansbury was again the chairman and Otis Spear was appointed Secretary. After prayer by Rev. Dr. Morris and short remarks by James Carter, Chairman of the Executive Committee, the report of the Committee on the Constitution was read and unanimously adopted. Subscriptions were taken up amounting to $469. A committee of five with James Wilson as chairman was appointed to arrange for a public meeting of citizens before which the objects, aims, and principles of the Association might be fully presented and its claim to the public confidence and support urged.

In the American of December 11, 1849, the committee made the following appeal to the public:

The Committee takes this occasion to appeal earnestly to the public to come forward and give a prompt, cordial and generous support to this benevolent enterprise. They appeal to the public sense of humanity, of right, of justice to the poor, of justice of society, and they confidently trust that each and every man in the community who claims to be a friend to the friendless will consider himself personally and directly interested in the organization and success of the Association and feeling so, will not trust the performance of his duty to others, but come forward and give the movement his presence and support.

The meeting of citizens was held December 14, 1849 at Temperance Tabernacle, Gay Street. The meeting was called to order by George Brown with Mayor Stansbury as chairman. An election of Vice-Presidents and secretaries followed and the proceedings of the Convention of Delegates was read. James H. Carter then explained briefly what had already been done and what was proposed for the future. The Ex-Governor of New York, William H. Seward, spoke on: "The Care of the Poor as a Duty," "Who are the Poor?" and "To Whom is Relief Due?" He concluded with the thought that not charity but the prevention of poverty is the duty of society. A committee was appointed to solicit subscriptions from those
of the audience who might wish to become members of the Association. Subscriptions were collected for $450 making about $900 in all. It was moved that a meeting be held the following Monday night to elect other officers and to collect the pledges of other subscribers. It was also resolved to purchase 100 cords of oak wood, five cords to be distributed by each ward in one-fourth cords to suffering families.\(^37\)

The meeting was held the following week on December 17, 1849. Further organization of the Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor was complete and $586 was paid in.\(^38\) After having completed the organization, the Association published an "Address to the Public" in the American of December 24th stating the aims and ideals of the Organization.\(^39\) The address was accompanied by a very sane and favorable editorial stating that:

The address from the Association to the community at large published in the morning's American is worthy of the thoughtful consideration of every reader. The plan of the Association seems well adapted to the ends in view and well calculated to prevent those abuses to which a well meant charity without system is so often liable. With the support of the community liberally bestowed this Association may become a permanent establishment having its agencies in every ward of the city with appliances and means at hand to administer relief judiciously to the deserving and to check, if not suppress entirely the whole nuisance of street begging. The success of this organized system of public charity would mark a signal advance in the discharge of those duties of sympathy which every one is ready to acknowledge but which may know not how to perform with any assurance that they are performing them usefully. The mendicancy of the streets, however, cannot be stopped by any mode of unorganized contribution. There must be a systemized and general plan known and recognized to meet this evil. The one here proposed seems to be best that circumstances will admit.\(^40\)

Thus we see that charity in Maryland had its beginning in the colonial days. Through the various Acts of the colonial Assembly or legislature of the State, some attempts were made to do something about the conditions of the poor and needy. Much was done by individuals; but it was not until the 19th century that a more positive program was put into operation. It was in the 19th century that both the government and organizations became more enlightened concerning welfare and charity.
In Baltimore City, where the problem was more complex, concern
developed for more positive results. This concern revealed itself in the
organization of charitable societies by the churches and the foreign-
born taking care of its own.

But to the more enlightened charitable in Baltimore City, the num-
berous organizations could not meet the increasing demands adequately.
They saw that pauperism was growing, that nothing was being done for
the real needy and that the charitable were being victimized by those
who were not in need.

As a result of this, there was a growing demand in Baltimore City
that a reasonable City-wide organization be set up to deal with the
poor. As a result of the demands, the AICP became the first organized
charitable society in Baltimore City.
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CHAPTER II

THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE IMPROVEMENT
OF THE CONDITION OF THE POOR
1849-1902

It appears that throughout the early history of the charity and
welfare movement in Baltimore, relief to families or individuals outside
of institutions was traditionally in the hands of private agencies. The
Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor,¹ organized in 1849, was the first non-sectarian and city-wide agency to pro-
vide relief for families in their own homes. The AICP movement in the
United States rose in the 1840's to help the poor achieve self support.
The New York AICP, organized in 1842, was the pioneer in the move-
ment.² The Baltimore Association with objects similar to New York,
was the third to be organized in the United States and was incorporated
by an act of the legislature on May 17, 1850. The first president was
John Wilson and the first general agent, Z.D. Brashears.³ The purpose
of the organization, as its name indicated, was to give help that would
rehabilitate as well as relieve.⁴

The organizational structure of the Association was set forth in
the original Constitution and By-Laws, as adopted in 1849. It was
provided that anyone who became an annual subscriber to the funds of
the Association should be a member for the current year. At the annual
meeting of the Association, a president, two vice-presidents, a treas-
urer, a recording secretary and a Board of Managers to consist of sixty
members, were to be elected by ballot. A general agent was to be
appointed by the Board of Managers. The Executive Committee was to
consist of the president, vice-presidents, general agent, treasurer
and one member from each ward or district to be elected by the Board.⁵

The duties of the president, secretary and treasurer were those
which usually pertain to their respective offices. The Board of Managers
held exclusive control of the funds of the Association and held the
right to make all necessary by-laws and from time to time to amend
them. It was to fill vacancies, appoint all committees and adopt such
measures as the objects of the Constitution required. The Board was
to hold regular meetings, and submit a report of the proceedings at the
annual meeting of the Association in October.

The general agent was to superintend the work of the Central
Office, which was to be opened for the purpose of concentrating and
diffusing all information pertaining to the Society's operations and
objects and for the transaction of its general business.

The work of the Executive Committee consisted of purchasing
supplies and distributing them in such a manner as the Board would
authorize. It was to hold stated meetings, and during the recess of
the Board to act generally in its behalf.

The visitors were to confine their activities to their particular
sections so that no individual might receive relief except in the sec-
tion in which he resided.

The secretary was to keep the Central Office records and the
books of the Association, to receive reports of the agents, read them
at each stated meeting of the Board, and to collect and prepare
material for publication in the annual reports. A special duty of the
secretary was to keep the names and residences of the applicants for
work and also of those desiring to hire help. This was the beginning
of the employment bureau that was organized by the Association in 1895.
The Constitution also provided for the managers in each of the dis-
tricts to assist the agents of their respective districts, particularly
in periods of active winter duty, in visiting the families and giving
counsel and advice; and in the purchase of such supplies as were
authorized by the Board.

The originators of the Association realized that much of the pau-
perism and vagrancy of the times was due to promiscuous almmsgiving.
They believed that the only way to save the poor from themselves was
to do away with this objectionable form of relief. While this habit
prevailed, the prevention of pauperism and vagrancy was impossible.
They noted that there were beggars by profession on the streets and
calling at the doors of homes, who daily resorted to plans involving deception, and even crime. In this way they obtained from precarious charity what should have been the fruits of their own industry. There were children brought up to beg as a trade, the evil results of which could not be described. These children had lost all respect for their parents, claimed relief as a right and deemed themselves the victims of injustices when it was withheld. They also lost all regard for the rights of property and from begging they proceeded to crime, which led to the penitentiary. 6

To make its position clear, the Association appealed to the influence of the community to put a stop to this encouragement of making a living by street begging. The AICP made strong appeals to the public, some of which did not seem practical. For example, individuals were asked never to give to strangers at their doors so much as a cast-off garment, or a portion of broken vituals; but in every case to visit the applicants in their homes and learn of their true condition before granting relief, or send them to the visitors of the Association. If this was disregarded they expressed the firm belief that all efforts to suppress this evil would be defeated. However, if there was a strict observa-
tion of these rules the evils so much feared and felt would be dimin-
ished, and the needy would be relieved in a way which would most effectually benefit them and serve the best interests of the community. 7

The Association was aware that the alms of benevolent soci-
eties were often misapplied and as often abused by those who re-
ceived them. Therefore, the "Visitors Manual," which formed a part of the first annual report of the Association, warned the visitors to be especially careful to do all that a cautious and discriminating judg-
ment may suggest to prevent every abuse of charity. 8 When cases of abuse appeared, the visitor was to report this to the general agent, so that the names of the undeserving applicants could be placed on the record at the Central Office and become known to every visitor and member of the Association. 9

The great aim of the AICP was not mere relief giving, but reform:
to improve the individual's general welfare by developing a well-rounded life. The good of the present and future generations depended upon
their improvement of society. The founders of the Association were men of keen minds and visions. They realized the weakness of human nature and especially of those persons who had not had the advantage of a good environment. Their intent was to remedy the conditions of the poor by removing the causes. To them one of the main causes was the temptation to beg.\textsuperscript{10} They proposed to develop possibilities within the individual and this could be done through the visitor.

The visitors were called upon to visit without delay the homes of the applicants, and carefully inquire into the causes which brought them to the state of destitution. This would be an important instrument of good to the suffering poor, when they were aided in obtaining good from resources within themselves. They were to be shown the true origin of their sufferings, when the sufferings were the result of imprudence, extravagance, idleness and intemperance, or other moral causes which were within their control. The visitor was to endeavor by all appropriate means to awaken their self-respect, to direct their exertions, and to strengthen their capacities for self-support.\textsuperscript{11}

The same ideals were set forth in the annual reports from 1851 to 1860, expressing with emphasis the plan of the AICP to diminish pauperism by creating in the minds of those who would eat the bread of idleness and beggary, more self-exertion and pride of self-reliance.

The agents were urged to avoid all appearance of harshness in dealing with individuals. They were reminded that a single visit was not enough to determine who were the virtuous and industrious, and who were the vile and indolent; or to determine the kind and amount of relief needed in each individual case. Systematic personal investigation was necessary before these decisions could be made. The visitors were encouraged to extend relief with that kindness and considerate encouragement which was calculated to elevate rather than degrade. Yet the visitors were given the following principles which were calculated to do the very thing that they were encouraged not to do:

1. Give necessary articles and what was immediately required.
2. Give what was least susceptible to abuse.
3. Give necessary articles only in small quantities and in proportion to immediate need.
4. Give assistance at the right moment, not prolonging it beyond the duration of necessity; extend, restrict, modify it with that necessity.

5. Remind the recipient that aid granted gives no promise for the future.

In 1857, the Managers reported that their system was the best yet devised for wide and sure relief. In 1860, they reported that the AICP was the acknowledged almoner of the whole city. 12

In the 1860's the purpose of the organization was modified somewhat to give temporary aid in time of necessity to relieve sickness and suffering and to assist the worthy poor in bettering their condition by appropriate counsel. As originally proposed, the managers claimed that their aim was to improve the condition of the poor; but they found that the lowest of physical wants must be met before further steps could be taken. This could be accomplished in the first instance by supplying the immediate necessities of food and fuel. 13

The modifications in the 1860's were also partially due to the Civil War. The problems of and demands on the Association were made greater by the increased need for aid to children and mothers due to the death of soldier fathers. These fatherless homes resulting in children being neglected, created a serious community problem. Although wartime organizations such as the United States Sanitary Commission 14 and the Baltimore Christian Association 15 were active on behalf of the parents, bereaved widows and children of soldiers, it was essential that pre-war social agencies alter their programs of self help to do something about the immediate problems resulting from this crisis. Consequently, it was the AICP, along with the Children's Aid Society which had been organized in 1860 to aid neglected children, that carried the major relief load in Baltimore City during this period.

The AICP had attempted to do the work of many social agencies. As the city grew and the work increased it came to be more than one society could well manage. This resulted in the inevitable, the Association gave up all functions other than relief giving and this was when it became the largest, but by no means the only, almoner of citizens of Baltimore. 16
Unfortunately it dropped not only those functions which other societies assumed, but also failed to put into practice its early ideals of relief giving. The idea of giving relief for the improvement of the conditions of the poor was lost in an effort to minister only to the immediate necessities. Therefore, after a few years of operation the duties that were planned for a large number of volunteer managers and workers, came to rest largely on four paid district agents. The distribution of fuel and groceries, intended to be only one means of dealing with the needy, became the chief work of the agents, and fell more and more into a system of doles. The AICP came to be merely a distributing agency, making little effort to develop mutual resources of relief for applicants or to be a center of cooperation for the charitable.

With the formation of the Charity Organization Society a rivalry was created which led the AICP in the latter parts of the eighties and in the nineties to a determined effort to do some preventive work. Being influenced by the development of the Charity Organization Society in 1881, the managers of the Association took a new look at their programs. They then restated their determination to organize the AICP along practical, intelligent, and careful lines and to take advantage of the wisdom of others and profit by the examples of similar institutions. The view expressed by them was that the business of charity was with the man himself, and not with the contents of his stomach, or the covering of his back. To give a man character and purpose was more helpful and it was this character development that differentiates man from any mere mechanism.

Certainly it cannot be said or implied that no practical and worthwhile work had been done prior to the period of rivalry. Comparing the AICP at the time with organizations in other cities and considering the resources and general knowledge of the community, it had done some very worthwhile work.

"The AICP had early shown its interest in children other than trying to stop them from begging. In 1855, the Board had expressed its opinion against separating children from families. In some cases they recognized that the good of all parties concerned would be served
by separating children from their parents; but it should be done only after much care and considered study of all the facts. They thought that in most instances the best thing would be to open the way for children, particularly those from around eight to twelve, to participate in the benefits offered by the schools. It would be most unfortunate for the future to put a child out to service who could not read, write, or cipher in the first rules of arithmetic.  

By 1861, failing to prevent street begging by appeals to the public, the AICP appointed a committee to present a petition to the legislature, the result of which was a law for the arrest of habitual beggars. Also in 1861, work was found for sixty-one children, and 187 were placed in school. The schools were visited in an effort to follow up the progress of the children.

In 1864, the AICP recognized the problem of the poor sewing girls and women. Many of them worked from sunrise until far into the night, making as little as three dollars a week. They were mostly from large families, without education, and unable to secure other employment. At about the same time a general intelligence office, at which both employer and employee might apply without charge, was opened at the Central Office of the Association. This aided the efforts of the AICP to improve the conditions of the sewing girls and women. By 1869, the AICP had been able through this new venture to secure work for 299 persons, and place fifty children in day school and Sunday schools.

From 1869 until the eighties, the annual reports were devoted chiefly to appeals for funds and there was little energy exerted in terms of a program. The income of the AICP for its first year of operation (1849-1850) was $8,696.97 while the expenditures for that year were $8,448.97, leaving a balance of $248.00. Although its income increased steadily for over a decade, expenditures increased more rapidly. In 1862, the Association ended up with a $10,000 deficit.

In 1865, due to the efforts of a special collection committee, the Association's income increased until 1875 when it reached its highest peak of $33,342. At the same time, however, its expenditures also
reached the highest point of $36,717 in 1875. After this, there was a steady decline in income because of the failure of the Association to carry out the major part of its program and the turnover in leadership. Moreover, appropriations averaging over $2,000 per year and totalling some $36,000, which the Association received from the State from 1861 to 1876 were discontinued as a result of a suit to prohibit the State from contributing unspecified funds to private agencies. The income fell to $19,968 in 1880.

In 1881, the AICP was requested by the trustees of the Thomas Wilson Fuel Society to be the distributor for a fund created by Mr. Wilson to purchase fuel for the "worthy poor" who desired to pay a price in keeping with their circumstances. In 1893, under the auspices of the AICP a "creche" was opened where women might bring their young children to be kept during the day while the mother worked. This was followed in 1895 when the Association, assisted by small annual appropriations, established both the Day Nursery at 1215 McEldery Street and the Home for Mothers and Infants, 2101 Barclay Street. In the nursery, according to the report of the secretary, Mrs. George F. Taylor, 3,606 children were cared for during the year at an average of sixteen cents each.

The James Bates Sewing School was organized in September, 1893 at Stumpf's Hall, 1900 East Baltimore Street. In October, the Otis Hinkley Sewing School was organized at 1308 North Fremont Street. In one year, 2,348 new garments were made and distributed. By 1895, there were fifteen active sewing schools with an enrollment of 1,131 children. Children had been entertained at various times with social gatherings in their behalf, by readings, music, recitations and picnics at Druid Hill Park. The results of this were conducive to the good decorum, obedience, and morals of the children. All of the activities were arranged without cost to the AICP through liberal donations from friends.

In 1898, the Association found that the request for food in 156 out of 600 cases was due to illness. As a result of this and similar observations, the AICP adopted in 1893 the plan for furnishing pure milk and fresh eggs for diet in cases of illness. Arrangements were
made with a dairy, which handled only pure milk of the best quality, to deliver a fixed quantity for periods of ten days or longer, according to the order, to the home of the sick anywhere in the city. Nurses, physicians and agents of the Charity Organization Society cooperated in locating those in need of this diet.27

The AICP was and had been guilty of supplying foods that were inadequate in the necessary food nutrients. For example, in 1900, each agent was asked to prepare a sample "bill of fare" for a week's meals for families of varying size and nationality. The articles of food were selected from the authorized list on the order blank, and suggestions were secured from families in order to prepare lists for the agents to use in educating the families to economical living. According to the reports of the agents, the lists submitted were not ideal; but they were considered adequate. However, the lists contained no milk, eggs, butter, fresh fruit, or green vegetables. Not only were they lacking in these nutrients necessary for good health, but the amounts actually given were not enough to last the prescribed time.

The following list is an example submitted for a family of three which included husband, wife and a child of three:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/16 barrel of flour</td>
<td>1 lb. white pudding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bottle yeast powder</td>
<td>1/2 peck potatoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1/2 lb. shoulder</td>
<td>1 pint beans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lb. lard</td>
<td>1 quart hominy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lb. sausage</td>
<td>2 onions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 lb. oatmeal</td>
<td>1/2 lb. coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 lb. sugar</td>
<td>2 oz. tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pint dried apples</td>
<td>1/2 lb. starch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pint syrup</td>
<td>1 box soap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pint salt</td>
<td>1 box matches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another list, for a mother and five children ages 18, 16, 13, 10, and 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/8 barrel flour</td>
<td>1 lb. rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 lbs. soup meat</td>
<td>1 lb. barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1/2 peck potatoes</td>
<td>1 lb. coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 heads cabbage</td>
<td>1-1/2 cakes yeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 can tomatoes</td>
<td>2 bunches soup herbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1895, the Association established an employment bureau as a distinct department, with a special superintendent. And in 1898, "street work" as a work test was first tried. The Association in an endeavor to distinguish between those who wanted work and those who did not, made an agreement with the superintendent of street cleaning. The agreement called for all able-bodied men who were out of work and whose families were dependent upon the AICP to be given work on the street and be paid at a rate of $1.40 a day by the Association in orders for fuel or provisions. No man was allowed to work more than two days each week. From January to September of the first year 115 men gave 467 days on the street and 92 refused to accept work. All further relief was denied those who did not work. One year later in 1891, 638 men were offered street work. Of these 435 worked, 35 were excused and 178 failed to work. 29

One of the functions that the AICP had allowed to diminish was that of the friendly visitors. In 1892, the Board resumed the work of the friendly visitor with the view of carrying out the practical work of benevolence as fully and as far as possible by endeavoring to give advice and sympathy as well as material assistance. The paid agents had done some of this; but they were too few to do the work as thoroughly and as well as good visitors could. Women were especially invited to become visitors and by 1895, women were not only visiting families, but also conducted sewing classes. For the first time the interest which women had shown from the beginning was recognized by the election of several to the Board. 30 It was at the suggestion of a group of women interested in south-west Baltimore, that the Association established vacation schools in 1898. The plan had been tried in several other cities and found a valuable means of educating the children of poor districts who did not leave the city in summer. The necessary funds were provided by generous donors. Mr. William W. Locke, who had had several years experience in New York and other places, was engaged as principal.

The teachers in these schools were qualified in terms of education and experience: Miss Mary E. Richardson, a graduate of Teacher's College, New York, as a teacher in sewing; Mr. John E. Auld from the
Baltimore public schools; Miss Laura Lee Davidson, a graduate of the Baltimore Kindergarten Association Training School, as kindergartner; Miss Isabel Lazarus, graduate of Professor Felix Adler's School of Ethical Culture, New York; Miss Julia Davis, and Miss B. B. Doll from the Samuel Meady School. The instruction given was planned to supplement that given in the public schools. There was an average attendance of 86 at the classes. They seemed to have been enjoyed by both the children and the mothers, who spent much time in the classes. The committee reported the following budget for the first year.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>$509.58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 20, 1898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$413.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Stationary</td>
<td>41.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>93.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving of desks</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deficits $41.81

$551.39

Although the schools fulfilled a useful function, the Association reported in 1899 that it did not think it best to ask the contributors for a vacation school for the summer of 1899. They did not think it a proper object of private benevolence after the experience had proven successful. The work, being educative, should be part of the educational work of the city, as it was in New York and Philadelphia after several years of private management.

In 1899, the AICP also closed the sewing schools in its charge, because there was a large number of such schools in existence under the supervision of churches and other societies. There existed, however, such a great need for better methods in these schools that the Association employed Miss Richardson as an organizer and normal instructor and offered her services to all teachers of sewing in charitable societies or institutions. The offer was accepted; the results proved to be very satisfactory. Cooking and housekeeping classes were soon added.

By 1899, the sick diet demand had assumed amazing proportions. From the time of its introduction in 1898 to September, 1899, 1,362 orders for 2,972 gallons of milk and 1,797 dozen eggs at the cost of
$1,344.49, were delivered. Only $239 had been contributed for this fund, so the AICP was forced to supply the deficit from its General Fund.\textsuperscript{34}

The blizzard that struck Baltimore in 1898 presented the AICP with unforeseen demands. It was so severe that in order to meet the increased need the Association employed about twenty assistants. They were not trained men but were intelligent and capable of meeting the emergency. The offices were open all day instead of the usual two hours. A full notice of this work and location of the Society was published in the newspapers and the agents inquired at police stations, shops, etc., in an effort to learn of the need of every individual. The Association had carts under contract so that it was possible by employing extra men and horses to deliver a large amount of coal. When roads were blocked the carters carried the coal part of the way. In emergency cases the agents purchased coal in small amounts at nearby stores and carried it to the families so that they might not suffer because of delayed delivery. So efficient was the delivery of coal that many of the wealthy who were unable to have coal delivered, appealed to the Association for assistance. A record high of 2,277 families were relieved during the week of the blizzard.

In 1901, the Association of Church Sewing Schools disbanded by a vote of nine to four. The services of Miss Richardson were no longer needed in this area, but it made it possible for her to give much more time to the cooking classes which had become one of the chief activities of the AICP. The Association had found from the agents’ reports that much domestic trouble was due to the lack of proper training of the mother. There was a great interest and concern about this problem, therefore the AICP made a special effort to organize classes for older girls and mothers. Instructions were given in matters concerning the economical purchasing of foods and their proper preparation and cooking.\textsuperscript{35}

The years from 1899 to 1901 were quiet and rather uneventful for the AICP. The numbers helped were smaller than many previous years. This was probably due to the mild weather and favorable industrial conditions. But it was also due to the improved case work of the agents
and better cooperation between the AICP and the Charity Organization Society.36

There had been numerous attempts on the part of the AICP and the COS to work together in joint efforts. These efforts had never materialized to any degree until the Panic of 1893. It was because of this panic that the two united their forces to meet the tremendous economic depressive demands. This effort led to the organization of a joint committee on cooperation in October of 1896. As a result, feelings between the two societies greatly improved. Many more referrals were made back and forth, and the agents regularly conferred on common cases, learning to respect each other individually.37

Mary Richmond, the General Secretary of the Charity Organization Society, stated that the cooperation worked much better than she expected. William W. Maxwell, who was the General Secretary to the AICP at the time, showed a sincere desire to learn the principles of giving. For instance, after the blizzard of 1899 he wrote:

I am sure we have not yet reached that point where the criticisms of our friends would fail to be beneficial, and to this end will kindly ask you, when convenient to let me know wherein you have found the work of the Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor defective, or where it has failed to properly perform these duties for which it was organized. I do not ask commendation for anything we may have done right, but to have our errors made known to us, that we may use them as stepping stones to better and more intelligent service.38

This cooperation and clarification of relations culminated in a working Federation in 1902. The two agencies were organizationally separate, but with one executive head, Dr. Walter S. Ufford of New York. Even though they were not incorporated until 1910, the two began functioning as the Federated Charities of Baltimore in 1902.

In retrospect, we must keep in mind that the Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor was founded at a time when begging was at its worst in Baltimore. This was also a time when widespread systematic and efficient charity was unheard of in the city. Therefore, the AICP was the first in Baltimore, and in the state, to give some organization to a disorganized system of charitable giving. It was
the first to attempt any permanent and systematic improvement of the less fortunate in Baltimore. Through its sewing schools, cooking classes, vacation schools and employment bureau, it tried to train the poor and improve their conditions. In doing this it attempted to show that it was necessary to give assistance in problems other than relief. And the founders tried to educate the public as to why such an organization was necessary and why they should support it. However, it was not always successful in its practice of carrying out the enlightened aims upon which it was organized. But, in its half century of operation, the AICP was the pioneer agent in giving aid to the disadvantaged of Baltimore City.
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CHAPTER III

THE CHARITY ORGANIZATION SOCIETY
1881-1902

The Charity Organization Society of Baltimore City was organized in October of 1881. The first Charity Organization Society, which was formed in London, England in 1869, came into being because of the degradation and anarchy brought about by the rapid growth of population and industry in the mid 19th century. London's vast numbers of workers lived on the verge of poverty and starvation, with few sources of help. The churches dispersed some relief in periods of economic distress, large numbers of persons littered the streets of London begging, and the States' aid was administered under the Poor Law of 1834. Under the law, the state recognized only one obligation: to relieve the destitute either in the work house or by outdoor relief. In the 1860's, the evils of street begging and the plight of the masses had reached such proportions that many persons were demanding that something be done about the squalid conditions in which the majority of people lived. Basic to the demand was the insistence that better organization be given to relief giving in a way that would avoid poverty and pauperism by cooperation of benevolent forces and the diffusion of knowledge concerning charity.¹

In America too, the rise of the Charity Organization Societies related to the growth of urban centers. The immediate and precipitating cause of the movement was the panic of 1873, and the following years of depression. The post Civil War outcry was that the existing charitable agencies had failed, in the opinion of many, to meet the demands made upon them by the emergent social and economic conditions. This resulted in a rising feeling after the War of the need for a more scientific approach in relation to charity and philanthropy. By doing away with overlapping programs and waste in private charity, social obligations could be discharged more effectively.²
The object, then, of the Charity Organization movement in London and in the United States was to help the poor by educating the public in wise and adequate charitable methods. Its chief aim was to improve public methods by serving as a channel through which the charity of a community could flow to the poor with the least waste and with the greatest efficiency.

A clear and essential difference to be noted, however, was the role played by the church in London and the United States. The London COS was in name, non-sectarian, but churchmen were prominent in its leadership and in some districts the Society served as almoner for the church. American organizers thought that a policy of non-sectarianism was absolutely necessary in order to receive cooperation from all citizens and in turn be able to serve all who needed help whatever their creed or religious belief.  

The events leading to the organization of the COS in Baltimore resulted from the interest that Daniel C. Gilman, president of John Hopkins University, had in the Social Economy Department. Dr. Gilman was especially interested in the Symposia on Associated Charities. In December, 1880, while attending the Conference of the American Social Science Association at Saratoga, New York, he heard an impressive address by the President of the Boston Associated Charities. Dr. Gilman left Saratoga with the strong impression that organized charity might be another area meriting scholarly investigation. On his return to Baltimore, he recruited a small group of socially-minded men to look into whether such a society was needed to add efficiency to the work of local charitable organization. They collected literature and reports from existing agencies, and appraised the philosophy and accomplishments of the COS methods. These early meetings were held in Dr. Gilman's office, and it was in the meetings of June, 1881, that the little group considered the advisability of organizing a COS. Colonel John A. Tompkins was requested to attend the meeting of the National Conference of Charities and Correction in Boston, July 25-30.

The next meeting held in Dr. Gilman's office was in October, in which Col. Tompkins gave a favorable report; the Society was organized and William A. Fisher was elected president. In November, an office
and registration bureau was established in the Wilson Building, in charge of a paid registrar. Also, in November of 1881, a public meeting held at Concert Hall of the Academy of Music on "Charity Organization," was addressed by Robert Treat Paine, Boston, and the Rev. S. Humphreys Gurteen of Buffalo, New York.

When the Baltimore organization was launched, it had the advantage of experience in a number of American cities. Charity Organization Societies were in existence in Buffalo, Boston, Brooklyn, and Philadelphia, and they served to a large degree as models for the Baltimore Society. It did not wish to interfere with the work of existing relief agencies, especially the AICP. The object of both as stated in their Constitution was the prevention of indiscriminate almsgiving that encouraged pauperism. However, the founders of the AICP were primarily concerned with improving the general welfare of individuals, not through relief, but through pride and self-reliance. The new Society's emphasis was to be on cooperation, organization, and education. Its aims were to promote measures that would better social conditions and reduce poverty and pauperism, to enlighten the public and raise the standards of charitable work in the community.

One of its first steps in matters affecting the community as a whole was the establishment of a home for incurables. A wood yard, the forerunner of the Friendly Inn, was organized. The Friendly Inn, which was set up in 1884, was a lodging home for homeless men who "chopped" wood for their lodging. The two were merged in 1887.

In 1884, two public meetings were held, at which the city authorities and various charitable institutions were present on the invitation of the COS. The first one was held in January to study the question of outdoor relief in Baltimore and the second in October to study the work of similar societies in other cities. Charles J. Bonaparte, who was to play a significant part in the Society, was elected to the Board of Managers in November, 1884.

The Society did not employ its first general agent until February, 1886, when it chose Dr. W. C. Kloman. Dr. Kloman served as general agent until March, 1887. Up to that time the registrar managed the Central Office under the supervision of the Executive Committee. In
1884, there were two district agents, and in 1885, just before Kloman's appointment, the number had been expanded to five. The next two general agents of the Society were Amos Warner, a graduate student at Johns Hopkins, who served from March of 1887 to March of 1889 when Charles Lee Smith was chosen general secretary.9

In April, 1887, the Baltimore COS held a notable conference on charities. Among the subjects discussed were: "Charity Organization Societies," "Public and Private Charities in Larger Towns," and "Industrial Pursuits and Industrial Training as Preventatives of Pauperism, Tramp Legislation and Savings." Dr. Lyman Abbott, Dr. Thomas K. Beecher, Charles Loring Brace, Phillip C. Gamett, Dr. Edward Everett Hale, Charles D. Kellogg, Dr. Francis C. Wayland, Dr. Daniel C. Gilman and Charles J. Bonaparte, were some of the eminent persons who took part in the discussions. Baltimoreans showed a keen interest in this conference. The topics discussed and the information received from this gathering were very important to the newly organized COS.10

In September of 1887, the Baltimore Society sent its general agent as its first representative to the National Conference of Charities and Correction. It was represented at every subsequent annual meeting and its delegates were influential in the work of the Conference. The NCCC had become a national forum for COS to discuss and air problems and issues relating to their work. It started out in an informal manner comprised of members of the Board of Public Charities from several states. Some members who attended these meetings wanted a separate conference for those interested in charity correction. Beginning around 1874, those persons interested in charity correction met separately, out of this the NCCC emerged. By 1890, the Baltimore Society had reached the point where it was important enough to entertain the National Conference. Through the efforts of the Baltimore COS, prominent citizens and other Charitable Societies joined forces in this endeavor. Much of the philanthropic and educational development in Baltimore can be traced to this National Conference that was held in Baltimore in 1890.11

When Mary Richmond became General Secretary in April of 1891, the organized office routine she observed was part of the organizational framework Amos Warner and his predecessor, Dr. William C. Kloman had
worked out. Amos Warner had worked hard at perfecting both aspects of charity organization effort, social agency cooperation and district service to families. He had strengthened the central committees by clarifying their constitutional responsibilities and increasing their membership. This provided agents with a city-wide base in terms of seeking funds and support for its legislative and reform projects.  

One of Warner's most helpful innovations had been the organization of a Difficult Case Committee composed of some of the most experienced managers and visitors from each district. The committee went over cases when there had been community complaints, or the situation was so unusual that the district was at a loss as to what to do. He had tried to create the feeling that each district and committee was part of a city-wide movement and to establish approximate uniformity of policy and procedure. This had not always been acceptable to local leaders who like to run their branch offices to suit themselves. There were disagreements between the paid agents who investigated and made recommendations and the district committee which discussed each family situation and decided what should be done. There were many conflicts in the various points of view. In spite of these differences of opinion, there was under Warner's leadership a steady growth in the demand for the agency's services and financial support to meet it.

Another person who became a part of the COS during the 1880's was John Glenn, who became a member of the Board of Managers and chairman of the Executive Committee. Glenn was 70 when he came into the COS. A lawyer by training, he headed a real estate firm and was connected with several financial and banking interests. He was not one of the original group who helped Dr. Gilman organize the COS, but had been enlisted by Charles Bonaparte around 1885. By that time he was delegating most of the details of his business to younger members of the firm and as a semi-retired executive, was able to devote almost full-time to the work of the agency. Its ideals and goals appealed to him; and John Glenn became one of the greatest single influencing forces in the course of the COS development. He had become interested in social problems after his graduation from Harvard and had read widely in social and political philosophy. By the time he became a part of the
Baltimore COS, he was thoroughly convinced that philanthropy could not advance without a foundation in the social sciences. It was his belief that young scholars should be groomed to take over responsibility and that it was necessary to train a new generation to think and administer in the area of social problems. He wrote Dr. Gilman on September 20, 1887, urging him to find a way to give necessary background material to Hopkins students. Amos Warner and Charles Lee Smith, who became a part of the COS while finishing their doctoral studies at Johns Hopkins, were along with Mary Richmond, regarded by Glenn as persons who could assume future leadership.\(^6\)

The thesis presented by John Glenn was not new to the COS; his ideas and policies added to that which already existed. From the beginning, the Baltimore Society had taken the academic approach, which in large part was due to its close association with John Hopkins.

Dr. Gilman of Johns Hopkins not only helped to found the Baltimore COS; but he was active on the Board of Managers after the Society began to function in 1881. He participated for many years in policy formation within an inner circle of influential leaders behind the scene. His spirit of charity came from a genuine interest and broad experience. While in Baltimore, Dr. Gilman was a trustee of the Slater Fund, Peabody Education Fund, and president of the National Civil Service Reform League.\(^7\) Therefore his interest, financial backing and administrative advice lent stability and prestige to the organization.

His main thought in formulating the plans and future policy of the Johns Hopkins and its staff, was that improvement in working and living conditions must proceed along with medical provision. He could see little use in having fine medical facilities if community hazards that helped to make people sick continued. He regarded the COS as a kind of social laboratory. He encouraged mature students of history and political economy to become visitors and see social problems at first hand. He urged them to make statistical and descriptive analysis of what they observed. Gilman's scientific method in charity postulated that in dealing with the problem of urban poverty, all sorts of techniques should be employed to ferret out the truth—observation, statistics, experiments, reason. To gather facts and formulate laws is one of the
objects of Charity Organization. Yet, he believed that as in medicine, relief must be given to the sufferer in his hour of need; so in doing good, help must be rendered to the distressed in the moment of his necessities. Due to his influence, not only students but many distinguished faculty members took an active part in COS work; among them were: G. Stanley Hall, psychologist; Ira Remsen, chemist; Herbert B. Adams, historian; and Richard T. Ely, political economist. Almost every committee had at least one Johns Hopkins professor among its most diligent members, and a number undertook special research assignments.

It was through Dr. Gilman and his associates that the Baltimore COS became imbued with the conviction that theoretical and applied social science deserved attention equal to that given physical science. Gilman was one of the first educators to declare that scientific charity should have a place in the formal curriculum of the university. The questions and comments of the university students and faculty who were district visitors had a stimulating effect on all the agents and other volunteers. They were almost forced in such an atmosphere to reason concerning the aims and results of their work and study to improve it. As an added inducement Dr. Gilman had helped to start a working library with liberal donations of books which by 1887 had grown to almost 200 volumes. 18

From its inception the COS attacked the theory that the degree of want was the valid criterion. It was not to give relief except in very unusual circumstances. The firm belief of the organizers of the Society was that relief should be avoided if possible through the use of friendly interest in helping a family to make use of its own resources. If relief was to be given it should be given with the distinct purpose of improvement in view, and it should be given in amounts sufficient to accomplish the purpose.

The prevailing thought among the COS people was that direct relief was the reason why people got into difficulty. Some thought it a willful lack of "exertion" to continue to live off of others. John Glenn thought that the remedy was to locate and help people capable of individual effort and punish all others. Charles Lee Smith questioned the economic system. He wondered if the responsibility of the social worker
was not to furnish work, so that the "unworthy" would have a chance to become worthy. Edward A. Lawrence, pastor of the First Congregational Church, saw discouragement as the primary problem to overcome. Some thought that there should be a thorough "investigation" of all applicants before relief was given. The Baltimore COS attempted to do this, but the success for which it hoped for was never attained.  

The Society accomplished very little for several years in work for the needy and in influencing public opinion. During its organizational period, the COS took note of what the growing preoccupation with relief had done to the principles of the AICP and it hoped to avoid a similar fate. But, by the latter part of the 1880's, the Baltimore COS had become a relief giving Society. The Society during this time stubbornly refused to recognize that there was a difference in its noble principles and its practices.  

In 1887, to offset what it called some misunderstandings, the COS established "The Golden Book Fund" and the "B.I.'s." Givers were encouraged to deposit money in the Golden Book Fund or to guarantee reimbursement up to a certain amount. These funds could then be dispersed by the general agent to persons known to the COS to be in need. The "B.I.'s" were benevolent individuals who could give to the COS and designate to whom the funds should be given directly. To the COS, these were separate agencies which provided an effective means of putting willing donors in touch with those whose needs were found to be authentic. The belief was that the COS agents and visitors were meeting the most stringent needs of families under their care without giving relief. The distinction here was a mere quibbling over words because the Baltimore COS rated first in the country in the amount of money raised in this manner.  

Criticisms of the COS were beginning to come from a number of sources in the latter part of the 80's and early 90's. There had been early criticism by clients who claimed that the COS became too personal in its investigations and then did not provide relief in cases of need. During the winter of 1892, The World publicized several of these cases, and then made a direct, successful campaign for their assistance. The All-Around Club, an auxiliary of the Knights of Labor, had as a topic
for discussion in April, 1892, "The Charity Organization Society Adversely Criticized." The World reported that, although invited, the COS did not send any representative to answer questions. The chief speaker, Henry W. Rowland, an Englishman, had a poor impression of the London COS and he maintained that it was undemocratic in principles and methods and that it was wholly unsuited to the economic and social conditions in the United States. The objection of this group was that while the COS declared its belief in work instead of relief only about half the applicants who applied for work had secured any. 23

Another frequent accusation against the COS was that the money it raised did not go to needy people. Mary Richmond, who had become the General Secretary in April, 1891, emphasized to the agents and managers the necessity of explaining that money was not raised for that purpose. The money raised by the COS was used to pay for trained personnel who performed such services as helping individual families mobilize for self-maintenance, better training of children, and for helping all social agencies work together in a coordinated way. She felt that the agents and managers had often been too defensive or apologetic about the cost of service when they should have been more forthright in stating the purposes for which they raised the money. 24

The causes for much of the criticism stemmed from the conflict between the AICP and the COS. Each organization objected that the other was usurping its province and complicating the task of providing for the poor in an orderly manner. Each frequently implied that the other was not using its funds in the wisest way. To the AICP leaders, asking for funds for the purposes stated by the COS could not be justified. They contended that all money raised should be passed on almost in "toto" to the recipients of relief. The COS thought that the AICP only considered immediate needs and gave no thought to the results of relief-giving. They pointed out that little could be known about applicants when four agents investigated several thousand applications in a year. 25

The theoretical specialized functions of the two organizations had become more and more blurred in actual performance. The accusations and criticisms leveled against both organizations were justified. The AICP and the COS had become relief-giving societies; the average
client and the average citizen could hardly have been expected to see
the nice distinction between the COS's and the AICP's ways of getting
money.

While the quarrel with the AICP was the most critical inter-
agency problem, other things were being done. During the early part of
the 1890's, the COS approved or started new organizations to fill de-
mands for specialized services for which there were no existing pro-
visions. The Electric Sewing Machine Rooms were set up to give train-
ing and work to unemployed, unskilled women. It was first an experi-
ment of the COS and later an independent but closely allied agency under
the leadership of John Glenn and Kate McLane. 26 Charity Organization
Society contributors were asked to support a night dispensary for women,
a supervised lodging house and woodyard for transients, and a social
settlement that was started by the Rev. E. A. Lawrence. The COS sug-
gested that there was a need for additional hospital space, better train-
ing facilities for the unskilled and handicapped, and a visiting nurse's
association.

The Prisoner's Aid Association and the COS conferred on who
would deal with the prisoner and his family; it was agreed that the
Prisoner's Aid Association would visit the prisoner in jail while the COS
saw families at home. Out of these negotiations a more exact pattern
of what the COS was designed to do began to emerge. Special treatment,
varying in form and often continuous, was to be given in such a way as
to further permanent improvement by a force of efficient workers. The
COS should be an agency to which all unknown applicants might be
referred where their needs could be determined and they could be sent
to the proper sources for assistance. 27

The COS found that its long standing offer to investigate needs
of families asking for help began to be taken seriously by more and more
individuals and agencies. Several coal companies offered to give coal
if the COS would affirm the need of applicants. Dr. Henry M. Hurd
proposed that Johns Hopkins Hospital ask help in determining who should
receive dispensary and home delivery services free of charge. The COS
undertook to investigate the circumstances of those patients who applied
for this service. 28 The COS also appointed committees to visit the
almshouses and public children's institutions, and to work on legisla-
tion to enlarge and improve them.

There was a constant effort on the part of the Society to put its
program before the public. Mary Richmond thought that the charity
appeals were all too much alike. She composed a large, important-
looking document which was addressed to business firms suggesting that
busy people who had no way of finding out about persons who made ap-
peals to them could rely on the COS. Referral cards were also sent out
and it was urged that these cards be used instead of alms.29

Two channels were used to keep officers and contributors al-
ready interested in the COS abreast of what was going on—the Annual
Reports and the Confidential Circular. The Annual Reports which fol-
lowed a more or less set pattern, as did all other Baltimore agency
reports, began to be varied in 1890. The repetitious district reports
were removed, and more vivid and detailed reports were substituted.
These reports were brief, with more sympathetic case descriptions.

The Confidential Circular, which had been printed irregularly,
began to contain more philosophical explanations of the COS program.
In 1893, through the persuasion of Mary Richmond, the Society changed
its publication to a form more suited for wide distribution to persons not
too familiar with COS operations. This was a change from an organ de-
signed for an intimate message to constituents to a journal planned with
community education in mind. This change was probably prompted from
several directions; the growing familiarity with the publications of other
societies, especially Philadelphia and New York; and probably from a
desire to have Baltimore educated to do everything that others were
doing.30

The new journal, the Charities Record, began publication in May,
1893, and provided a much larger sounding board for the Baltimore COS.
The publication became a success and was quoted as an authority even
by newspapers that were often critical of the COS. Out-of-town agen-
cies subscribed, and it came to be regarded as part of the current litera-
ture of the charity organization movement. Mary Richmond was instru-
mental in all of this and did most of the work; but the Executive Com-
mittee, managers, and agents were included in the general planning.
The *Charities Record*, exposed to the public an argument going on within the organization, and a major criticism that had been directed toward the COS. There had been from the beginning different conceptions within the Society of the ideal relationship between the helper and the helped. What kind of charity should be exercised toward persons of inferior circumstances? Aristocratic superiority was particularly marked within the class-conscious English COS leadership. Whether this was transplanted to the United States along with the COS concept is a moot question. In the Baltimore COS, there was a clear feeling and attitude of a superiority among the inner-circle. This was manifested in the speeches of Robert Treat Paine, Charles Bonaparte, John Glenn and a goodly number of friendly visitors.

There was also the impression that the COS considered itself superi or to other agencies. Both the attitude and the impression were handicaps hard to combat. Dr. Gilman believed that informal contacts between directors and staffs of the various agencies would be helpful. He and Mrs. Gilman opened their home to about 200 leading citizens and executives in March, 1892. *The Baltimore News* noted:

> It was especially pleasant to see the agents of the AICP, those of the Charity Organization Society, those of St. Vincent de Paul and those of the Hebrew Benevolent Society assembled as united workers for the good of their fellow man, in company with the Mayor, staff members from public institutions, and leaders of many religious groups including the Cardinal Archbishop, the Bishop of Maryland, and the oldest Rabbi. 31

In 1895, they were again host to a much larger reception at McCoy Hall at the University. 32

The COS began to run into difficulty due to problems that were occurring repeatedly and were incompatible with its theory of personal consideration and individual treatment of cases. These were problems closely akin to begging, poor sanitation, and the various causes of poverty, referred to as "social illnesses." These had to be attacked on a community-wide as well as individual basis. Sickness, permanent disability and old age were relatively easy to identify and handle since they were in the old approved category of troubles not due to personal "fault." Medical care, retraining, and work suited to physical limitations,
could be handled without too much "danger." But much more puzzling were unemployment, fatherless homes, and neglect of children.  

Two different solutions were tried to combat unemployment. One was an unemployment service open to all unemployed persons, and the other, a "relief in work" for the unemployed in need of financial help. These two were used concurrently for a time, but they grew out of two different conditions.

During the relatively stable employment period of 1890, Charles Lee Smith started the Labor Bureau. The emphasis here was the "work rather than alms" theme. He assumed that for many applicants a job would be the most constructive solution, but they needed prodding and help in the technique of finding one. The managers encouraged a rapid expansion of this department. John Glenn was especially enthused, and the Labor Bureau was used most extensively in his district as an answer to the problem. His attitude was described in his report to the Committee on District Board for February, 1891:

> The applications of Negroes are still on the increase. Public laundries take away from women small articles, and the idea of education is making them less willing and fit for service. The large public works that were going on are drawing large numbers of transient laborers to the city and these are in many cases taking the place of the Negro.

John Glenn used the term "work fearers" when referring to idle clients. Mary Richmond sometimes joined him in using this derisive term. But it soon became apparent to her that other factors were operating, some could not find jobs because they lacked the skills most in demand. She, therefore, supported the work of the Industrial Education Society, an organization in which a number of COS managers were interested. In doing this, she went against John Glenn, who thought that too much education spoiled people for domestic and other menial work. She also ran afoul of the labor organizations which opposed manual training in schools because they saw it as a scheme of the rich to lessen the workingman's competitive advantage by increasing the labor supply.

The question of jobs in relation to training and skills, had been brought up in Board meetings and discussed by agents over a period of time. The necessity of giving training to help prepare workers to compete
in the changing industrial order received increasing emphasis. There were those within the Society who stressed that this would be of special value to young people. Mary Richmond expressed the view that, not only would it be of aid at the time, but in order to help avoid poverty in the next generation, training was essential. She urged all visitors to see that the children in families which they visited went into situations where they could learn, avoiding all "dead-end" jobs. Her influence was also instrumental in changing the Electric Sewing Machine Room from an agency employing the handicapped to one training the unskilled.37

After a period of time the Labor Bureau was conducted as an accommodation to the public. The agents began to protest that employees took advantage of the necessitous clients and refused to pay fair wages. In 1892, more than 1/3 of the 7,769 applicants wanted "work only." Therefore many resented being "investigated" when all they asked for was a job, but employers objected when the COS did not include a work history. Clients began to complain when jobs were not available and contributors wondered why relief was also needed. There was concern over the added burden on the agents' time when no service of "restoration" was involved. Clients did not always try to do their best when they knew another job would be given to them if the first ended. There were definite indications that the usefulness of the COS Labor Bureau was being questioned.38

By the middle 1890's both applicants and employers were referred to the best commercial employment agency available. This was partly due to the death of John Glenn in 1896, when the Labor Bureau was phased out. The COS continued to give special attention to cases where a district hoped to work out a plan of rehabilitation. Agents and visitors helped clients locate work on an individual basis without advertising the effort as a service to all.

As a result of its changing attitude, the COS declared in 1896 that its aim was not to be a general employment bureau, but to find employment only for those who would otherwise receive material relief. Also, the agency thought that it was better to limit itself to those who were handicapped in the labor market by ignorance, ill-health, or some other defect.
A great deal of courage was required to criticize a service that had been so popular. But it had been demonstrated that Charles Lee Smith's idea of "making the unworthy worthy" could not be achieved as a mass measure. This attempt illustrated the danger of a social agency's assuming a task or giving a service unaccompanied by case work counseling on all other family problems.\textsuperscript{39}

The problems of the Labor Bureau and the industrial education approach to unemployment had prevented the COS from noticing the shifts in the national economy. Business conditions were already beginning to slump when on January 1, 1893, the COS under Mary Richmond wrote that the problem of unemployment, in Baltimore at least, was largely the problem of the inefficient. Yet, the winter of 1892–93 was uncommonly severe with the Bay freezing over, oystermen out of work, and transportation at a standstill. The social agencies ignored the increasing numbers of jobless and carried on their small relief operations as usual. In the meantime the public became hysterical, floor space in station houses was packed, soup kitchens were started and unsolicited money and goods poured into the police stations. Some $16,000 was dispensed by the police at random in two months, with the approval of the newspapers through their editorials.\textsuperscript{40} The COS contended, with ample justification, that many imposters "reaped a harvest." Yet, it is hard to see how a great number of people could have survived without this prompt, if ill-considered, generosity when relief agencies failed to tackle the problem that everyone else could see. Relief applications increased 60% in 1893, but Mary Richmond attributed the expansion to better knowledge of the agency instead of "to the financial depression which was not felt until our year was two-thirds over."\textsuperscript{41} This exemplified that COS leaders, like most well-to-do Baltimoreans, were wholly unaware of what they had been feeling.

Despite the public utterances, there was much apprehension among many within the COS. Jeffrey R. Brackett felt it imperative that Baltimore be prepared for any eventuality. Mary Richmond appeared not to be alarmed but agreed that it was important to forestall the waste and panic of the previous year. As to what to do, her answer was in two words--"furnish work." She was still hopeful that planning for unem-
ployment would not be needed, even though she went along with suggestions that men who had money should invest it in enterprises that would furnish employment and that industries using machines return to hand labor. The belief that men should have work rather than relief was a sound one, but the Baltimore COS from its hemmed-in perspective, was unable to realize that the agency was facing a national emergency. It could not turn industrial progress backward to solve economic dislocations, nor could individual employers furnish full employment for all even if they would like to do so.

The laboring class was not as optimistic as the COS. At a political mass meeting this question was raised: "If this depression keeps on, where will the working man get food for his wife and children?" There had been letters to the newspapers with the plea, "It is all wrong for any man who is willing to work to have to seek employment in vain."

The police board, on November 14, 1893, asked the COS for help in working out a plan for better housing of transients. By this time the COS Board finally became convinced that there was something wrong and that they ought to channel public response toward established agencies. Dr. Gilman called employer groups and the officers of the AICP, the German Society, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, and other relief societies together to consider both the transient and the resident unemployed. A cooperation plan for a joint appeal by a Central Relief Committee was worked out; $30,000 was hoped for and $15,000 raised. Much more would be required for any satisfactory test of the program undertaken:

Our duty is a plain one. It is to provide work as a test for the professional mendicant and as a means of livelihood for the honest laborer. By this means we save the latter from degradation of begging. If the former refuses to work his true position is ascertained and our charity has not been wasted. If he accepts the work as we elevate him into a man."

For the first time all leading charitable interests in Baltimore combined to attack a community problem with a single concerted approach.

Under the direction of Jeffrey R. Brackett, Wayfarer's Inn was set up for the unattached transient. Contemporary critics felt that the results
were a great improvement; the new shelter became a permanent community institution and those persons having met honest misfortunes were helped to make permanent plans.

Dr. Charles C. Shippen and E.R.L. Gould, professors of economics and statistics at Johns Hopkins, established a work plan with the scanty funds left over after the shelter was established. Dr. Shippen was of the opinion that no job be given unless need for relief was proven. E.R.L. Gould was determined that emergency work should not jeopardize regular industry. They decided that any work given must be unpleasant, paid at below current wages, and done by the piece to take into account changing personnel and varying degrees of strength and skill. 48

Applicants were to be referred by the cooperating agencies under a quota system. In January of 1894, the COS had the heaviest month in its history, when it received some 2,398 applicants. Agents worked day and night, volunteers and temporary assistant agents were used on investigations; but they could not keep up. 49

Due to this great crisis, some of the leaders within the Baltimore COS experienced a change in their thinking toward work relief. Mary Richmond thought it unfair to leave the impression that a majority of the workers were anything but worthy, hard-working men. Other expressions were in terms of that they were out of work through no fault of their own and were glad to take this means of keeping the wolf from the door without accepting charity. 50 The idea that unemployment was not necessarily due to personal fault was hard for such persons as Glenn, Shippen, and some others to accept. Jeffrey R. Brackett as chairman of the Relief Committee concluded: "Relief is at times a necessity and relief in work so far has proved to be the best kind." 51

There were many who had reservations about the experiment, especially as a cure-all. In spite of the heroic fund-raising attempts, it reached only a fraction of those who might have benefited. The social agencies were so overwhelmed by numbers that investigations were hardly more than a formality. There were the different standards of the agencies as to what constituted need; some maintained that no investigation was needed—a man's willingness to do such work proved that he was needy and should have a job.
But, the winter presented facts that the COS reluctantly had to admit, many men had to have relief who were eager to work and the individual workman could not always get work through the regular channels. The unemployed man was no different in character and ambition from his next door neighbor who had been fortunate in holding on to his job. Even so, this was very upsetting to a group whose major tenet had been that something was lacking in the able-bodied person who could not take care of his own needs. Many of them could not rid themselves of the idea that in spite of its back-breaking nature and starvation pay some "undeserving" took advantage of public generosity in the emergency by accepting relief.

In the fall of 1894, there were signs that a third winter of unemployment was ahead. The COS Board was divided on whether or not to again unite with other organizations in a special program. The Managers voted that a committee should study the alternatives. John Glenn, who had been harshly critical of the previous year's program, was doubtful as to whether there was need to give relief in any form. He was very critical of the investigations of the other agencies. Glenn was of the opinion that unemployment was a sign of character fault requiring the services of a visitor even in hard times.52

Dr. Ira Remsen believed that a less detailed investigation was warranted for work relief applications not previously known to be relief recipients. In spite of the strong differences known to be within the COS leadership circle, the idea of advanced planning for such a crisis was a positive one. The point was not to create an atmosphere of emergency, but a careful study made by a committee could be useful at some future date, if not at that time. Instead the COS concluded at this juncture that most of those who applied for assistance in any form, even in hard times, were of the lower grades of labor. It was recommended that the COS expand its work by independently planning a work-relief program for both men and women.53 This led to stone yards being set up for men and a laundry and sewing room for women.

From December, 1894 to March, 1895, 237 men earned an average total of $8.50; ninety women an average of $10.29.54 Mary Richmond said of the other relief agencies that year: "Divide the total of what they
gave...by the number to whom they gave it, and it will be too often be evident that if their beneficiaries contrived to live with such help, they could have lived equally well without it. Here Mary Richmond and the COS leadership were too close to the stone yards and sewing rooms to see that the same thing could be said of them, because this was a regression from the philosophy of "reformative services." The less than meager amount earned in the COS work-relief program could not in any manner be justified. Plus the fact, the Charity Organization Society system of lengthy case study when they had so few agents to carry out the work, followed by a period of waiting for a district board to approve, meant that the help they theoretically had to offer was not available to most of the unemployed. Yet, part of the money that they raised was returned to the donors.

The whole program was a strange contrast in its avowed purpose and in practice. The family man did not know where to go; when he turned to one of the social agencies, the COS for example, he had to wait for insufficient help which lasted only a short time and he was subjected to many indignities. The struggling unemployed were fighting for work and the policy of the COS in treating them in one way, failed to realize the cruelty of sending a bookkeeper or frail store clerk to the stone pile.

Granted, the period of depression was an aggravating distraction from the program the agency thought that it was equipped to carry out. But, the Society ignored the existence of the problem in 1892-93, then tried to join with others in a new way of meeting it in 1893-94, and finally tried alone to apply old rules to a new situation in 1894-95.

Recognition has been given to the fact that thinking within the COS progressed from a belief that able-bodied applicants for relief were persons who did not work because they did not want to, through a stage of seeing them as people who lacked advantages. Some even conceded that the unemployed were sometimes the victims of circumstances "no fault of their own." Still, they were controlled by the belief that those who had to receive relief in work, were paupers, most being unskilled or incompetent, even though their desire for work might be unquestioned. They were unable to entirely free themselves from the old belief that idleness indicated a person's shortcomings.
The deserted and neglected families were another recurring type of problem that began to attract the attention of the Society as early as 1891. Visitors' reports told of husbands leaving home or coming in and out at intervals with no consistent plan of aiding them. In such cases, some mothers were helped to get relief, others were helped to get work and the children of some were placed while the mothers shifted for themselves. There was a great deal of discussion within the various Charity Organization Society's throughout the country about the lazy, drunken, idle vagabonds. Almost every national conference and journal discussed the problems with no unanimity as to how they should be treated. The older and larger societies did express the feeling that children had to be provided for somehow.59

In the Baltimore COS, there was a general feeling that it was dangerous to help the family of a man who shirked work. But by 1894, John Glenn, Mary Richmond and other COS leaders were of "the conviction that the lazy and vicious would better for their own sake, go hungry to bed, and that their homes--the breeding places of an unwholesome generation--should not be maintained at charitable expense."60 Such phrases as "cowardly unenterprising creatures," "unattractive ne'er-do-well," "lazy men," "good-for-nothing," and "suddenly selfish fellows," came from the lips of the COS "inner circle."61

In its campaign against desertion, the COS urged that Charity Organizations take the lead in forming a "clear-cut" and "vigorous" opinion about the deserter. The Baltimore COS inaugurated a more severe and consistent handling of non-support and desertion cases, and began a strenuous campaign to education public opinion to its way of thinking. COS visitors and agents were to adopt "radical" measures and not give in to pity for immediate suffering.

Along with the problems of deserting fathers, the COS had to concern itself with what to do with neglected children if they were removed. The issue of institutions versus foster care was receiving national attention at this time. It was also a major part of the program of the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society and the Society for the Protection of Children from Cruelty and Immorality. The Baltimore COS discussed this question along with the best way of securing police
action in cases of cruelty. Mary Richmond urged drastic measures to break up "unsuitable" homes. But, Mary Wilcos Brown protested that more attempts should have been made to help parents improve the condition of the home life before children were taken away. The prevailing opinion seemed to have been the traditional thinking of punitive legislation and blanket rules for all cases.

The other "social ill" was that of the widow left with small children or wives with invalid husbands. These individuals were often referred to churches and "B.I.'s" on a temporary basis. The visitors also saw to it that mothers were referred for employment, often at very low pay, in order to preserve their independence. But, there was little concern shown about the sort of living the women could provide out of their wages. Neither did the Society show concern about any "struggling" widows other than those who happened to find their way to the agency.

The "social ills" of unemployment, non-support, and widowhood, did not respond to the "radical treatment" attempted by the COS. Disagreeable work-relief, breakup of homes, starvation income—were prescribed as social "preventives," because healing remedies for these ills were still being sought.

Yet, remedies were discussed and even put down on paper during the early years of the Society. But it is quite evident that what was discussed and put on paper was not really understood until 1895 and after. The depression years, 1892-95, had been a period of testing. Principles the organization accepted as a young agency, such as a standard type of investigation for all cases, had not always worked out. Out of this experience came the realization that investigation could be described and taught, but treatment was more of an intuitive art which each practitioner had to learn and perfect for himself. The two together were necessary and no investigation or treatment of one type could apply to every case.

In this respect, the COS labored under the disadvantage that only volunteers could successfully do "restoration" and visitors should not be paid. The organization needed more agents and volunteers, but it suffered from the danger of immediate assignment without orientation or experience. In its attempts to teach new recruits the rudiments of
practice, the organization was overwhelmed. The Society had presumed to be ready to deal with any human predicament, yet it had no exact directions to offer on how to start being a good friend or agent. Starting out with a belief in almost unlimited possibilities for character change through the influence of friendly visitors, it blundered, made mistakes and bogged itself down in many petty details. The district boards accepted trial and error and intuition as inevitable in handling many cases. These approaches were some of the things that began to strike some of the COS leadership, and in particular, the General Secretary, as wasteful and abortive.

One of the first things that the COS did was to pay more attention to procedure and to use experienced visitors and agents in its training program. Experts were brought in to lecture on medical care, summer care of children, sanitary housekeeping and proper food preparation. Visitors who had marked success were asked to write down exact descriptions of what they had done to bring changes about. Therefore, instead of continuing with the old sanctimonious generalized descriptions about "uplifting" the poor, teaching them "right living," and "helping them to help themselves," more was asked about the precise steps taken to accomplish these ends.

As a more positive approach, the most discouraging cases were considered step by step, as though each were a new one. Decisions were made at each juncture as to what could be done, and the various suggestions were compared with what had really occurred. These experiments led to a new way of learning to treat distressed families. This analysis of what did not work became a very important tool of research and teaching method for the profession—the positive breakthrough, because failures had been numerous; the few successes were exploited to the utmost to keep up visitors' morale, recruit new visitors and as publicity to gain support.

Another negative factor within the COS that needed attention was the relationship between the friendly visitors and the agents. The work of the visitors was given more attention; yet they did actually less visiting than the agents. In spite of the constant stress on the need to see families frequently over an extended time, volunteers easily
became discouraged after a few visits. The great problem was how to achieve continuity when social obligations and long absences from the city on vacations interfered. The bulk of these interruptions were made up by the agents. The 11,983 visits made by the eight trained agents in 1895, in contrast to 6,598 by 312 volunteers was so obvious even to the most adamant. Therefore, opinions were changed, cautiously at first, about friendly visiting being the prerogative of the volunteers only. The disadvantage of having a large corps of volunteers each following his own common sense began to be apparent. By April, 1896, instead of depending on tact and goodwill alone, friendly visitors were being made to see that in order to be successful, they would have to have more patience and obey the orders of those with more experience and who had been in the work longer.

Credit must go to Mary Richmond, for over a period of five years her vision changed from a large number of volunteers, to that of a smaller and more disciplined body advised by well-trained professional charity workers. She prophesized

"Here and there, one finds even now the charity agent of exceptional ability with power to acquire an organized body of experience in a disorganized school. These exceptional workers, underpaid and overworked, are the pioneers of a new profession. They will create a demand for a grade of service which can only be adequately supplied by charity training schools."

The change had come about due to the frequent discussions in the Board of Managers meetings and district meetings of the plan proposed by Zilpha Smith of paying would-be agents during an on-the-job training period, and to the paper read by Anna Dawes in 1893 at the International Congress in Chicago, on the need for training schools for charity workers.

In the Managers' meetings, the unavoidable mistakes new agents made when plunged directly into the job were constantly reported on. The description of a school such as one which was started in London, was enthusiastically noted by several members of the Board because of the value of such an experiment in providing trained-skilled service in the management of charitable work. In 1895, Mary Richmond with other members persuaded the Board to try an apprenticeship similar
to Boston's.74

Another obstacle had been overcome, but it was hard to locate capable candidates for training. Friends were asked to urge the "right" persons to apply. They found it necessary to advertise; even so, few of the applicants were suitable. Here we see that another plateau in the growth of the Society had been reached; there was the realization that special qualities of feeling expressed to clients had more to do with success than just the gathering of information as an answer to treatment.

The change was coming about in the crucible of daily pressures, the constant need to make difficult final case decisions and to answer questions of baffled learners. Qualities that were expected in other professions, were now equally applicable in social work and social work training. Professional standards were required of the workers who needed well planned formal training. Prior to this, charity workers were not considered professional persons; some even thought of them as errand boys to do the philanthropic chores of the wealthy.

Since there were no training schools, the apprenticeship programs and professional demands fell into the laps of the General Secretary, active leaders in the Society and the more experienced agents. There was no lack of problems for on-the-job-training in such areas as relief, lack of visitors, drive for social conformity and evidence.

Adequate relief was an ideal but clients often suffered the rigors of cold and starvation. This was true in part because workers had not been sure enough of the positive uses to which relief could be put. The COS had too often assumed that churches and relatives would assist when they really could not, and the clients were inadequately provided for. There were the glib promises that were seldom kept, and the agents had to learn, after much suffering on the part of the clients, that they had to make sure of the ability of relatives to give and to ascertain what clients actually received from such sources.

The sums given through the Golden Book Fund were usually small. Families who were assisted received an average of $6.00, about the amount of one week's wages for an unskilled workman. "B.I.'s" relief may have been slightly higher, but rarely provided an "adequate" living
even by the standard of the times. To exist, families were forced to resort to begging or going to the police for handouts; practices the COS inveighed against. The gap between "principle" and typical practice with regard to relief widened as the idea gained favor that relief, if given, should be sufficient to meet all needs.75

Visiting by a sympathetic friend was the service the COS had believed to be the most useful, but most families never saw a visitor. Actually, few cases were treated as the COS advocated. This was another discrepancy between principles and daily practices. The lack of enough visitors and the ineptness of many meant that some families were investigated more or less thoroughly, others not nearly enough. In some cases relief was secured by the agent through several small donors to tide a family over some emergency and then it was lost sight of until another crisis. Many times visitors were recommended but none would be available for a long period. Also, in many cases, the Board decided that a family needed temporary aid and the help of a visitor, only to find out three months later that no visitor had been assigned. But by 1896, the concern was for quality and experience, not numbers alone. The visitor without the quality of experience was insufficient to meet the needs that the changes were bringing about.

In its drive for social conformity, expressed principles often differed from performance in the attitude of agents toward questionable conduct and personality limitations. The COS frequently stated that it stood willing to help wrong-doers if there was any change of "restoration." But, the General Secretary, Mary Richmond, and agents were quick to seize on uncomplimentary information as a reasons for refusing to recommend continuing with a family.76 Charles Bonaparte often expressed concern that they be certain of the reliability of the informants, not to overlook certain favorable reports from other sources and try to understand the reasons for their client's behavior.77

In their investigation, agents seemed more intent on unearthing reasons for excluding people from the agency's services than they were in discovering hopeful characteristics that might be effectively utilized. They were quick to see reasons for not giving relief and slow to admit the reality of wants that needed to be met. Charles J. Bonaparte was
the first to set the thinking about what constituted reliable "evidence" in the social field: how to observe accurately, question purposely, and organize and assess a collection of miscellaneous facts. He approved of the idea of a cautionary list but warned that personal impressions and vague gossip should not be confused with fact. Agents were to distinctly understand that their opinions, or suspicions, however strong, amounted to nothing without positive proof. 78

The COS learned much from the meeting with Charles Loch, General Secretary of the London Charity Organization Society. Loch came to Baltimore in the spring of 1896 and spent several days with the Board and staff of the Baltimore COS. From him they received better ideas for conducting investigations, and other means of determining information. He pointed out that a good case record meant moving from definite premises toward a definite conclusion; and it was from Loch that the COS adopted the term "case work."

The year 1896 was momentous for the COS. The death of John Glenn in the spring led to a reorganization of the Board with Jeffrey Brackett becoming chairman of the Executive Committee. During the summer two new and better qualified agents were added to the staff, times were better, and there was less concern about unemployment. There was no doubt that Mary Richmond had been dominated by John Glenn; now she was more free, working with colleagues with experience more comparable to her own and she had become a nationally recognized figure.

The COS had become an educational institution at many levels with detailed decisions left to the discretion of the General Secretary instead of the long business sessions to decide routine matters. It no longer gave lengthy thought to the question of whether or not poverty as a whole was ultimately remediable, but more concern about hindrances clients were meeting at the time.

The previous years had been years of turmoil and contradiction, but the organization had moved from the point where principles had to precede practical application, to the point where principles were beginning to take form. The COS had moved to the position where Dr. Henry Hurd had made clear the possibilities of individual case analysis
and the need to "re-educate." Bosanquet and Barnett had shown that the understanding of clients must include seeing them as people and taking account of their strivings for cultural opportunities as well as physical survival. Charles Loch had stressed the importance of warmth and discerning records.

Public institutions had been a concern to the COS from its beginning, especially since Glenn's study of Bayview, the almshouse in 1888. For years the Society made strong efforts to secure the adoption at Bayview of methods of treatment which would prevent the entrance of able-bodied transpts and thereby relieve the city of their support.

In 1896, shortly after Mayor Hooper took office, he appointed a Board of Trustees of the Poor, which contained several Managers of the COS. The policy of the new Board quickly brought about some of the objectives long desired by the Society. Notably, it provided an office to regulate admissions, required work of all the inmates who could work and set up supervision of hospitals used by the city.

When Charles Loch visited the city in the spring of 1896, one of the major points discussed was the question of blanket subsidies to private institutions. This led to the appointment of a commission to investigate appropriations by the city to private institutions and to study city charities. The commission included Brackett as its chairman, the president of the AICP and a member from each Board of Managers. The report was made the basis for the provisions of the new city charter with regard to city charities. Dr. Gilman, who was in charge of writing the section on charitable institutions, followed the recommendations of the commission. Blanket subsidies were abolished, payment per unit of service was insisted upon, and a bi-partisan Board of Supervisors of City Charities was included. Both Mayor Hooper and his successor consulted COS leaders before making appointments. Brackett was selected as the president of a new Board in February, 1900 and John M. Glenn, nephew of John Glenn, and Kate McLane were suggested as members.

The General Secretary was upset when she learned of these plans. She thought that Dr. Gilman was giving more time to city charity work and less to the COS. Sharing Brackett, Glenn and Kate McLane was
like losing three mainstays of her staff. Mary Richmond did not agree at all with Bonaparte, Brackett, Glenn, Kate McLane and Mary Wilcox Brown, who firmly believed that sound direction of the public institutions would help more people and be the greatest contribution to the poor that they could make. She felt that the "inner circle" of her Board deliberated together without including her and she was angered and hurt by this. It seemed that there was a conspiracy against her to damage the work of the organization. 83

The same social ills continued to call for ingenuity in treatment. A relentless campaign against beggars continued. Mary Richmond personally took beggars to arresting officers and urged strongly that they be jailed and sentenced. This campaign resulted in a more stringent law in 1900. The law, initiated by the COS Committee on Law and Vagrancy, required beggars to be sent to the House of Correction. 84

Chattel Mortgages were another great source of family distress after 1896. Hard working families who had tried to avoid relief by borrowing lost their possessions through chattel mortgage foreclosure. In many instances there was chicanery or the borrowers' ignorance of the law was taken advantage of. The COS, with Bonaparte taking the lead, organized a panel of honorary counsel which advised with agents and defended clients. With the advice of counsel it was often possible to redeem furniture and obtain better legal redress. The attorneys became concerned to the point that they cooperated to draft new legislation to limit interest and protect the rights of borrowers, which was passed in 1900. 85 Through their intimate contact with the clients, many of the lawyers became understanding supporters of the COS.

As to the married vagabond, there were still some who advocated getting rid of the "lazy" head of a sham household or breaking up the family altogether. But, a great deal of attention was now being given to the elements of a true home. The idea now was to foster good homes and prevent bad ones. This was a marked progress from a desire to merely punish. Bonaparte cautioned against stressing the idea of punishment, rather more emphasis should be given to rehabilitation.

Social Hygiene was given consideration when the COS asked doctors for reading lists on sex and the "licentious ills." After carefully
studying the material, a meeting was arranged with the married agents and the more experienced visitors. The unmarried agents asked to be included. Dr. Hurd was asked to explain and discuss the question of venereal diseases. This was the first time that some of the women had heard of the problem. Since some of the agents had been unwilling to write the word "pregnant" in their records, it was clear that the staff needed to be informed on this matter if they were to treat and prevent family difficulties.

A new development in community charity efforts was the organization of a State Conference of Charities and Correction which held its first annual meeting in November of 1897. The Baltimore COS believed in such state boards and had worked for such a conference since 1893. The concept was similar to what had been done in the New England States, the holding of yearly conferences, to learn from each other the best methods of dealing with their problems. This would be the proper organization to promote state-wide legislation and foster new ways of helping people. It was mainly due to the united efforts of the Conference, that a "Board of State Aid and Charities" was set by the legislature in 1900.

In January, 1898, the COS, the AICP, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, the German Society, the Hebrew Benevolent Society, and a number of prominent citizens united in requesting the Police Board to discontinue the practice of distributing relief from police stations. The Police Board honored this request, and such givings dwindled. During the blizzard of 1899, there was a short period of time when contributions resumed, but not to any extensive degree. The period did make it possible for the Charity Societies to point out and prove that established agencies could handle emergency needs much more efficiently than the police. In 1901, the Police Board made a definite rule that policemen were not to engage in relief activity and were to refer all donors and applicants to the agencies.

The COS organized and conducted a class for the study of charitable work in the homes of the poor in February and March of 1898. They invited friendly visitors and leaders in church circles to attend, the only prerequisite for entrance being a serious desire and willingness
to do the readings. The purpose was to learn more about how to help the poor, add to the knowledge of the agents, and to avoid as far as possible, all theoretical speculation. The class leaders were to strive to give practical suggestions of practical people who had been engaged in the work. 90

The eight sessions were a great success, members of the class urged that it be repeated and asked for further reading. Here was the opportunity for expansion, sound experimentation, and putting into practice cumulative experience. This kind of study and training helped the practitioners to profit by their experiments and discoveries.

In the scheme of things, the paid charity worker now became the person in the educational concept. He was to teach visitors, clients and community workers. He had to give major emphasis to recruiting candidates for the newly instituted apprenticeship training. However, there was concern that a highly specialized education might be a drawback; it might prevent a student from seeing much of life at first hand. A person might admirably conceive of society as a whole, and yet might not be able to deal with units which compose it. In all of this there should be the reasoning, imagination, sympathy and faculty to take hold of things by the right handle. 91

To find such paragons willing to work indefinitely for $35 a month, after at least three months at $25, was not easy. In the appeal to women of education and ability, the work was pictured as fascinating and offering opportunities for the future, but the COS did not minimize the difficulties. Agents-in-training acted as friendly visitors in a number of cases, but investigations and reports to case committees made up the bulk of their assignments. They attended agent meetings and as many district board meetings as possible. In spite of a carefully planned orientation, learning to be an agent was still largely "learning by doing," but with the experienced consultants readily available, many costly mistakes were avoided. Such agency training plans were a step in the right direction, but not an ideal solution. Only large agencies could offer training programs, and they could not supply the manpower needed. Also, the beginners were too closely identified with a particular agency. The need was for a special school to concentrate
on the training of all kinds of practitioners. The theoretical orientation in a university was not the answer. What was needed was a training situation which would combine theory with practice under persons trained in both.

It was in Philadelphia on March 17, 1897 at the National Conference of Charities and Correction that the Baltimore COS through Mary Richmond, unfolded the blueprint of what such a school should be like. It was to inculcate established principles and common knowledge, underlying all services, with specialization late in a two-year course. The director should be a university-trained man, with practical experience. The school, if connected with a university, should emphasize practical rather than academic attainments. Its "vital connection" should be with public and private charities. 92

In 1898, the COS of New York City started a six weeks summer course which was found to be promising, yet too brief. As a result a formal school with a full year's program was established for students with six years' experience. Hannah Fernold, an agent-in-training in the Baltimore COS, was a scholarship student in the second semester class of 1899. Mary Richmond lectured on "Cooperation of Charities," and Jeffrey Brackett talked on "Principles and Methods of Placing Dependent Children." 93

In 1900, Mary Richmond's book, Friendly Visiting Among the Poor, was on the required reading list of the New York School. Jeffrey Brackett lectured for a week on "Treatment of Needy Families in Their Homes," and along with E.R.L. Gould, was on a committee to plan the school program as a whole. Dr. Gilman was among those who endorsed the New York plan for organizing a real school. Philip Ayres, first director of the New York School, was a graduate from Johns Hopkins and an old COS friendly visitor. 94

In spite of the emphasis given to the practical aspect of training, the Baltimore Charity Organization Society did not, at first, take to the "settlement movement." The prevailing thought in Baltimore was that the settlement failed in its aims and methods and that it leaned too much to socialistic views and was patronizing. The idea of living with the poor, somehow, smacked of curiosity. Trainees should live in
places where they would be in a position of genuine equality. 95

Jane Addams spoke at the Johns Hopkins School of Nursing in the spring of 1899. The COS Board and agents had the opportunity to meet her informally, and her speech, "Ten Years Residence," was so simply and modestly told, that it made a profound impression. Mary Richmond, Mary Wilcox Brown and Jeffrey Brackett were interested in learning about such activity at first hand. The three of them went to a Conference on Settlements at Hull House in Chicago in May of 1899. They expressed the hope that the neighborhood buildings the COS promoted would take the place of settlements, by providing programs that would stimulate the people in each section of the city. 96

In 1899, an investigation and report on school attendance, made for the COS by one of its members, was the beginning of a new movement which culminated in the passage of a compulsory school attendance law in 1901. 97 Mary Wilcox Brown, as had been stated, became the Board member who gave the most thought to institutional provisions, better school attendance and child labor laws, and the need for a juvenile court. She had also worked with the Arundel Club, the Union for Public Good, and in 1897 became a visitor for the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society and its head in 1898. Therefore, in 1901, the Society in connection with the AICP, the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society, and the Society to Protect Children from Cruelty and Immorality called a conference to consider the establishment of a juvenile court. As a result of this conference the law authorizing the appointment of a magistrate for juvenile cases was passed by the legislature of 1902, and the court, the first in Maryland, was inaugurated in June of 1902. 98

Mary Wilcox Brown expressed the feeling that some children did not need care outside of their own families and she worked with them in their homes. The COS as a whole was coming around to seeing how bad some situations were for children. And under the leadership of Mary Wilcox Brown, one principle governing the breakup of families had slowly taken form: "Parents, however, poor, who were trying, to the best of their ability, to do a parent's part, should be helped and encouraged to keep their children with them." 99 Thus they had come
to the conclusion that destitution alone was not sufficient reason for separating parents and children.

In 1901, the Society also made a vigorous campaign to arouse public interest in the care of the feeble-minded, and it gave material assistance to the Board of Managers of the Maryland Training School for the Feeble-Minded in securing larger annual appropriations, which materially increased the capacity of the institution.

There were two other delicate matters that the COS found itself faced with in the latter years of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries. One of the issues was the question of securing relief for strikers. Would recommending relief to strikers in a sense be taking sides against management, and would this offend some persons who supported the agency? Some were for keeping starving persons from starvation, no matter what caused the starvation. Others thought that agents should first determine the justification of the strike. Still others believed that the Society was too weak to risk criticism of the well-to-do. The question was a pertinent one, but the Society was not giving enough relief at the time to effect in any way the outcome of a strike.

The second issue was the critical question regarding Negroes. Because of limited educational background, lack of work or training opportunities available, and more numerous health problems, could they be considered for "restoration" on the same basis as white clients? All agents but the one from John Glenn's old district thought that they could; she thought that Negroes had not reached the stage of development which made it possible to always treat them exactly like their non-colored neighbors.

As a result of this, Helen Pendleton, an agent in the COS from 1896 to 1904, volunteered to attempt to organize a committee of Negro leaders to discuss COS principles as applied to members of their race. A young Negro doctor became an ardent COS supporter and friendly visitor. A Negro pastor also came in and stated that he attended the meetings to learn more about the problems of his people. The doctor accompanied Helen Pendleton on several difficult investigations in a carriage rented for the occasion, so that Jim Crow regulations would
not embarrass either. Mary Richmond firmly supported this effort to draw the Negro into the agency planning, and had Helen Pendleton report about it at agents' and Managers' meetings. This COS policy of helping people to help themselves worked so well that in 1900 a similar committee was started by the doubting agent.\textsuperscript{101}

On reaching the turn of the century and looking over the history of the Society, it is obvious that the COS believed itself to be the aristocrat of the Baltimore Charity Movement. The feeling of aristocratic superiority was particularly manifested in the speeches of Charles Bonaparte and John Glenn. Many of the volunteer visitors were from old Baltimore families. Their names were listed in the "Blue Book" directory for social visiting and their doings recounted on the society pages. The COS visiting and the program of the Arundell Club were similar and provided worthwhile pursuits in which a lady of leisure and means could profitably engage. The Arundell Club was organized in 1894 by a fashionable group of women interested in literary and artistic study. A subsidiary club was the Arundell Good Government Club, organized when Bonaparte was setting up good government organizations in each ward.

Many socially prominent and public-spirited women of Baltimore had indicated a desire to study social questions and work for civic improvement. The Arundell Club itself was an ultra-conservative body, whose board sometimes insisted on caution in the Good Government branch. This very fact helped to make reform activities of the civic-minded members seem respectable and less revolutionary. The public schools' milk inspection and health facilities were the first topics for study and action. The group undertook to work for compulsory education, better child labor laws, and later for a juvenile court.\textsuperscript{102} This was the period when women were becoming more conscious of their potential power in civic affairs. The COS took the initiative, as has been stated, to direct these influential women in a solid course of action.

While the activities of these women aided in securing legislation for compulsory education and a juvenile court, the proper relationship in terms of equality between the visitor and the client, the giver and
the receiver, still remained. Baltimore had strong-deep feelings; Baltimoreans were brought up to respect social barriers.

Mary Richmond was subjected to these social barriers because she was not a college graduate, nor did she have the proper family antecedents. She had lived most of her life in the "Old Town" section of the city and graduated from the Eastern Female High School in 1879. In 1889, at the time she decided to apply for a temporary job as collector of funds for the COS, she was a hotel clerk. John Glenn brought her into the COS as an office worker and it was he who recognized her ability and was instrumental in her becoming the General Secretary in 1891. In spite of her lack of higher education, it was during her tenure as General Secretary that the Baltimore COS did the most in terms of philanthropy in the city of Baltimore and was catapulted into national prominence. She had been able, during her pioneering days in Baltimore, to work with any and all groups, but by 1900, she seemed to have become emotionally upset and felt that she had lost the confidence of her Board. It was during this period of disillusionment that she announced her resignation at the March, 1900 meeting of the Board to take the job as secretary of the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity. 103

During her last month, she tried to stay aloof from the deliberations as to her successor. When she was repeatedly pushed by Kate McLane and Bonaparte, she hesitantly expressed the opinion that someone from the outside might be more perceptive in seeing the needs of the Society. Dr. Gilman was definitely opposed to any outsider, and the committee preferred "home talent." Again when pressed she suggested Helen Pendleton, whom the committee thought too new and not a "true Baltimorean." They had from the first considered Mary Wilcox Brown and finally offered her the position in June. 104

The COS, the same as the AICP, had reached a high point in its program at the turn of the century. This was done in spite of the many internal problems. Blunders were still made but not as many nor of the magnitude as before. A person receiving relief was no longer expected to be abjectly grateful and humble. The Society had learned that the one who showed a little crustiness was apt to be more sincere and that
pride could be a great safeguard to the poor, be they men or women. 105

But the success of the COS, the same as the AICP, was due to increased cooperation with one another, and with other charity organizations, especially the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society and the Maryland Society to Protect Children from Cruelty and Immorality. There had been very little, if any, effective cooperation between these agencies during the early stages of their operation; but there was at time hostility and open resentment. Yet, each agency existed, covering the city with duplicate offices and personnel whose work was similar in the treatment of the needy. The need for cooperation between the organizations was clear and apparent; yet they could find no common ground on which to meet. This lack of harmony resulted in their failure to do the best job possible for those who were in need and to realize true economy in money and service. However, the outstanding rivalry which had vexed the COS and the AICP was largely resolved between 1896 and 1902. The report of the joint committee on merger, submitted May 12, 1902, was given careful consideration by the COS Board; and, although some differences of opinion developed respecting its merits, the merger was endorsed by a large majority on the 19th of June. 106

In a backward glance, we must take note of the national perspective of the various Charity Organization Societies. It was after a study of the Charity Organization Society movement that a group of men decided that such an organization was needed in Baltimore City. Therefore, the COS of Baltimore was organized by this group of men who wanted to bring efficiency to charitable work in Baltimore City. They represented some of the leading men in the intellectual and business community of the city. The new Society stated in the beginning that it did not wish to interfere with the rules or methods of any existing benevolent society. It was not to give alms except in very urgent cases. Emphasis was placed on cooperation, education and organization. Through investigation, conferences with other agencies and the personal touch, it hoped to reduce pauperism and enlighten the public. The objects of the COS were in part the same as the AICP, but like the AICP, it too became a relief-giving organization.
The question of direct relief and cooperation with other societies represented two difficult problems during the early period. Where the first direct relief was concerned, the leadership of the COS did not want to recognize that there was a difference in its principles and practices. They attempted to get around this by setting up separate agencies to collect funds for destitute families. As to cooperation, every effort to get the charitable agencies to work together over any period of time met with failure. Because of these early antagonizing problems, a great deal of energy was exhausted in overlapping policies and complications in providing for the poor in an orderly manner.

The Baltimore COS was very fortunate in having a strong leadership throughout its history. Daniel C. Gilman, the President of the Johns Hopkins University, took the lead in helping to found the organization. Dr. Gilman also encouraged faculty members and graduate students to become active in the Society. This element, faculty and student, gave to the organization an activist scholarly leadership that no other organization could point to. Along with the academicians, the Society received backing and leadership from the prominent families of Baltimore. From both of these groups, there emerged individuals who not only provided the foundation for the Baltimore COS, but became prominent as national figures in the field of social work.

In looking back over the history of the COS in Baltimore City, two things stand out: the first was its pioneering work in the training of workers and the lead it took in establishing schools of social work. The second, as mentioned above was the number of persons who after receiving their training in Baltimore, left to take the lead in charitable work throughout the country. Therefore, as to the agency's success, the above factors caused the Baltimore COS to become distinguished both locally and nationally.
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CHAPTER IV

FEDERATED CHARITIES
1902-1919

Basically, the Baltimore charitable agencies had experienced four major problems; namely, the recurrence of economic crisis, a lack of cooperation, inadequate local and state legislation, and inefficiency due to the lack of skills, techniques and professional know-how. Federation of the AICP and the COS in 1902 was essentially a desire to advance still further the cooperation between the two agencies precipitated by the panic of 1893. The purpose was not only to avoid duplication of investigation, relief and records, but to utilize forces of skilled workers in the way most economical to the charitable and most helpful to the needy. The new secretary, Walter S. Ufford, was made responsible for the training and direction of the agents. He was to have them do the best constructive work possible by following methods which experience had proved helpful in dealing with needy persons.

The agencies recognized early in their history that without the necessary social legislation their programs of preventative measures, rehabilitation, or temporary relief would come to naught. There was a definite need for laws to protect workers from hazards and unhealthy working conditions, protective laws for women and children, housing codes, health laws, and institutional care regulations. During this period, therefore, agencies individually and collectively began to spend considerable time attempting to get the City Council of Baltimore and the State Legislature to pass laws of a humane nature. The Federation found it equally necessary to spend a great deal of time educating the public to the necessity for such legislation and the need for concerted action. It should be noted, however, that the Maryland Constitution provides for local government, so that while the primary
push for social legislation came mainly from and was applicable to Baltimore City, other political units could apply whatever part of a law they desired.

The first joint public meeting of the Federation was held at McCoy Hall on the evening of December 1, 1902; Dr. Ira Remsen, President of the COS, presided. Mr. Eugene Levering of the AICP spoke, placing special stress upon the character of the federation. Mr. Levering invited attention to the fact that the relationship between the Association and the Society was that of a partnership for joint action in matters of mutual interest. Dr. Gilman reminded the audience of those who in the earlier days had given so much time and thought to the work of organized charity. The principle speaker of the evening was the Rev. George Hodges, Dean of the Episcopal Theological Seminary of Cambridge, Massachusetts and president of the Associated Charities of Cambridge, Massachusetts. His theme for the evening was "Practical Philanthropy." ¹

The Federation continued the program to inform the public about the purpose of charity work, to aid those who were working for the poor and to inspire higher standards in charitable work. In this, it continued to have the constant aid of the Johns Hopkins University. Lectures on charities and correction were continued at the University. The annual public meetings held at the University continued to bring many prominent speakers to Baltimore and had become a recognized feature in charitable progress. These public meetings were not only joint affairs under Federation, but an increasing number of other charity organizations were now included. ² Also, in December of 1903, Mrs. John Glenn and Miss Mary C. Goodwillie organized classes for the study of charitable problems and their solutions.

In January of 1903, a joint night application bureau was opened at 4 West Saratoga Street. Any person asking for aid in any form, either upon the streets or from door to door was to be sent to the bureau up to midnight. Provisions were made to meet the emergency, and further assistance would be given if investigations proved that it was needed.
The bureau was open from January 1 to March 31; and its existence was widely advertised among the police, the clergy and householders to whom cards of reference were furnished. During the period of its existence, only ninety applications were received and forty of them were received in the month of January. The highest number on any evening was five on January 4. On six nights in January, there were no applications. The ages given by the applicants during its existence ranged from twenty to seventy years. Some listed themselves as being single, widowers, widows and some with families. The length of time that they had been in Baltimore ranged from one day to fifteen years. One of the things hoped for was that the night bureau would discourage professional begging after dark. 3

In April of 1904, through the dominant role played by the Federation, the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court established in 1902, was expanded and three probation officers were provided for. 4 Also, the work of the General Secretary had reached the point where in May of 1905, Mr. James M. Motley, a Fellow in the Economics Department of the Johns Hopkins University, was appointed assistant General Secretary. The Eight O’Clock Club, composed of paid women charity workers of Baltimore, was reorganized in February, 1906 as the Social Service Club of Maryland. The purpose of this group was to bring together all persons, both men and women, who were interested in the advancement of social philanthropic work. The Federation worked closely with this group to bring about social legislation. 5

During 1906, the Federation in cooperation with other agencies was successful in securing what it considered to be an important child labor law. This law equipped the Bureau of Statistics and Information with a corps of inspectors whose business it was to visit, inspect and report on all establishments employing children. The act further provided that no child under twelve, except when engaged in farm labor, was to work for hire in any part of the state from June 1 to October 15. It is not clear why the prohibition was made for the time period between June 1 and October 15. Nor did the provision specifically indicate whether this same age group was prohibited from working
between October 16 and May 31, which would include most of the school months.

An employment permit was also required for all children between the ages of twelve and sixteen. This permit was not to be issued unless satisfactory evidence was furnished regarding no only the age of the child but his or her ability to read at sight and write legibly short sentences in the English language. The child was to be of normal development and of sound health and physically able to perform the work for which the permit was issued. The permits were to be accessible to the inspectors and the attendance officers of the public schools. In the case of factories, shops, mills or messenger service, a list of the children employed was to be conspicuously posted near the principal entrance of the building where they were employed.

The inspectors authorized by the act and the attendance officers of the public schools were to be given access to any office, establishment or place of business covered by the act throughout the state of Maryland and the City of Baltimore. This was done to ascertain whether any minors were employed contrary to the provisions of the act. The feeling of the Federation was that the act made it more difficult to hire children under twelve years of age in Maryland and even more so in the shops and canning factories of Baltimore City.6

One of the major arguments used against the passage of the child-labor bill was put forth by some parents. They contended that it would work a hardship upon invalid fathers, widowed mothers or families dependent for support upon the earnings of these children. The advocates of the measure believed that the experience of Maryland would be similar to that of other states. In states where there were similar laws it was found that the number of families that suffered hardship was comparatively small and that private charity could be relied upon to see that no families became destitute by reason of the law. The Federation pledged itself to assume responsibility for the care of families who found themselves in need as a result of the law. The Federation waited for four months after the law was passed in order to more fairly judge the amount of privation before making any move. On January 1, 1907, it asked the Bureau of Statistics and
Information for the names and addresses of all the families that, when permits were refused, stated that the earnings of the children were needed for the support of the family. Out of about one thousand instances where permits were denied to children of Baltimore City, the referral to the Federation averaged about one in ten. The family of each referral was promptly visited and a careful inquiry was made as to the need of outside assistance.

The following is a summary of the report made as a result of the inquiry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of families given aid</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of additional families likely to need assistance</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of families to whom school scholarships or continuous aid was given</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of families found not to need assistance</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Federation felt that it was possible that some of those receiving temporary assistance would require continuous aid, but the inquiry showed that relatively few families in Baltimore were made dependent by the operation of the law. To the Federation the gains were manifold. There was almost an immediate increased interest on the part of parents of foreign birth in having their children learn English. The parochial schools began to revise their curriculum so as to give more attention to the reading and writing of English. Not only were illiterate children denied permits, but many undersized, frail boys and girls, whom it was thought should stay in school until they attained normal growth, were prohibited from working. Therefore, but for the passage of the law, the practice of working children under twelve in the factories, mills and shops would have continued. The practical difficulty in the enforcement of the law was the lack of birth certificates. This led to an effort on the part of the charity organizations to have the State pass a law requiring birth registration.

Another concern of the Federation and the other social agencies was the passage of legislation to control tuberculosis. In 1902, the legislature authorized the Governor to appoint a Tuberculosis Commission "to investigate the prevalence, distribution and causes of human
tuberculosis in the State of Maryland, to determine its relationship to the public health and welfare, and to devise ways and means for restricting and controlling said disease."  

The Commission made what was thought to be a practicable and conservative report to the legislature in 1904. As a result of the report, a law was passed to protect the general public from infection by requiring the registration of all persons in the state known to be affected with tuberculosis. It also required the disinfection of apartments vacated by the death or removal of consumptive occupants.  

In 1906, the Federation and the other charity organizations worked with the Commission to obtain an appropriation for a State sanitarium. Much educational work was done by the charities, and as a result they were aided by ex-Governor Smith, public-spirited citizens and leading members of the medical fraternity. The legislature responded generously to the appeal for the establishment of a State sanitarium for the treatment of incipient tuberculosis. Fifty thousand dollars was appropriate for each of the years 1907 and 1908 and a maintenance fund of $15,000 was supplied.  

A bill providing for a Commission to study approved reformatory methods was drafted by the chairman of the Committee on Law and Legislation of the Federation. The bill received the endorsement of the Maryland Prisoner's Aid Association, the Jail Board and individuals interested in penology. The Commission was to be an unpaid one, with $500 being allowed for clerical and other expenses.  

The "Salary Loan Bill," was drawn by one of the honorary counsels of the Federation. The bill was passed without amendment, very much to the surprise even of its friends. The legislation was aimed at abuses practiced by certain money lenders in advancing money against future unpaid salaries. Any assignment of wages or salary given as security for a loan tainted with usury was void under the act. Because of the publicity given to the bill the "loan shark" was deprived of the weapon used for the collection of debts which was the threat of exposure.
Through joint efforts of the charitable agencies, action was taken to seek legislation to aid the blind. This resulted first in a commission of five persons appointed by the Governor to improve the condition of the Adult Blind in the State of Maryland. The commission was to secure a complete list of all blind persons in the State and record the names, ages, financial condition, cause and extent of their blindness, their capacity for educational and industrial training and other facts that might seem of value.

The Commission as it was set up was to aid such adult blind persons that they considered worthy, to find employment, and to furnish material and tools at a cost not exceeding $50 to any one individual. They could place in Homes such indigent blind women as appeared worthy and had no means of support. Expenditures on any woman were limited to $200 per annum. Five-hundred dollars was appropriated for the expenses of the Commission, and $3,000 a year for the care of the adult blind. ¹³

Secondly, a bill providing for compulsory education for blind or deaf children between the ages of six and sixteen was passed. Any child with defective eyesight or hearing that could not attend public school had to attend some school for the deaf and the blind for eight months out of the year. The penalty for failure of the parents or guardians to comply with the law was $5 for each offense. Any person inducing or preventing a child from attending school was subject to a fine not over $50. A census of deaf, blind, and feeble-minded between the ages of six and sixteen was to be taken by teachers and truant officers. ¹⁴

Joint efforts affecting the charitable, correctional and philanthropic work of the City and State accounted for a variety of other legislation. In Baltimore no midwife, institution or corporation not duly incorporated for the purpose was to receive infants or young children for compensation without receiving a license from the Board of Health. The applicants for license were to be endorsed by four respectable citizens. The Health Board was to keep a record of the children received, given name, address and date of birth. The Board
of Health was to make a careful investigation of the institutions and the persons in charge. The penalty for violation of the law was $25. The act did not apply to persons or homes recommended by the Supervisors of City Charities. 15

Legislation was provided for changing the name of the House of Refuge to the Maryland School for Boys, the Egerton Orphange to the Egerton Home, and the almshouses to county Homes. 16 A workshop was approved for the Baltimore City Jail and money was authorized for a woman's annex to the Penitentiary. 17 Juvenile institutions were allowed to retain inmates until they reached the age of twenty-one years, and the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore were authorized to contract with the Playground Association for the establishment of playgrounds. 18

Thus we see that the year 1906 was a memorable one for the generous response which was made to requests put forth by charitable, correctional and philanthropic agencies of the City. It also showed the gains that could be made through cordial and effective cooperation and how it could be of mutual benefit to all of the organizations.

Of the various causes of dependence, the trinity of evils, namely, child labor, tuberculosis and bad housing, seemed to have been beyond the control of the individuals whom they injured and whom they too often destroyed. The Federation, with the assistance of other charitable groups, had waged a vigorous and successful campaign against the first two. It also engaged in an effort to secure better housing conditions for the vast army of people who, on account of their impoverished condition, lower rentals, and ready access to their jobs, were crowding into the already congested sections of the city.

As early as 1903, the Federation appointed a special committee to consider the question of housing in Baltimore. Soon after this, February 7 and 8, 1904, Baltimore was hit by a great fire, which for the time being postponed any active consideration of the subject. In May, 1906, the question was again taken up and a special Committee on Improved Housing was appointed for the purpose of conducting an investigation in certain sections of the city that might be considered typical of Baltimore's housing problems. This was felt to be the first
step toward securing needed reforms. The work was begun in July, 1906. Miss Janet E. Kemp, a trained investigator, was engaged to make a systematic inquiry regarding housing conditions in Baltimore. Four districts were selected for investigation. 19

One district consisted of 215 alley houses in the interior of the block bounded by Preston and Biddle Streets and Pennsylvania and Druid Hill Avenues. The block had a high death rate from tuberculosis and was known as Baltimore's "Lung Block." A second district comprised 124 houses on East and West Hughes Street in South Baltimore, with the adjacent alleys and courts. These two blocks were selected because of their being typical of the bad housing scattered throughout the city. The first district was occupied largely by Negroes, and the second was exclusively so occupied.

The other two districts chosen for study were representative of the city's tenement problems. These contained a large number of houses occupied by three or more families, which were tenements according to the definition accepted in other cities, even though the Baltimore Charter defined a tenement as a house occupied by more than three families. The first of the two districts consisted of 119 houses in five blocks on Albermarle and High Streets. In this district the dominant ethnic groups consisted of Jews of Russian descent, with a sprinkling of Italians. The other tenement district embraced 136 houses in a Polish neighborhood, between South Broadway and Caroline Streets, south of Lancaster Street. A study was also made of a small, entirely enclosed court in South Baltimore occupied almost exclusively by native Americans.

Altogether 600 houses were inspected, containing apartments of from 1,100 families upwards. Seven hundred and fifteen of these apartments were found in the 255 houses of the two tenement districts. The schedules used in the inspection of these houses were largely based upon those that had been used in a Philadelphia housing study, with modifications needed to adapt them to local conditions.

From a preliminary investigation it was clear to the committee that the increasing tendency was to cover a very large percentage of the surface of a lot with a house which was a serious defect at the
time and presented a growing evil for the future. Therefore, it was essential to secure exact information as to the number of overcrowded lots in the tenement districts. This involved the taking of measurements of houses and lots which materially increased the work of inspection. This, however, put more substantial facts in the hands of the committee to buttress its case. It was found that in the Jewish section 56% of the houses occupied more than 70% of the lots on which they were built; and in the Polish section 83% of the lots were covered to the same extent. The blocks studied were typical of the blocks surrounding them, therefore, these figures fairly represented the conditions in the section of the city where the tenement problem had developed. Of the houses inspected in the districts, very few had the appearance of having been intended for more than one family. These one-family houses with some alteration or no alteration at all, had become the home of from three to ten families. The great fear was that with the pressure of a daily increasing population, the one-family homes, by change of ownership, were becoming crowded tenements. 20

Of the 119 houses in the Jewish district, 17 or 14% were three-family houses. Thirty-one or 26% were occupied by four or more families, making 40% of the whole number fall into the tenement classification. In the Polish district, 64 houses out of a total of 136 or 40% were found to contain three or more families; of this number, 19 or 14% were three-family houses. In the Jewish district 71% of the 315 apartments included in the investigation were found in houses containing three or more families. Of the 400 apartments inspected in the Polish districts 76% were in the tenement classification. As to overcrowding, the Jewish district was found to contain 22 one-room apartments, 87 two-room apartments and 93 three-room apartments out of a total number of 315 apartments. Only 9.5% of the apartments in the Jewish district contained more than an average of three persons to a room. In the Polish district, out of a total of 400 apartments, 72 one-room apartments occupied by 222 people were found. There were 21 two-room apartments and only 35 three-room apartments. Twenty-six percent of the apartments averaged more than three persons to a room.
In the Polish district, many families migrated to the South for "oyster shucking," or to the country to work in the canning factories, according to the season, which prevented the inspection of about 100 rooms.

In all the four districts inspected the sanitary conditions were found to present the strongest possible argument for the speedy installation of a sewer system. In the 600 houses included in the investigation, only nine were found to have flush toilets. The outside privies, often used in common by a large number of families, were exceedingly objectionable. They were built over vaults or "sinks," usually of wood or brick. In a great many instances the vaults consisted of nothing but wooden barrels sunk into the ground, and they were emptied at infrequent intervals. Stagnant pools of drainage from the primitive receptacles were found in the yards of a number of houses; and the drainage flowed out into the street or alley.

The study of the two different alley districts brought the Committee face to face with different phases of the housing problems in Baltimore City. Here they found that delapidation, dampness, bad sanitation, and insufficient water supply were the worst evils. But they found that a majority of the houses were occupied by only one or two families, making the question of lighting and ventilation less serious than in the tenement districts. Of the 120 houses studied in South Baltimore, sixty-seven had leaking roofs. Of forty-nine cellars inspected in this district only nine were found to be dry, and of the 179 cellars in the Biddle Street and Druid Hill Avenue section, 131 were scheduled as "damp," "wet," or containing water. The privy conditions were even worse in the two alley districts. In the Hughes Street section, the water supply was notably inadequate. Only sixty-eight fixtures were found for the 172 families residing in three blocks and for sixty-four of these families the only source of water was one of the six hydrants located in public courts. The investigation revealed that in many sections of Baltimore there were many overcrowded homes, gloomy, ill-ventilated rooms, dark hallways and lots that afforded far too little vacant space for the circulation of air and the admission of sunlight.
The Committee, in presenting its report, was optimistic about the solution if the necessary codes were adopted immediately. They recommended that the City Council enact a tenement code in line with the best standards that prevailed in the cities that had taken the lead in civic improvement.

In the Fall of 1906, when the City Council of Baltimore City was discussing an amendment to its building regulations, the Committee took advantage of this opportunity to be heard. Even though it was not successful in securing the legislation requested, the conditions disclosed by the study provided the facts for future housing code legislation in Baltimore City.

In April of 1907, Walter B. Ufford resigned as General Secretary to become General Secretary of the Associated Charities, Washington, D.C. Mr. J. William Magruder was appointed General Secretary in September, 1907. Also in the Spring of 1907, the report of the Housing Committee was published in a fully-illustrated pamphlet entitled "Housing Conditions in Baltimore," and was widely distributed by the committee to arouse public attention, interest and action. After the publication of the report, the subject became such an important one that the Committee on Improved Housing was increased to fifty members. At their first meeting on June 28, three sub-committees of five members each were formed, the executive, legislative and public interest. At a meeting held at McCoy Hall on October 22, the topic was discussed from various points of view and an active interest was shown. Among those who spoke, with practical suggestions and assurance of cooperation, were representatives from the Federated Jewish Societies, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, and other groups actively engaged in philanthropical work in the city.

It was the unanimous opinion of those at this meeting that the most important line for immediate action was arousing and maintaining general public interest by widely spreading all possible information on the subject, both by means of illustrative lectures and through the press. The press had already responded to many requests for publicity and had shown that they recognized the gravity of the matter through several editorials.22
In November of 1907, a special worker was appointed by the Federation at the request of teachers in South Baltimore to study the social and economic conditions of pupils in special South Baltimore schools. To a group of teachers in South Baltimore the evident low physical status of their pupils had become a growing cause of anxiety, and they wanted to ascertain, and if possible, mitigate or remove the causes of the pupils' disability. The worker, with the cooperation of the teachers and the medical inspector of the district, visited thirty-four families, representing sixty-five children. These children were the obes who appeared to be the most underfed, dirty, and neglected. The direct knowledge of the home conditions of the children visited, led to the placing of the worker, Miss L. White under the direction of a special committee. After further study of the facts, the committee felt the need for fostering an educational movement the aim of which was to set up a medical and hygienic center to instruct mothers in the care of infants, hygienic cooking and the care of the home. The committee emphasized the need for the heads of families to familiarize themselves with the regulations of the health board and the street-cleaning department in respect to sanitary care of homes and the streets and alleys. The belief was that such education would emphasize the responsibility of landlord and tenant and of neighbor to neighbor. The immediate result of the study was the referral of families who were in need of charitable assistance to the proper relief agencies. The children who were found to be neglected or without proper guardianship were referred to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

In the Fall of 1907, a Social Service Department at the Johns Hopkins Hospital was added. The Department was an outgrowth of the Charity Organization Society medical student boards, formed by Dr. Charles C. Emerson, Johns Hopkins Hospital in 1902. Miss Helen Pendleton, former secretary of the Northeast District, was the social worker in charge. Many physicians were of the conviction that medicine for some patients was the least of the treatments necessary for their recovery. The belief was expressed that two-thirds of the
patients treated needed some reorganization of their lives, some radical improvement in their home surroundings or the conditions under which they worked. Some might need material relief, but medical treatment was not the cure for their needs. It was the worry or heart-ache from these that led to superficial physical disorders. These were the cases where the social workers would be especially valuable. And the ones who would be responsible for the examination and diagnosis of these social problems needed to be thoroughly trained in that specialty, just as the physician or surgeon.

The Social Service Department had a separate staff of workers, a chief with volunteer assistants. It received patients, studied their cases and kept records much the same as other departments in the hospital. It became an intermediary between the patients and the charitable organizations of the city. After the diagnosis was made and the line of treatment marked out, most of the social treatment was done in the homes by volunteers. This was where the various charitable organizations were able to render valuable services with well-trained, tactful friendly visitors.²⁴

An equally significant development during the year 1907 was the creation of the office of Extension Secretary. It had been an accepted principle that a part of the work of every agent was to propagate the ideals and methods of modern philanthropy as well as to care for families in distress and eradicate the causes of poverty. The new secretary was Miss Janet E. Kemp, formerly a teacher of Sociology, the investigator of housing conditions, first in Washington, then in Baltimore and a district agent for the Federation. Her duties included all of those that belonged to a financial secretary, but the principle upon which she and her associates were to work was to seek not only money and subscribers, but sound philanthropy.²⁵

The City Council and Mayor in July of 1908, passed a new building code for Baltimore, which included sections on tenements. After its passage, the chief duty of the Committee on Housing was to endeavor to see that it was enforced. The new code provided for two tenement-house inspectors, with a salary of $900 each appropriated
by the Board of Estimates. Neither of the two appointees professed any knowledge of their work and had to learn while doing. Fortunately, they seemed to have learned well, because nine months after the code had been in operation, 967 nuisances were ordered abated and upon inspection 561 were found to have been corrected. The nuisances consisted of full or filthy closets to be cleaned, halls to be provided with ventilation, rubbish to be removed and premises to be cleaned. Five warrants were sworn out and all of the parties were convicted.26

The "panic" of 1907-08 was a crisis period, and very heavily taxed the resources of the Federation. The financial crisis had the double effect of throwing thousands of people out of work; and, at the same time, making it difficult to raise the necessary funds to care efficiently for the largely increased number of applicants.27

The result of this increase in work was the development of volunteer service in all the districts. When the pressure of the "hard times" was beginning to make itself seriously felt, according to the Annual Report, an inspiring meeting was held in the Donovan Room at Johns Hopkins early in January, 1908. Each agent was given an opportunity to state just what kind of service was most needed in his district. After the agents stated their needs, Mrs. John Glenn asked for volunteers to meet the various needs and about thirty-one persons offered themselves for work. Many of the volunteers were able to give one or more full days a week in the districts and some spent their time in the office to render whatever service that was needed. They were able to assume the burden of some of the clerical work; and still others enrolled themselves as friendly visitors. Several friends who were deeply interested in the work and acutely conscious of the needs, but who could not themselves spend time in the districts, paid the salaries of additional workers to be employed during the rush period.

Even with the help given by volunteers and by additional workers the strain on the agency was very severe and it continued to suffer the bad effects of these unavoidable and unusual conditions for sometime afterwards. Every appeal for help was met, and as far as possible, wisely dealt with; but it was done at a tremendous cost to the vitality of the workers.28
The rush of work in the districts made it practically impossible for the agents to spend as much time as usual in raising funds for the relief of special cases through such channels as the relatives of families applying, former employers, churches, and other philanthropic organizations. With the employment market at a standstill, it was much more difficult for the Federation to procure a substitute for relief. However, from the above mentioned sources, the agents were able to collect $11,982, which was used to meet the needs of a considerable number of families seeking relief, but the general conditions made it necessary to draw upon the general and special fund of the agency to an enormously increased extent. The amount of increase was due largely to the corresponding increase in the number of people who were helped. To some extent, the increase was due to the fact that the Federation had raised its relief standards. Whatever the cause or causes, the panic of 1907-08 created abnormal conditions of destitution that tested the working efficiency and ability of the Federation under the strain of excessive and unusual demands.

A change which undoubtedly contributed to the increased efficiency of the Federation was the creation of the office of District Secretary. For some time the agents, general secretaries and some members of the Boards had felt that it was impossible for the General Secretary of such a large and complicated organization to give any close supervision to the details of work done in the twelve district offices. It was recognized that such supervision was essential in order to secure uniformity of method and the best results in all the districts. It was also felt that this important service could be undertaken only by a person who had practical working knowledge of all the details of district work. In January of 1908, the Board of Managers selected Miss Elizabeth Brown to fill this new office of District Secretary. Miss Brown had served the organization as a volunteer worker and later as a district agent and it was thought that the district work would reach a higher degree of excellence under her supervision.

One of the most important results of the reorganization of district work was the enlargement and expansion of the Joint Registration System. During the year 1908, more than twelve organizations availed
themselves of the advantages offered by this plan by which every co-
operating organization knew when a family or individual who came to
it for help had also gone to another. It prevented the duplication of
effort and made possible the interchange of information, without which
it was impossible to deal intelligently with the problems of a family.
Therefore, it was very difficult to over estimate the importance of
registration as a factor in effective work for families. There were the
demoralizing effects upon rich and poor alike, when the organizations
worked at cross-purposes. But, by means of this clearing-house all
registering societies could work together to obtain the best results for
the people whom they were trying to benefit. 31

The Federation organized the fight that led to the passing of a
Milk Ordinance in 1908. It had a personal interest in view of the
yearly expenditure of thousands of dollars for a Sick Diet for hundreds
of tubercular patients, little children and infants. The Ordinance was
forced through the City Council by an aroused public sentiment in the
face of organized opposition. The public had been educated to the
hazards by epidemics of diseases directly traceable to infected milk,
by the milk exhibits that had been held in McCoy Hall at Johns Hopkins
and by the startling declarations of doctors in Baltimore as to the
number of annual deaths caused by bad milk.

The Milk Ordinance provided for inspection of the milk supply
in Baltimore "from the stable to the table." The enforcement powers
were lodged in the Health Department with eight inspectors in the be-
ginning. The Health officers of Baltimore City certified that during
1909 they tested the milk of 1,988 wagons, made 22,932 visits to
dairies and milk stores to test the milk, examined 14,031 specimens
of milk in the laboratory, and threw out 8,056 gallons out of a total
of 6,327,063 gallons of milk examined. There were twenty-five
prosecutions for violation of the ordinance, and all of them were suc-
cessful. 32

In April of 1909, the Federation entered into an arrangement
with the State's Attorney's office to investigate non-support cases
for the purpose of ascertaining the facts and to determine the merits
of cases. There were 124 investigations during the year and counting
those that were dealt with in the offices, there were a total of 169 cases of non-support.

The problem of non-support was considered to be a growing evil and several conferences of social and civic workers were held where this matter was taken up in detail. The Federation voiced the sentiment of the conference and began to work to modify the law to provide not only for extradition and correctional treatment of deserters, but for the compulsory support of their families.\(^{33}\)

Also, in April of 1909, the Federation became a forwarding center for Maryland and Delaware at the request of the Field Department for the Extension of Charity of the Russell Sage Foundation. Forwarding centers were being established at strategic points throughout the country. They were bonds of union between charitable societies leading to a national organization,\(^{34}\) providing for the exchange of information and services. Mary E. Richmond, former General Secretary of the COS of Baltimore, became the first Director of the new Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation.

The Federation was also concerned about the conditions of the Negro in Baltimore. In a joint session in 1905, the Federation adopted the following:

"Resolved, that we favor the establishment of a new and separate institution for the care and custody of the colored indigent insane,"\(^{35}\) The State had passed legislation that was to assume the care of all indigent insane persons in 1909. The Federation did not think it too early to make provisions for the proper housing of the indigent insane, both white and colored, who had been cared for by Baltimore City and the counties.

The Federation called for:

"An act to establish a hospital for insane colored persons of Maryland and to appropriate a sum of money therefore." The amount called for was $50,000 to be used for the purchase of land and the erection of the necessary buildings to house the insane colored persons of the State. The sum of $25,000 was also requested for the maintenance of the proposed hospital. The plan was that with the establishment of a separate institution for the colored insane,
Grove, which had received colored cases, could be relieved of that class of patients and the entire institution devoted to the care of the white indigent insane.\textsuperscript{36}

In terms of work with Negroes in Baltimore City, the Federation organized Section II, which was composed of colored workers. These workers held regular weekly meetings and the number in attendance continued to increase over a period of several years. The friendly visitors showed greater familiarity with the work and proceeded with the families assigned them with more understanding. The reports coming from Section II indicated how the work as a whole advanced in interest and efficiency. Section II showed particular interest in the conference classes held at the Central Office and had members in regular attendance that contributed their experience to make the sessions profitable. Much was done by the visitors to interest the colored people in the Thomas Wilson Fuel Saving Society, thereby promoting the habit of thrift.\textsuperscript{37}

One of the most serious problems the workers encountered in Section II was what to do with dependent children. There was no adequate placing out system for them; therefore, institutional care had to be sought. But, upon investigation, they found very little in the way of institutions for colored children in or near the city. The matter was taken up by the Central Office and the records show that the question of legislation was discussed for a number of years, but nothing was accomplished during this period.\textsuperscript{38}

The actual working together of the AICP and the COS as one gradually brought about a unity of spirit, with one accord and of one mind in favor of consolidation, if it were legally possible. The Joint Committee on Law and Legislation instituted a searching investigation into all legal questions at issue, in which Attorney Joseph C. France, a corporation lawyer, rendered invaluable service. The investigation brought out that there was nothing either in law or in the provisions of the trust funds of the two societies to prevent legal consolidation.\textsuperscript{39}

As a result of the investigation, a meeting of the members of the two societies was held at the Donovan Room, McCoy Hall, January 10,
1910. The meeting was well attended by members of each society in person or by proxy; and on the motion of Charles J. Bonaparte, it was unanimously voted, first by the AICP and then by the COS, to consolidate under the General Laws of the State. On the following day, January 11, a certificate of union was issued, confirmed by an Act of the General Assembly. 40

Thus, with the consolidation of the AICP and the COS, the year 1910 marked an epoch in the history of charity in Baltimore City. This legal consolidation of the two societies was a triumph of the new social spirit. For a generation the two societies had been pursuing their independent ways; and all attempts to cooperate for any sustained period of time had failed, until the Federation in 1902. A sort of working agreement was effected, not legally, but in name only. 41 But, in 1910, the legal merger of the two societies culminated in the Federated Charities, Incorporated. J. William Magruder was the General Secretary. However, it is important to note that most of the records and those members of the Family and Children's Society who have retired or who are still in the agency, in referring to the Federated Charities, refer to the 1902 date.

The By-Laws of the new corporation continued all of the essential features of the original corporation, with one new modification. The Executive Committee was to consist of two sub-committees, one on Administration and the other on Finance. This combination was expected to bring about closer supervision and serve as a double check on the handling of the corporation's finances.

In March of 1910, The Federated Charities became a constituent member of the Children's Bureau of Baltimore, organized by agencies dealing with children's cases. It was a somewhat unique social experiment, the various agencies getting together, without a formal constitution or by-laws or additional machinery. Its office was with the Children's Aid Society, its registration was with the Confidential Exchange of the Federated Charities. The purpose of the Bureau was to consider children's cases and work for better enforcement of laws affecting children and increase the use of existing children's agencies. 42
By 1910, the churches in Baltimore were beginning to address themselves to the problem of poverty and turned to the Federated Charities for its services. In increasing numbers they used the Confidential Exchange of Information, consulted with the agency as to families in need and cooperated in programs for community improvements. The Sunday prior to Thanksgiving was observed in many churches as Charity Sunday, in which a collection was taken up for the Federated Charities. This was done in spite of the fact that the agency insisted that the object of the day was not financial, but educational. Several churches instituted "Health-to-Baby Day" as an annual event and took up a collection for the Sick Diet Fund, to be used especially for supplying milk to babies whose parents were too poor to buy it. All of this seemed to indicate the growth of the social spirit in the churches and the acceptance of the Federated Charities as being better equipped to deal with most problems of charity.

The Baltimore newspapers, without exception, were by 1910 being more cooperative. The editorial pages as well as the news columns were breathing the social spirit. Special appeals for pensions for families requiring continuous relief were issued by The News, The Star, The American, The Sun, The Evening Sun, The German Journal, The Afro-American, and The Times. The News, for example, instituted a new and original feature during Xmas week, by bunching appeals for twelve different pension families under the head of "Twelve Opportunities," raising more than $2,400 in 1910. The Evening Sun came to the aid of the Sick Diet and Ice Fund during July and August of 1910, by running a different story each day; and the Federated Charities for the first time raised as much money as was expended during the season. 43

In May, 1910, Lawrence Veiller, Secretary of the National Housing Association, spent a day in Baltimore inspecting housing conditions, and met the original Committee of Fifty on Improved Housing in the evening of the same day. They discussed the next things to be undertaken in the campaign for improved housing conditions. All agreed that the first and foremost task was the completion of the city-wide sanitary sewer system. Mr. Veiller pointed out to them the evils of the private-alley system, with its absence of paving, cleaning and lighting; and
the many existing unsanitary conditions, either because the housing code was inadequate or because it applied only to houses containing "three or more families." He urged the employment of a trained secretary to give his whole time to the work of investigation, education propaganda, and improvement in the housing code.44

At this juncture, according to the files of the Family and Children's Society, a Baltimorean of pronounced social spirit and with educational and legal training, unexpectedly became available, and the committee seriously considered hiring him. But, the Commissioner of Health, also became interested and indicated a willingness to appoint him as Chief Tenement Inspector. However, he would have to go to New York at private expense for technical training under Mr. Veiller; also the Board of Estimates would have to make the necessary appropriation for an additional inspector. All of these conditions were met, and the appointment was made, giving the city a Chief Inspector with two assistants.45

There had been from the beginning the closest affiliation between the Federated Charities and the Johns Hopkins University. In October of 1910, a new and vital relationship was established with Goucher College. At the request of Dr. Thaddeus P. Thomas, of the Department of Sociology and Economics, and the College authorities, the Board of Managers of the Federated Charities agreed to an arrangement by which the General Secretary would teach the course in Philanthropy at the College. The agreement was to admit in addition to the enrolled students of the college, the workers-in-training assistants and volunteers of the Federated Charities, and any others who in previous years were eligible for the weekly training class at the Central Office. The first enrollment included thirty-three regular students and twenty attendants. This arrangement provided another means for the training of Federated Charities workers and from this came the suggestion that a coordinated program for the benefit of social workers be organized between Johns Hopkins and Goucher College.46

In October of 1910, Miss Theo Jacobs was appointed an assistant to the General Secretary to succeed Miss Brown who left Baltimore to become Assistant Secretary for the Associated Charities, Washington,
D.C. Also in October of 1910, Mr. Eugene Levering became the President of the Federated Charities. And the speaker at the annual meeting, held at McCoy Hall, was Miss Mary E. Richmond whose subject was, "Lessons Learned in Baltimore." In the speech, Miss Richmond emphasized the many experiences she had had in Baltimore and what they had taught her. She talked about the distinct qualities of those with whom she worked and how they influenced her and their dedicated services in behalf of the less fortunate.47

The Federated Charities in January of 1911, invited Mr. Francis H. McLean, Field Secretary of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, to come to Baltimore to go through its entire organization, equipment and management and report his findings. He was to take as long as necessary and was made to understand that what was wanted was not commendation, but constructive criticism.

The immediate occasion for the call to Mr. McLean fell into two categories. The first was the merger of the AICP and the COS; and secondly, a variety of new ideas contemplated by the management. There were still some persons who believed that the two organizations had vital traditions in common, but by no means alike in ideals of methods. The two categories above were fraught with such possibilities for good or ill, the management thought that expert information and advice was needed.

Preparatory to his coming, Mr. McLean drafted and forwarded to the Baltimore organization a somewhat elaborate questionnaire to be filled out. Upon his arrival the entire organization was opened for his inspection, and an outline of the plans and purposes already under consideration was submitted to him.48

It required a full month of night and day work for him to go through the central and thirteen district offices. He studied in detail the records of seventy-two families and examined the preventive, educational, organizational and cooperative work, and the financial system of the Society. Mr. McLean's final report consisted of one hundred closely typewritten pages.
"My comment on the whole," he said, "would be that the work with families is inherently sound; that nowhere are there any pronounced heretical weaknesses, and that, on the other hand, there is adoption and modification of acknowledged principles." 50

To those who feared that the Federated Charities would soon forget the curative, preventive and constructive side of its work against poverty, and degenerate into a mere relief-giving institution, Mr. McLean in a parting word to the Executive Secretary, replied, All danger of that kind is passed. He had criticisms and many suggestions; none, however, were in conflict with the changes already contemplated by the management. And he left the Society with a collaborated program of readjustment and expansion of work, with a strong plea to augment its work force as it expanded.

Mr. McLean noted that the program for administering direct relief was indicative of the spirit and manner in which changes for the better were being made. The new system gave families more and better groceries at less cost and conserved the human feelings and physical health, and well-being of families. The individual needs of each family were considered separately and fully supplied without exposure to public gaze. No member of the family was sent to the corner grocery with order in hand, to stand and wait as a charity client to order whatever was possible within the prescribed limits of a stereotyped form. The district worker would visit the home and in consultation with the mother as to the actual needs of the family, make out a grocery list, phone the order to the store and it was delivered in the same manner as to other customers.

Each order was in triplicate; one copy was left with the housewife to check each article received, a second was mailed to the grocer to verify the telephone order and the third was retained by the District Secretary as a voucher. The number of grocers was reduced from twenty-six to nine, all of whom entered into written agreement to supply groceries and provisions, meat, and vegetables, according to definite specifications, and at the lowest market prices.

Radical changes were also made in the Sick Diet, at the insistence of the medical fraternity, on whose advice the Society had acted
in setting up the Special Fund for Diet and Ice. The special diet agreed upon at the time was that milk and eggs would constitute the staple foods to be supplied to patients. The first objections to continuing this diet were registered at a joint conference of physicians, nurses and social workers, which was held at the Charities Building. The doctors and nurses both expressed themselves in no uncertain terms against this continued stereotyped form of diet. They pointed out that there were patients who could not assimilate milk and eggs, and they agreed that instead of narrowing the diet down to one or two articles there should be a variety of foods—meats, vegetables, greens or anything desired, subject always to specific prescription of the physician. The discontinuance of eggs as a fixed part of the diet not only resulted in the substitution of foods better, cheaper, and more easily assimilated, but enabled the Society to negotiate a new contract for its supply of milk at a marked reduction of price.  

The employment of a visiting Home Economist or Dietitian was another development credited to the medical fraternity. It had been urged that the giving of a diet without intelligent supervision and follow-up treatment involved in many instances a waste; and better results could be obtained, possibly with little or no increase of expense, if the diet was administered under the supervision of a trained dietitian. With this in mind, the regular appeal for the Diet and Ice Fund for the season of 1911 was accompanied by a supplementary appeal for special contributions toward a guarantee fund for a Dietitian. The money was to be used to meet the additional expense of salary. The response was very prompt and before the end of the season the Society engaged Miss L.E. Weer, Director of the Department of Domestic Science in the Baltimore County Schools, to begin the new work at the opening of the fiscal year, November 1, 1911.

It should be pointed out that the Federated Charities' attitude toward the Diet Fund was a curative one. The Society thought that it could scarcely justify establishing and maintaining a Diet Fund for the benefit of the poor unless at the same time it carried on some educational work, at least in elementary dietetics and domestic economics. They believed that this would do much to forestall the
need for a fund for the diet exactly as the Society sought to do in other forms of material relief.

In September, 1911, the Legal Aid Bureau was started as a separate department of the Federated Charities at 1010 American Building with Thomas F. Cadwalader, General Counsel; and Edward B. Lowndes, secretary. The following is a partial quotation set forth in the prospectus which was circulated at the time of the Bureau's establishment:

The establishment of the Bureau is the result of a need, long felt in Baltimore by those cognizant of actual conditions, for a more prompt and efficient method of giving to the city's poor the necessary legal assistance. In establishing the Bureau the Federated Charities has the cooperation of the Bar Association of Baltimore, and it is further provided that this association shall always have a majority representation on the Executive Committee of the Bureau. It is not the purpose of the Bureau to compete in any way with attorneys, and when an applicant is otherwise in a position to obtain the services of an attorney, he will not receive assistance from the Bureau. 52

Although the Bureau was a separate department, it was not an independent organization. It was a part of the Federated Charities and under the general control and supervision of that corporation, but it was to be self-supporting for at least two years. At the outset, when the newspapers were giving it wide publicity, it was threatened with a flood of applicants from the jail and penitentiary; thrifty offenders in these institutions looked to it as a free handout of legal services for all comers. But the Prisoner's Aid Association promptly volunteered its good offices as a go-between and warded off the danger. 53

At about the same time that the Legal Aid Bureau was being established, the Social Service Corporation of Baltimore, at the request of its president, Mr. Robert Garrett, had been planning a Social Worker's Bureau. One of the main purposes of this Bureau was to list systematically all college graduates residing in the city and to enlist them as far as possible in social service. The Federated Charities had contemplated including this work in its own scheme. By mutual agreement, this function was left to the Social Worker's Bureau with one of the Managers of the Federated Charities being appointed to the Executive Committee of the Bureau to establish connection between the two. 54
To meet the exacting demands of an increasingly enlightened public, the Federated Charities had to give more attention to the training of its workers. Three new workers were assigned during the year 1911, to districts as under-studies with three of the most experienced District Secretaries. These Workers-In-Training and the Assistants in twelve of the district offices were organized into a new weekly class at the Central Office for intensive case study under the instruction of the Assistant to the General Secretary. The General Secretary was continuing with his weekly course in Philanthropy at Goucher College. The Society now required that The Workers-In-Training and the Assistants in the districts were to be admitted to this class only after they had taken the year's instruction in the Central Office Case Study Class. The Society believed that this combination of work, study and collaboration during two academic years would make them more efficient, and in time more expert.

Through special contributors and friends, the Society was able to send one of the district secretaries to the Summer School of Philanthropy in New York for more training in social work, and another district secretary to the winter session of the school for three months. Also, four secretaries were sent to the National Conference of Charities and Correction in Boston. This systematic education of old and new workers was a great asset in that it kept the efficiency of the staff from deteriorating and also because the organization was constantly losing workers to other agencies. 55

The class in Philanthropy at Goucher College, was beginning to bear fruit for the Society. Of the forty-three Goucher College students who elected the course in Philanthropy, seventeen were from Baltimore, three from other parts of Maryland and the remainder were from various other states and three foreign countries. Nine of these students indicated a desire to take up social work as a vocation; others intended to become volunteers. To make the course of study practical, each student was required to go into one of the district offices of the Federated Charities, make a study of the records of at least two families, reduce the records to concise written reports covering investigations,
treatment, and the social significance, and report them to the class for discussion and criticism. 56

The district secretaries continued to cooperate systematically with the Attendance Department of the Public Schools. They saw to it that every child in need of shoes, clothing, proper feeding, eyeglasses, proper medical or surgical treatment, to keep him in school, was fully provided for.

The Society continued unreservedly to concern itself with un-sanitary conditions in which the poor were the chief sufferers. When it was feared that the final $10 million loan for the completion of the city-wide sewer system might be defeated, the Managers of the Federated Charities enlisted the district secretaries and volunteers in the campaign in favor of the loan. In carrying this fight to the public, the Society showed by diagram and chart the number of deaths, sickness and disease among the poor, caused by the poor sewage system. They were able to spread a little fear by warning that the rich would not be safe if an epidemic broke out; and that only through the completion of the storm-water and sewage system could Baltimore expect to see the morbidity and mortality rates go down. 57

The Committee on Improved Housing was continuing its campaign. It too, did not allow the public to lose sight of the fact that the Housing Code did not go far enough in bringing about improvements in tenement housing. The Code applied only to houses containing three or more families, which affected less than 5% of the population. It in no way applied to one-and-two-family houses, which sheltered more than 95% of the population. Even where it applied, the standards represented only the minimum, and the Committee on Housing let it be known that the movement for better housing had barely begun.

Industrial accidents had increased to such an alarming state, that the Federated Charities found itself in the vanguard in demanding Employers Liability and Workman's Compensation Laws for Maryland. The records showed that an increasing number of families applying for aid was the result of injuries received on the job. The workers were underpaid to begin with and when they were injured or maimed on the job they had to bear the entire loss. The subject was made the topic
for discussion at the Annual Meeting of the Federated Charities, McCoy Hall, November 28, 1911. The members of the meeting addressed themselves to the difficult problems involved in legislation of this kind, the essential principles which must enter into it, and at the same time set forth the pressing need for relief of the condition.

Workman's Compensation was recognized as a public problem when Governor Crothers appointed an unpaid commission to study the question and draft a bill to be submitted at the next session of the legislature. The matter was also thrust to the forefront when both political parties adopted planks in their platforms pledging themselves to the enactment of a compensatory law. 58

The proposition for a Charities Endorsement Committee as one of the immediate needs of Baltimore was strongly endorsed by the Social Service Club of Baltimore. Mayor Mahool incorporated in his annual message to the City Council a recommendation for the creation of a board to pass upon all Charities applying for permits or appealing to the public for contributions. Mayor Mahool did not press for the recommendation, but he did appoint a committee to develop, if possible, a charities endorsement plan for Baltimore. The committee reached no conclusion because it could find no experienced central body of citizens with whom to lodge power and responsibility such as was involved in any scheme of charitable endorsement. But, the committee did see certain unifying forces at work in the social, civic and commercial life of the city that in time would serve to remove the difficulties.

Money was always a problem to the charitable societies of Baltimore City; therefore, it goes without saying that the expanded programs taxed the already inadequate financial resources all the more. In order to obtain funds, the General Secretary and the Extension Secretary spent much time in raising money and interpreting the work. They continued the seasonal newspaper relief appeals for the Sick Diet Ice Fund and Christmas Opportunities. All district secretaries had their list of "B.I.'s" to whom they wrote regularly seeking funds for specific families.
Numerous special funds were administered by the Society, such as the Robert Crain Testimonial Fund. This fund was given to Mr. Crain, and in return by him to the agency, in recognition of his success in bringing to Baltimore the National Democratic Convention in 1912 which nominated Woodrow Wilson for President of the United States. The Society was also receiving help in raising funds from the Speakers Bureau which was organized in November of 1914. At the same time, "Helping Hand" was published to tell of the work and needs of the Federated Charities. One of the earliest issues carried the news that Maryland had passed a Workman's Compensation Law. 59

By 1915, fund raising by the various individual organizations had become a problem and concern for the future use of this method was paramount to all of the charity organizations. Members representing most of the charity organizations in the City had met periodically for several years to consider what the possibilities were for financial federation. In February of 1915, the Federated Charities was one of twelve non-sectarian agencies which formed the Baltimore Alliance for the purpose of securing funds through one joint annual appeal. 60 The Federated Charities believed in this alliance of voluntary agencies as a solution to the money raising problem, even though, through such federation, it had less opportunity for close relationships with contributors.

In March of 1916, through the efforts of the Federated Charities, legislation was secured compelling support of children by dependent parents, known as the Dependent Parents Act. 61 In September of 1916, the Society became the Red Cross International member for Maryland. In this capacity, it was called upon to care for needy families of soldiers and work in connection with any general Red Cross movement that was instituted. The Central Office of the Federated Charities moved to McCoy Hall in December of 1916 which was offered by the Johns Hopkins trustees to the Baltimore Alliance free of rent.

The General Secretary who had been on leave to the National Red Cross, returned to the Federated Charities in January of 1918 after an absence of nearly ten months. But, the return was only for a couple of months; the General Secretary, Mr. J. W. Magruder, resigned from
the Federated Charities in March of 1918 to become the Southern District Manager for the War Department—Training Camp activities conducted by the Playground Recreation Association of America. Miss Theo Jacobs again was to become Acting General Secretary beginning the first of April, 1918. The Health Insurance Bill drafted by a special committee of the Federated Charities was defeated by the House of the Maryland General Assembly in April of 1918. The bill though defeated, did serve to bring the whole subject before the public for serious discussion. And it was the hope of the Society that this public discussion would lead in due time to intelligent legislation. 62

The agency along with others was instrumental in the inauguration at Johns Hopkins of courses for the training of social workers in 1919. The courses were given by the Department of Political Economy. Miss Theo Jacobs resigned as Assistant Secretary of the Federated Charities in October of 1919 to become the teacher of Family Case Work and the full-time staff member in connection with the courses. Miss Elsie Bond who had been assisting Miss Jacobs succeeded her; and the Federated Charities also began supervised field training for the social work students at Johns Hopkins. 63

With the development of financial federation and specialized agencies, the Federated Charities gradually became aware of the fact that its responsibility for organization of services had lessened and it had become a specialized agency, with the welfare of the family the focus of its interest. There were those in the agency who contended that its name had no significance and that its relations to the Alliance gave no clue as to the agency's function. This overall feeling which had prevailed for some time led to the Federated Charities' vote to change its name to the Family Welfare Association at the annual meeting held in Levering Hall on the 17th of November 1919. 64 This change was confirmed by an Act of the Legislature on May 17, 1920.

Here we see the Society acknowledging a change that had come about. And, by 1919, this change in scope and method was recognized by a majority of the Society's leadership. They believed that its aim would be reached sooner by focusing on the new interest, which was the welfare of the family.
In summary, we see that the Federated Charities represented the merger of two agencies which had competed and worked at cross-purposes. The relations between the two, AICP and COS, had become a pressing question. A cordial and effective cooperation between the two societies would ensure to each the benefit of the other's resources and avoid the unnecessary expense of maintaining two sets of agents to investigate the same cases of alleged destitution. Therefore, the leadership and supporters of both agencies thought that federation offered, as a whole, the best guarantee to improve charity work in Baltimore. In their opinion, it was both practicable and desirable.

The Federation continued to place emphasis on the treatment of the individual according to his needs. It was more successful in establishing and carrying out a program of rehabilitation. This was due to the concern for new services to meet needs which did not fall within the immediate province of the agency.

There was more cohesiveness among the social agencies than ever before. The Confidential Exchange of Information proved its effectiveness after three years of operation. Also, the efforts put forth to cooperate with other agencies resulted in the passage of legislation of a local and state-wide nature. The Federated Charities received not only local support but state-wide support in its legislative program. There were child labor laws and laws regulating conditions in the institutions for juveniles, the informed and disabled. One of the most positive factors to come out of inter-agency cooperation was the Baltimore Alliance of 1915, calling for a joint appeal to the public for support.

In retrospect, it was during the existence of the Federated Charities that charity work in Baltimore City reached maturity. Better trained workers were hired, and older workers returned to school for more training. And it is important to note that when the organization reached the point that necessitated a change in focus and interest, there was no real opposition. Thus, in 1919 when the name was changed to the Family Welfare Association, the Society had reached another plateau. Its aim now was not merely to meet the immediate needs of the
individual. In contrast, the primary focus became the evaluation of causative factors and meeting needs in relation to an individual's social environment, the family.
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CHAPTER V

THE FAMILY WELFARE ASSOCIATION
1919-1942

The fundamental purpose of the Family Welfare Association was the promotion of better family life. Its aims were to help families overcome difficulties which they could not overcome without help. Therefore, the Family Welfare Association inherited the aims of both the Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor and the Charity Organization Society as to the treatment of families on the basis of their needs and through plans designed to help them become contributing members of society to the extent of their individual capacities. Service, as distinguished from relief, was the major emphasis. But, this aim became more of an ideal than an actual accomplishment because the Association inherited a relief function too. It was the one city-wide non-sectarian relief agency and carried responsibility for a very large percentage of the relief needs of the city. And it should be noted here that in the twenties, when there were some prosperous years, the agency gave assistance to more families because of unemployment than it had in all previous recession years. For the Family Welfare Association's caseload increased year after year until relief demands became far and beyond anything in its previous experience.¹

The events of the twenties, as a result of the economic system, could not have been foreseen by the FWA. In addition, there were other mishaps in its inception that were unexpected and detrimental to its program. The same month that its name was changed (November, 1919), McCoy Hall where the Central Office was located, was destroyed by fire. Records of the FWA for the period from around 1912 to 1919, especially the Annual Reports and correspondence, were lost. In December, the office was temporarily located at 505 North Howard
Street. Then, in January of 1920, the Baltimore Alliance rented the Old Fountain Hotel at the corner of Pratt and Calvert Streets, but it was not until April that the FWA moved to the new address. At the time, the FWA had to face the immediate task of trying to operate without records. Great credit must go to the staff who did a yeoman's job to relieve this matter somewhat through the tedious task of copying from district files and from the master file of the Bureau of State and Municipal Research.

The year 1920 also began with numerous changes in the leadership which caused a temporary interruption in the program of the FWA. Mr. Knowlton Mixer was appointed General Secretary in April of 1920 and resigned in December to take effect January 1, 1921. In November, Miss Elsie Bond resigned as Assistant Secretary; and Miss Anna D. Ward, Secretary of the Northern District, was appointed Central Office Supervisor of Case Work. The following month, Miss Ward was appointed Acting Assistant Secretary to become effective January 1.

The year 1921 was one of retrenchment for the Family Welfare Association. This was due to the increasing unemployment and consequent heavy demands on the FWA for relief. A drastic "retrenchment program" was put into effect in order that as much of the available funds as possible could be devoted to relief. The southwest and Middlewest Districts were combined; others were housed together and both the case work and the clerical staff were reduced. The "B.I.'s" appeals that had been discontinued in 1919 were renewed because of the emergency with the consent and endorsement of the Baltimore Alliance. A Municipal Employment Bureau was created by the Mayor upon the recommendation of the FWA in cooperation with other private agencies. And the FWA received from the city through the Board of Estimates - $7,720.00 of an appropriation of $15,000.00 for the relief of the distress caused by unemployment.

Due to the improvement in industrial conditions, there was a decrease in applications by unemployed persons the next year. The Association cared for 3,169 families or 611 less than in 1921. These families consisted of 13,825 individuals and averaged 4.3 persons per family. Of the total number under care, 2,631 families or 82% were
American-born -- 1,859 white and 722 Negro. The largest foreign-born group were Polish (205 families); the next largest, German (95 families); and the third, Italian (92 families). The vast majority of 2,177 families, had Protestant church connections while 793 were Roman Catholic. In more than 50% of the cases, the head of the family was an unskilled worker, but many were skilled and 26 were professional. 5

Sickness as usual was the problem more often met than any other with mental or physical illness accounting for 1,951 cases. Unemployment and underemployment, which were first on the list of problems in 1921, had second place in 1922 with a total number of 1,396 instances—or 440 less than in 1921. The third largest group of problems were desertion and non-support and other domestic difficulties with a total of 753 instances, a larger number than in 1921. The FWA wondered whether this was because a long period of unemployment had weakened family ties, or the improved industrial conditions encouraged the potential deserter to try his fortune in new fields, leaving his family to shift as best they could. A curious fact that was observed in family social work was that men who never felt their full responsibility for their families stayed home when times were hard and work difficult to secure; but deserted in good times. The Association had begun to note in prosperous times there was an unusually large number of desertions.

The FWA observed also that conditions in regard to intemperance were interesting, but not easy to explain. In spite of the reduced number of families under care, intemperance was found to be the problem in almost twice as many families in 1922 as in 1921. There were 102 in 1922 as against 56 in 1921 and in 1920 intemperance was a problem in only 22 instances out of 2,793 families under care. The percentage figures over the three-year period were: 1920, 8%; 1921, 1.5%; 1922, 3.2%. Other problems during this time were dependent old age, illegitimacy and dependent widow-hood. 6

As the problems that the Association faced were varied, so the help given had to be varied according to the need. More than half of the families under care required service only, while the others needed
material relief as well. The expenditure for material relief was $104,286.64, the largest amount that had ever been given by the Association in a single year. About $20,000 of this was given to carry families over the period of unemployment, and the largest expenditure was in the early months of 1922. Baltimore City, through the Supervisors of City Charities, refunded to the FWA $9,990 spent on unemployment cases in January and February of 1922. $35,425.20 was given to 120 families in the form of regular allowances which for the most part were given to widowed mothers with children under working age and to families of men who were regaining their health through sanitarium treatment. Among the many other services rendered by the agency were securing medical treatment, finding employment, providing business equipment or special vocational training or in other ways straightening out domestic difficulties. The Association also aided in finding better homes, giving instruction in household economics, and strengthening connections with church and relatives.  

In March of 1922, Miss Anna D. Ward was appointed General Secretary of the FWA and a Negro worker was approved by the Board for the Western District. The request for the latter appointment was made by the Colored Conference which paid half of the worker's salary. And in May, the General Secretary was granted a leave of absence from June 8th to October 1st to do postgraduate work at the University of Chicago.

The Association began the work of 1923 with hopeful assurance. Industry in Baltimore had revived, the unemployment problem was less and the people seemed a little more prosperous than in the early months of 1922. But, this did not mean that the work of the agency would be lighter or the problems less in degree. As a matter of fact the problems continued to grow faster than the staff and the increase in the budget that were so necessary to deal with them. Sickness persisted, disabling accidents occurred, old age overtook men and women who had not been able to make provisions for it and breadwinners died and left helpless dependents.
In January, the Confidential Exchange of Information was renamed the Baltimore Social Service Exchange. Until this time the Confidential Exchange was a department of the FWA; now it was to be operated as a separate member agency of the Baltimore Alliance. The plan was to strengthen its cooperation with other agencies, because its purpose was to benefit all social agencies, not merely the FWA. It was also felt that the service of an Exchange could be greatly expanded if it was managed and financed by the group of agencies using it instead of by a single agency.  

Miss Dorothy Pope was appointed Assistant General Secretary in February and the Fifth Edition of the Directory of Social Work was published. The last edition, published in 1917, was out of date. The Directory, which was compiled by the FWA, was used daily by all social workers. The Eleanor Carey Scholarship was awarded to Miss Georgia Walker, Secretary in the Patterson Park District for special work with immigrant families under the National Board of the YWCA of New York.  

In January of 1924, a Young Men's Conference was organized to discuss specific problems relating to civic issues and public questions. The conferences discussed over a period of time some of the main problems faced by the charity agencies of the city and were helpful in publicizing the difficulties that they faced in trying to deal with them. The Young Men's Conference did more than talk; they succeeded in having a resolution passed by the Maryland Legislature in April advising State Institutions to buy brooms from the Maryland Workshop for the Blind, thus making that institution able to employ and train a larger number of handicapped people. This was important because the Association had made an agreement with the Goodwill Industries to give work tests and occupational training to the FWA's handicapped clients. This relieved the agency of some responsibility and gave it more time to try to place the handicapped.

As in previous years, there were certain administrative changes in personnel and program. Miss Anna Bond was made Executive Secretary of the Social Service Exchange. The Middlewest District was divided and the old Southwest District was re-established. Miss Pope,
the Assistant Secretary, began study classes at the Central Office for new workers. The field work for Johns Hopkins University social work students was centralized in the Southwest District and Miss Margaretta Culver was made supervisor. And Dr. Esther L. Richards of the Phipps Psychiatric Clinic, Johns Hopkins Hospital, volunteered her services for psychiatric problems by holding monthly conferences with the staff of the FWA.10

While the Association from the beginning insisted upon adequate knowledge as a basis for social treatment, the conception of what was adequate knowledge had changed greatly. It continued to change as the FWA took over and made practical use of discoveries in related fields especially in psychiatry and psychology. There was the time that such descriptions as shiftless, lazy, non-supporting, bad-tempered, untruthful and similar general characteristics entered largely into the diagnoses of unsatisfactory homes. But the Society was able to make great advances when mental tests were standardized and made available for practical use. At first the members of the FWA were astounded at the findings of some of the tests, but in the 20's they had become routine in a large number of its cases. Therefore, the Society increasingly placed its emphasis on personality study.

The Association saw that in the midst of growing city life, many persons of normal mental capacity made sorry failures of living and working together with their families, their neighbors and their fellow workmen. Neither sympathetic nor disciplinary treatment at the hands of the social worker, clergymen, or jedge would effect the desired transformation unless the treatment was based on the findings of a very delicate and scientific study of the complex personality. While the Association would hold on to its concept of the family as the vital and indispensable unit of society, it now called for the physical, mental and moral development of each individual as well as the well-being of the family collectively.11

During the year 1925, the FWA had under care 4,197 families for whom it accepted responsibility for social diagnosis and treatment. This total was the largest number cared for in any one year by the
Association and was an increase of 5% over 1924 (3,987). To some extent the increase was due to the unsatisfactory business conditions during the early part of the year when there existed a large amount of unemployment. But there were other factors, such as an increase in population, better acquaintance with the work of the organization and improved standards.  

Of the families under care, 2,266 or 54% were native white Americans; 1,213 or 28% were Negro; and 718 or 17% were foreign-born. A three-year comparison of figures showed that the proportion of American-born white families and foreign-born families was decreasing while the proportion of Negro families was increasing. A study of the birthplaces of the Negro families under care in a largely Negro district showed that the greater number were not Maryland-born, but migrated to Baltimore from farther south, with most of them coming from Virginia. As to religious affiliation, 2,716 of 65% were Protestant; 1,185 or 26% were Roman Catholic; while the remaining 9% belonged to other faiths or had no religious connection. There was also at the time a noticeable increase in the proportion of Roman Catholic families coming to the agency for help.

The major problems grouped themselves in the same order as they had in each year since the bad industrial period of 1921, when industrial problems were first on the list. In 1925, the figures were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Health Problems</th>
<th>2,941</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>2,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Industrial</td>
<td>1,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>1,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underemployment</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial accident</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational disease</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child under sixteen working illegals</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) Domestic Problems

Desertion and non-support 794
Non-support of dependent parent 77
Domestic difficulty 553

Outstanding problems in addition to the above were dependent old age (333), illegitimacy (333), sexual immorality (285), intemperance (281), bad housing (263), and debt (232).14

Statistical reports do not adequately present a picture of the Association's activities. This was particularly true with respect to the services rendered so that much that the FWA did for families cannot be classified. But the statistical reports clearly show the tremendous expanse of the Society. Of the families under care, 1,811 or 43.1% were given service and relief, while the remaining 2,386 or 56.9% needed only service. The total expenditure for material relief such as rent, food, clothing, and fuel was $120,255.25 as compared to $127,988.85 for the year 1924 when fewer families were under care. There were two factors that principally contributed to the reduction of relief expenditures in spite of increased case load. The first was that unemployment as a widespread problem did not continue throughout the year; and the second was that the Society practiced a more rigid economy with respect to all relief expenditures.15

The Baltimore Alliance was succeeded in June of 1925 by the Community Fund which included the Baltimore Alliance agencies and others which indicated their intention of joining the Fund. With the organization of the Community Fund, the FWA noticed an improved spirit of cooperation and a more congenial attitude among the various charity agencies. But, the Association also noticed a number of interesting effects upon its work, quite apart from the relationship between the Society’s budget and campaign success. Some of the things that it noticed immediately were that it was on equal footing through membership in the Fund with agencies whose standards and policies had not been identical to its own. The organization of the Fund tended to increase its case load and at the same time dried up many sources of relief which the Association used to supplement relief expenditures.
In the early days of the Fund, the idea was becoming wide-
spread that a contribution to the Fund was an insurance premium that
relieved friends, relatives, and other natural connections from respon-
sibility for aid to those having a claim upon them. For example, one
firm referred to the Association for relief of a man who had been in its
employ for sixteen years. The man had been ill for four months and
the money collected for his assistance from his fellow employees had
been exhausted. The firm believed that since it had contributed to the
Community Fund that it should make no allowance to this employee.
The FWA was able to get them to modify this decision and supply the
allowance needed. Another firm because of its contribution to the
Fund, discontinued a pension to an aged employee who had worked
fifty-four years for them and referred him to the FWA for relief.
Therefore, before these wrong ideas became more harmful, the members of
the Fund had to get across to the general public and the business
community that a contribution to the Fund was not an insurance premium
that entitled them to pass their responsibilities on to the agencies of
the Fund.16

The Association had reached the point in history where its task
continued to be a large one, though not a new one. There was no
indication of a decrease in the need of the Agency's services in the
individual homes. But, there was no doubt that its efforts had to be
more coordinated with those of other social agencies in both case work
activities and in attacking community problems.

By 1927, the FWA was giving some form of service to one family
out of every thirty-one in the city. Even though all of them did not
require material assistance, a larger percentage than ever before was
financially dependent. The following table gives the number of
families under care and the comparison between 1926 and 1927:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1926</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of</td>
<td>5,421</td>
<td>6,132</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>families under care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major service to</td>
<td>4,296</td>
<td>4,535</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>families ....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor service to</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>families ....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of families receiving material relief .......... 1,819 2,276 25.1

Relief Expenditures ...... $138,009 $170,434 23.4

Unemployment again became the most outstanding problem, with more families suffering from this socio-economic ill than from any other single problem, and it affected a larger percentage of the total number of families than in any other year for which the Association had figures. Along with unemployment were the almost as devastating problems of underemployment and insufficient wage. Figures for unemployment and underemployment for 1926 and 1927 were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1926</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underemployment</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The problem of unemployment was recognized not only as the Agency's number one problem, but by 1927 the FWA had a far better understanding of its far-reaching effect on society. It had become quite clear that the first to be laid off by the employer when business was dull or when he was reorganizing, were the shiftless, the inefficient, those suffering from some physical and mental conditions, or the aged who could not compete with the young and more vigorous workers. Such persons were the first to appeal to a relief agency for assistance. But, from 1927 on, widespread unemployment existed in Baltimore to such a degree that skilled workmen who were self-respecting were forced to appeal to the Association after months of idleness, during which they had used their savings and credit, and had reduced expenses to a minimum.

The FWA found that unemployment had an undermining and destructive influence on the family it attacked. The first thing noted was how it diminished the worker's efficiency and lowered his morale and of his family in many ways. In the early days of the unemployment period, businessmen and municipal authorities were inclined to deny
its existence. There were interviews in the newspapers with Chamber of Commerce officials and much space given to how excellent business was, but no news items about the plants that were shut down completely or whole departments closed, or those which had moved away from the city. The father of a family lost his job and started out hopefully to find a new one; and because of the favorable newspaper reports, he thought that he would have no trouble, in particular if he had a trade. He naturally tried the plants that hired men with his skills, going from one to another. Finding no work, he began to wonder, then he found other men who were having the same experience. Then he began to understand, but in most cases not before his homelife had been disturbed. The wife had read the papers and she, too, was puzzled and began to doubt her husband's truthfulness when he said that he could not find work. This led to loss of confidence, misunderstanding and bitterness in a time of worry, fatigue, and discouragement which ended in the disintegration of the home.

The FWA, knowing this, had to stand by helplessly in the presence of a personality deterioration which rapidly progressed as the period of unemployment stretched from weeks into months. The Association's main office was receiving increasing reports from its workers on how family men in their districts were losing self-respect, sense of responsibility and interest in family advancement. There were the reports of those who had become bitter toward the government and the social institutions of the community. There were those who suffered mental breakdowns, some began a career of lawlessness and those who were able to survive all of the pitfalls, suffered from a deterioration of skills.19

The lack of an adequate income lowered health standards, for food presented an opportunity for economy more readily than did many other budget items. The baby's milk order was reduced, or discontinued altogether; green vegetables disappeared from the menu, for starchy foods were cheaper and they went further. Recreational advantages were curtailed and young people were more apt to form unwholesome associations. Furniture was sold or placed as security for a
loan or broken up and used for fuel. Debts were accumulated and even if the wage earners returned to work, they were so burdened with indebtedness that they had to have help to see them through this difficulty. So the FWA experienced a lag in clearing up its unemployment problems because relief expenditures continued on after some of the workers returned to work.

The continuing problems resulting from recurring periods of unemploy-ment made it crystal clear that philanthropy was not the cure. If any solution was found, it would have to be by capital and labor, businessmen and governmental authorities, and the political economist. By 1928, it had also become clear that private philanthropy not only could not solve the problem, but it could not continue to pay the increasing cost of relief. In Baltimore City the municipality had acknowledged some responsibility for the care of the dependent children, for nursing and medical care for the sick, institutional care of the dependent aged and for recreational needs of young people. Its traditions were against giving outdoor relief, that is, relief to families in their own homes, except when it could be persuaded that a general emergency existed.20

From April 27 to May 11, 1928, the Association closed its intake to families whose needs grew out of unemployment—the first "refusal" in its history. Nineteen hundred twenty-eight experienced a heavy increase as each year had since 1921. The peak of the problem came in the early period of the year beginning in January and continued to be extremely heavy during the spring months. The demands were such that in May the Board of Estimates voted an appropriation of $4,000 to the Association to reimburse it for money spent on families of unemployed persons. The total number of families receiving some form of service or relief was the largest recorded; the number of families requiring material assistance was greater than ever before and the same applied to the amount of money spent for material relief. The total number of families under care was 6,281—4,467 for major service and 1,814 for minor service. This represented an increase of 249 families or 4% over the number cared for in 1927, but in relation to the population of the city, it was about what it was in 1927, that is, about one family
out of every thirty-one in the city. Of the major service families, 2,611 received material relief at a cost of $179,232, or an average of $68.64 per relief family.

Two other agencies were helpful in meeting the unemployment situation. The Community Fund office gave the services of one of its employees to be used in an effort to find work for the unemployed in a family. This proved to be a very worthwhile venture, because jobs were found for many of those who really wanted work, and others who were not honestly seeking work were weeded from the Association's relief lists. The venture also demonstrated the possibility of finding many jobs even in the midst of a general unemployment situation and the value of an employment service as a part of the FWA's program.

The second agency which gave notable help was the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society. The Staff and Board of that agency voted during the emergency to give service to a group of families ordinarily accepted by the FWA, thus giving the FWA more time to work on the unemployed families. The Henry Watson Children's Aid Society also paid from its own fund certain board bills of children of families under care of the FWA.

In February of 1928, the Baltimore Labor College held a conference on unemployment. Representatives of employers, labor, government, economics, and social workers participated. The conference voted to ask Mayor Broening to appoint a Commission to study the problem in its relation to Baltimore. Such a Committee was appointed and in July made its report. The chief recommendation of the report was the appointment of a permanent Commission, with an economist in its employ, to collect and interpret facts, and to make suggestions to the various groups involved. A permanent Commission representing various interests seemed the only effective way of approaching an intelligent solution as far as the local problem was concerned. To the FWA the end result of unemployment was an accumulation of family and community problems; therefore it was better social work to prevent them than to try and cure them.
After the industrial problem, the next largest group was health and behavior problems. Conspicuous among the health problems were mental defectiveness, tuberculosis, malnutrition, cardiac condition and syphilis. There were also a large number of behavior problems under care such as non-support, desertion, domestic infelicity and alcoholism.

Old age dependency was another problem that was increasing the work of the FWA. During 1928, the Association had 294 families in which dependent old age was a problem. The percentage of old age dependents had increased from 3% in 1921 to 6% in 1928. The increase was attributed to two factors, the lengthening span of life and the earlier arrival of the industrial age. In actual members and in proportion to the total population there were more persons over sixty-five years of age in the United States than ever before and it was becoming increasingly more difficult for a person over forty-five who lost his job to find a new one. It was also clear that wages had not been large enough for these workers to have saved enough to support themselves when they were too old to work. 24

Since 1921 the history of the Association had been a struggle to meet the relief needs of families due to unemployment. Now the question was looming large as to whether this growing responsibility belonged wholly to privately supported social work. The task of securing funds for private social agencies was growing increasingly difficult, while the demands upon them were apparently without limits. Theoretically, the state assumed some responsibility for the social well-being of its citizens, but the practical expression of that feeling of responsibility was totally inadequate to the needs. As the demands were increasing, the state had made no plans to expand its responsibility in this connection. The FWA was beginning to spread its services too thin over a wide range of relief needs which was detrimental to the quality of its work. It became obvious that if every kind of problem got a little help from the Association, none would get enough. This is why the Association had to refuse applicants for the first time in its history for the short period between April 27 and May 11. 25 Therefore, the biggest responsibility facing the FWA at the end of the year 1928 was to
examine its program with the view of determining what was the proper relationship between relief from private contributions and relief from public funds.

During the year, Johns Hopkins University found that it could no longer support the courses for the training of social workers that were instituted in 1919. Therefore, in 1928, the courses in social economics were discontinued at the end of the academic year, leaving the job of training workers in the hands of the Training Committee of the FWA. 26

Unemployment was the most conspicuous problem in 1929; but the year was considerably lighter in work for the FWA than was 1928. The total number of families under care was 5,598-3,666 major care and 1,932 minor care or 10.8% less than the number under care in 1928. The total relief expenditures were 9.6% less than in 1928, which amounted to $161,999 for 1929 and $179,232 for 1928. The experience in job finding which began in 1928 by the Community Fund led to the formation of the Placement Service of the Association in 1929. Two persons, a man and a woman, were doing a satisfactory job in finding work in that 719 persons were found permanent employment, 377 were found temporary employment and 323 refused work which was found. 27

During the year, the Association published a much needed edition of the Directory of Social Work, cooperated in a survey of the Community Fund agencies doing work with children, engaged in a number of staff studies regarding the case work policies of the Association, and was represented in inter-agency activities regarding community needs. These and past experiences indicated the necessity for a certain amount of social work and especially relief work that should be taken over by the public and supported at the expense of taxpayers. At the 1929 session of the State Legislature, several bills were passed directly affecting family social work. One bill which provided for vocational education to industrially disabled persons went into effect October 1 under the State Board of Education. 28 Two other pieces of legislation carried appropriations for relief which had heretofore been met from the family society's budget. These two, Mother's Pensions and Relief to Blind Persons, went into effect on January 1, 1930. 29
The FWA's dilemma was that while it would always have an interest in community projects which affected the well-being of families, its primary function was no longer considered to be leadership in community organizations, as it was in the early days of the Charity Organization Society. The family society had concentrated its efforts more and more upon its case work function so that by 1929, the Association regarded itself as existing primarily for the treatment and prevention of family problems. Unfortunately, neither the general public nor the other social agencies understood this interpretation of the Association's function. Rather, they looked upon it as a large central relief fund into which all the community might dip for the meeting of any kind of financial need. There existed a number of specialized case work agencies; but they had equipped themselves to give service only. Therefore, when their own plans required financial assistance they too turned to the family society, bringing about a transfer of responsibility, which increased the burden of the Association. The task of the Association was to define and interpret its functions to the general public and the other social agencies. This was necessary because the increased burden weakened its standards at the time the FWA needed to improve its case work methods in terms of quality of service rather than quantity. 30

The problem of unemployment continued to increase in size and intensity in 1930. The number of families needing help in one month because of unemployment was greater than the number which in better times had been assisted by the FWA in a whole year for all other social problems. During 1930, there were under care 6,543 families, 17% more than in 1929 and 4% more than in 1928. Of this number, 3,324 or 49% received material assistance, a far larger proportion receiving relief than ever before. Three thousand, four hundred seventeen families or 52% suffered from unemployment, while underemployment was present in 747 families. 31

Of course, there were the many other family problems, the usual variety of health and behavior problems which occur in families whether times are good or bad. But in many families unemployment was the direct cause of other problems. Jobs that were expected to be permanent
were found for individuals in 1,200 families and temporary work was found for 827. The FWA found that many persons continued to hold the positions found for them but many had lost these jobs, some because of unsatisfactory personal characteristics. One of the most disastrous effects of unemployment was personality deterioration. It was hard for an employer to understand that men who had worked irregularly or not at all for months or years had lost the habit of work, as well as technical skill, and had to learn to work all over again which accounted for the unsatisfactory qualities he found in them.

The unemployment experiences of 1930 did not lend themselves very well to case work treatment. Therefore, more than 2/3 of the time, money and effort were spent on palliative, non-curative and non-preventive work. The value of relief work was not minimized, because the fundamental principle of social work was the relief of suffering and it was absolutely necessary in the emergency. Relief was needed on a much larger scale than ever, and it was the obligation of the FWA to assume a large responsibility in relief work. But, social case work had developed a technique and standards calling for cure and prevention and the case worker treated the social ills of a family on the basis that a recurrence of the same problem be reduced to a minimum. It became obvious that the case worker could not give this sort of treatment to families suffering by reason of unemployment when thousands of families were affected and jobs could be found for only a small proportion of them.32

The FWA continued to emphasize that unemployment was a community problem to be dealt with, not through social case work, but by social reform. The Association also expressed the belief that unemployment could not be cured or prevented until its causes were discovered. The Agency found that the experts in the fields of business, government, and political economy not only differed widely in their opinions as to the causes, but the experts in the same fields expressed directly opposite views. A group might agree that unemployment was a monetary phenomenon, and then immediately disagree on the subject of wages, some contending that the worker had too much money and that wages had to come down, while others insisted that the worker had too little to
spend and that wages had to go up in order that consumption could catch up with production.

Family social work had little if anything to contribute toward the discovery of the causes and remedies of unemployment. But it could and did testify to the relative price in human suffering and to the direct and indirect costs that communities had to pay. The social worker knew that unemployment destroyed standards of living, that homes were lost, that families moved from good neighborhoods into poor ones, that household effects which were gathered slowly over the years were disposed of for almost nothing. They knew that children were taken from school prematurely, health was endangered due to insufficient food, insufficient clothing and insufficient heat that broke down physical resistance. Children developed diseases which had their beginnings in undernutrition and adults became acutely ill or developed diseases like tuberculosis which involved long and expensive treatment. Disappointment, worry, misunderstanding, bitterness, discouragement, fatigue, inability to meet responsibilities, pounding day after day, and month after month in the human mind, was more than many could stand, and they escaped into mental depressions, the cost of which was met in terms of expensive hospital or clinic care. Some of those who did not suffer much mental breakdowns, became dependent in other ways, or became so very bitter in their attitudes that they were easy prey for those who would resort to violence to gain their ends.

And it became frightfully clear to the FWA that each new periodic return of unemployment was more extensive than the preceding one, that it involved more people and lasted longer. 33

In the late summer, the Association's funds were being used at such a rapid rate that it was impossible to keep within the approved budget. Every resource opened to the agency was tried, but extra funds were so slow in coming that for ten days in early October it had to refuse to assist new families. During the ten days more than 100 families in dire need were turned away. Finally the Association received some assistance through city funds, $8,921 which, together with the assurance of a share in the emergency money of the Community Fund, enabled the agency to complete the year without any further lapse in service. 34
As there was no public relief agency in Baltimore, the necessity for providing relief to the unemployed continued to fall on the private agencies in 1931 as it had in 1930 and before. The FWA, for example, began 1931 with demands approximately 2 1/2 times as great as at the beginning of 1930. The approved budget for the year 1931 was the same as 1930, which as indicated, had proven insufficient for that year. However, the Community Fund granted the FWA $42,000 from the emergency contributions, and that amount enabled the Association to carry the extra work until the end of February. This money was used entirely for relief to families and for extra workers. The unemployment relief work was as far as possible separated from the usual work of the districts, and was handled by an emergency unit organized in connection with each regular district office. The districts worked at wartime speed to handle the unprecedented volume of work. The offices were not large enough to provide space for all persons who came for interviews and lines began to form on the street outside of the office. During January more than 8,000 persons were interviewed in the district offices.

However, it became obvious early in 1931 that the funds raised in the usual way were totally inadequate to meet the need. In February, at the suggestion of the Board of the FWA, and after conferences with officials of the Jewish Charities, the Catholic Charities and the Community Fund, the Association of Commerce was asked to assume leadership in organizing a Citizens Committee to raise and distribute funds as needed and to coordinate the work of the agencies. The Citizens Emergency Relief Committee was organized under the chairmanship of Mr. W. Frank Roberts. This Committee raised $669,166.00 which included $247,000.00 from the City of Baltimore. Four hundred twenty-four thousand, four hundred fifty-one dollars of this was administered by the FWA for relief only and in addition it spent $189,904.00 for relief, which was received from the Community Fund and directly from contributions. The larger part of the Community Fund budget went for service and operations which were not paid for by the Citizens Emergency Relief Committee.
Since the Citizens Emergency Relief Committee provided funds for relief only, it was exceedingly difficult for the Association to maintain a sufficient staff. But the morale and capacity for work of the Agency was strengthened considerably, because throughout the year a number of contributing friends of the Association, realizing its dilemma, sent special contributions to pay for workers. Other social agencies loaned workers, sometimes paying all of their salaries. The volunteers redoubled their efforts and interest, and more recruits were added to the volunteer staff. The Federation of Churches helped to secure the understanding and cooperation of the churches. The YMCA with its 24-hour telephone service, gave valuable help in serving as the receiving station for after hours and holiday calls. This special kind of aid and encouragement not only helped the budget and the families being served, but in a larger measure it helped to stimulate and maintain the faith of the Association's staff. 38

During the year, there were under care a total of 12,837 families which represented one family out of every fourteen in the city. There were 9,658 families, or about 3/4 of the total number, who had to have material relief. Five thousand five hundred and six families, or 43% of all the families were Negroes. Negroes represented about 14% of the City's population and ordinarily made up about 28% of the work of the Association. The total amount of money spent for relief was $614,355 against $173,437 spent in 1930. The amount given each family was inadequate, averaging about $5.00 per week per family. The funds were not sufficient to provide more adequate help, and the attempt was to meet immediate needs only, allowing other needs to be postponed. Rents were paid only when eviction was threatened or had taken place. Gas bills were paid only when service had been discontinued or was about to be discontinued. Shoes and clothing were given only when immediately needed, and comparatively little new clothing was purchased. Food was the largest amount for relief, and here the allowance in a family budget was $1.00 per week per member of a family. 39

The Association began to link the unparalleled economic need to vast and significant changes that were occurring in the industrial and social life of the country, that were not to be fully understood until
some future time. The Society knew that for twelve years or more family relief societies had been experiencing an increase in their relief requirements. In 1928, the Association aided in a statistical study covering the previous ten-year period. The study revealed that fully two-thirds of the increased expenditures could be attributed to the demands made because of unemployment. The experiences of the Association dating back to around 1921, gave it no reason to believe that the needs of Baltimore's poor families could be reduced to the point of being reasonably cared for on the amount of money raised through voluntary giving even after the depression. The Society saw emerging out of the period of unemployment many other problems which social and health agencies would be called upon to meet and pay for in years after the depression had lifted. The problem of increasing relief demands upon private social agencies without correspondingly increasing income had reached such proportions that they would have to master it or it would destroy them.  

Leaders within the social agencies in Baltimore had for a long time recognized the need for a continuing program to study the social needs, to coordinate the work of existing agencies, to assign fields of real usefulness to agencies whose programs might not be so necessary under conditions which had changed greatly since they were organized, and to improve standards of work and promote new programs where new work was needed. They emphasized that Baltimore needed a Council of Social Agencies. Subsequently, a step in this direction was taken when the FWA's Committee on Family and Adult Case Work became, unofficially, the Council of Social Agencies. The membership included representatives of member agencies of the Community Fund, the Catholic and Jewish agencies. But it was not until 1935 that this new Agency was officially organized.  

Baltimore City entered 1932 with its unemployment rate estimated to be over 61,000. This was out of the 365,108 gainful workers of the city. The population of Baltimore City was approximately 806,874, ranking about eighth in size of population below St. Louis and above Boston. The general character of the population was native white, but 18.6% were Negro. Nearly 1/2 of the population of the entire state,
69.39% were in Baltimore City.\textsuperscript{43}

The year 1932 was a history making year for the FWA, and for Baltimore social work. In spite of unparalleled success in raising funds from private gifts to care for the ever increasing burden of unemployment relief, within the first three months of the year, the FWA, along with the other relief agencies, reached the end of its ability to carry on. All concerned agreed that there was no other way by which the great need could be met other than by the municipality assuming a large measure of the responsibility. So, for the first time in history, the city of Baltimore assumed the largest part of the relief burden to families in their own homes. The city had no general public relief department; therefore, relief was provided through the private agencies which took this responsibility, assuming all costs for administration and operation from their privately contributed funds. From March of 1932, the private agencies requisitioned the city treasury, through the Citizens Emergency Relief Committee, the larger part of the amount needed to pay for direct relief.\textsuperscript{44}

During the year, the FWA had under care a total of 27,214 different families—114,723 individuals or 14% of the total population of Baltimore. This was more than double the number under care in 1931, when an unprecedented high level had been reached. More than 1/2 the total number of families, 16,330 under care had never applied to the Association before. Also, a little more than 1/2 of 14,031 families were Negroes. The figure showed that during 1932, the Association had under care 41% of the entire Negro population of Baltimore City. As in previous years, the families came from all parts of the city and from all sorts of homes. But, there was an increase in the middle class. The majority of the workers who had come for help were unskilled, but there was an increasing group of skilled and clerical workers. Almost all who came for help were native born, only a little over 6% were foreign-born.\textsuperscript{45}

The expenditures for relief were tremendous, for direct relief the total was $3,394,819 against $614,355 for the year 1931, and $173,437 for 1930. Most of the relief was given in the form of cash payment for work done. The FWA had started an Emergency Work Bureau to provide
relief work for clients in February of 1932. The Director was J. Warren Belcher, Secretary of the Mayor's Committee on Unemployment Relief. He organized the projects, assigned the men to them, and the amount of work given was decided by the case workers on the basis of their knowledge of the individual families and their needs.46

The Association had to simplify its procedures to try to avoid mass treatment and base all relief and service upon individual needs as much as possible. The attempt to do this was through quiet sympathetic conferences and through home visits; but all too often the crowds pressed so hard that the District Offices were seriously overcrowded.

The food relief policies of the FWA were established to provide basic health requirements at the lowest possible cost; but the Association did seek the advice of dietary experts to help them determine standards. The Federal government's contribution of flour was a great help in meeting some food needs. During the year the Association distributed 198,516 twenty-four pound bags supplied by the Federal government through the Red Cross.47

The problems relative to shelter and clothing needs were tremendous during the year, but the agency had some success in securing both. A number of landlords turned houses over to it rent free, while others only required the Association to take care of repairs. The Federal government supplied the agency through the Red Cross with 103,124 yards of cotton goods and 30,978 ready-made garments. The yard goods were made into garments by volunteers and through a sewing group organized as a work project.48

Emphasis was of necessity upon relief needs, but the Association was able to give some constructive intensive case work service to many families. There were the important services that helped with health problems, behavior problems, legal tangles, budget adjustments and many other problems which followed in the train of unemployment. However, the quality of the case work service had to be limited in many respects by the all too heavy burdens on the staff. In the midst of this great burden, the FWA experienced more criticism than it had ever before
in its history. But, never had it so many friends and sponsors, and never had it, through Board and staff, tried more genuinely to be flex-
ible enough in its program and its methods to serve the unfortunate in their hour of great need.

Despite the fact that a public relief agency was created in Balt-
timore in 1933, the FWA cared for the greatest number of families it had ever at one time. The highest point in history was reached in July when some 19,148 families received assistance. During the year, 26,450 different families were under care, 92% of whom received fin-
ancial relief. Of this number, unemployment or underemployment existed in 23,918 families. 49

Even though the relief disbursed by the FWA was paid for by city funds while administrative costs were met from Community Fund allot-
ment, the FWA found its staff inadequate and workers overtaxed. They worked long and hard under great pressure, carrying high case loads, and receiving inadequate salaries. Yet, in spite of the mass of relief work, they found time to give some case work service as shown by the fact that employment, either permanent or temporary, was found for 3,000 people. Over 15,000 individuals were given examinations or treatment for mental disorders and some adjustment on behavior prob-
lems was made in nearly 1,800 families.

In February of 1933, the Association outgrew its old quarters and moved into larger and more comfortable ones provided free by the city. The new quarters made possible the expansion of the sewing room where thousands of garments were made from the yard goods given by the Red Cross. Through this project, hundreds of unemployed women were put to work. In connection with this, under the direction of Miss Slothower and Miss Sophie Ulrich, a handicraft department was developed in which the scraps from the cutting of the garments were utilized in making quilts, rugs, and other saleable articles. The sewing room also provided an excellent opportunity for vocational training. 50

Another activity that expanded rapidly was the Clothing Center. It was found that tremendous savings could be made by buying clothing wholesale and keeping it in a central place to be requisitioned by the workers for the families needing it. The Junior League took the lead in
operating the Clothing Center as one of its projects and ran it until it outgrew its quarters and had to be moved to the Central Office.

Prior to 1930, poor relief and other social welfare activities had been handled almost entirely by local governments and private welfare organizations. In 1929–1930, local government bore about 95% of the cost of general public relief. During 1930–31, the states entered the relief field to a greater extent than ever before. A bond issue of $12 million for the relief needs of 1933 and to reimburse Baltimore City for relief expenditures in 1932 was passed by the regular session of the state legislature. However, this was found to be inadequate for the balance of the year.

To be sure, the depressive conditions in the United States had reached such a low point by 1933 that neither the private relief agencies nor the local and state governments could continue to bear the burden of staggering relief demands. Hence they turned to Washington for help, the Federal Government having entered the relief field in 1933. Through the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, half a billion dollars was available to the states for direct relief, and by 1938, the Federal Government was providing over 65% of the total cost of relief while the share of the state and local governments was 28% and 7%, respectively.

In early June of 1933, plans began to be formulated for the coming of Federal relief which the Association hoped would lead to the development of a public relief department. At first, it was thought that Federal relief could be handled through the existing agencies; but in July the authorities in Washington decided that all public relief was to be administered by public agencies and plans for the Baltimore Emergency Relief Commission (BERC) began to materialize. The new organization came into being that September. This agency took over from the private agencies the families whose needs were primarily for relief. The FWA retained the families where the major need was for service, giving relief to those whose needs could not be met by the public agency. On September 1st the FWA turned over to the BERC 17,000 families. The transfer was made relatively easy for the families as almost the entire emergency staff of the FWA was taken over by the
BERC and in many instances the same workers continued to visit the same families. In addition to turning over its emergency staff, the General Secretary of the FWA, Miss Anna D. Ward, was granted a leave of absence to become Director of Social Work for the Commission. Also, Miss Elizabeth Hanna was made Case Work Supervisor, and some 25 regular trained workers became district secretaries and supervisors of the new organization. 55

The FWA was left with a total staff of fifty and about 800 families under its care. These families were first, those needing service but no material relief; second, those who were not eligible for Federal relief; and third, those needing a more intensive type of case work than the BERC was able or felt it their function to give. They involved difficulties associated with physical and mental health, domestic discord, personality and behavior problems, old age, and widows and widowers with dependent children.56

The coming of the public relief department lifted from the shoulders of the Association the burden of mass emergency relief. This gave it the opportunity to take up again the work for which it was organized, that of strengthening and promoting better family life through the interpretation of social needs, and intensive case work service. This had been largely crowded out, with the Association's being fully aware that it was doing so because of the overpowering emergency.

The year 1934 to the FWA was one of rediscovering itself. Freed at last from the great burden of relief administration, it had its first full year of opportunity to concentrate upon its own special contribution to Baltimore's social welfare. The Association had had many problems to solve and now was beginning to face many more in connection with defining the field in which it could best serve in working out relationships with the public agency carrying the major relief responsibility. There were the problems in learning about the new tools which the various social sciences had developed for the understanding and treatment of human behavior, and in training and re-training both new and old workers. The beginning of the year also found the Association with a limited budget and faced with the necessity of articulating the philosophy of sharing responsibility with the public agency. There was also the
necessity of developing a practical understanding of a division of work. 57

The FWA in expressing the relationships and division of work between the two agencies, defined the public agency's area of responsibility as being in the field of need which the majority of the community understood and wanted cared for. Its efforts at experimentation were to be confined to the improvement of methods within the area to which the will of the majority of citizens had assigned it. The private agency, on the other hand, could meet those human needs which were not yet recognized as vital by the majority of the community, and it could also experiment with methods not yet recognized as valid. The private agency was to be controlled, not by the understanding of the majority of citizens, but by the understanding of the volunteer group who supported, managed and sponsored it. Then, as community understanding advanced and as the experiments of the private agency proved valid, the public agency could widen its field and take on the work carried by the private agency. This did not mean that the private agency was then to go out of existence, but would find a new challenge in needs which the changing conditions of life demanded.

The FWA's point was that if both public and private agencies agreed upon these principles they would not overlap or duplicate each other's work, but would supplement one another to the end that the community would benefit by the maximum of helpful service.

In practical division of work, the FWA accepted more responsibility in those situations where diagnosis or exploratory service was necessary in order to determine the type of assistance needed. The major part of the Association's work during 1934 was with those family situations where there were maladjustments between the individual and his environment due to causes within the individual personality or his personal environment. Here, the FWA found that problems had grown out of some lack of ability or from some failure to develop abilities or understanding which in turn may have been due to lack of training. There were the families suffering from physical or mental illnesses or physical or mental limitations which could have been relieved or
modified by case work treatment. There were the families and individuals suffering from economic difficulties which were not due to widespread unemployment or other problems inherent in the social and economic order, but due to failure of the individual for one reason or another to avail himself of existing opportunities. There were those families suffering because of anti-social acts, such as desertion, non-support, delinquency or inadequate parental care. In less than half of the families given service during the year 1934, was there a normal family unit of father, mother and children living together. More than half were families broken by death or separation of parents. It was also noted that the factor which brought many families to the Association was the presence of a child who had been a serious behavior problem. 58

The line of demarcation between the field of case work service and relief administration was not as clear as a person might conclude from an academic discussion. For, those who needed case work service, frequently needed relief; and those applying for relief, frequently needed social case work. The ideal division of work would have been for the public agency to accept those situations where the primary need was relief, but to give the case work service necessary for the most effective administration of relief. On the other hand, the private agency should have accepted those situations where the major need was for help in the social adjustment, but it should have been able to give the relief which might have been necessary to make the case work service more effective.

At that time, neither public nor private agencies in Baltimore were equipped to allow such a complete division, the public agency being limited by high case loads and by the lack of professional training of a large number of its visiting staff, and the private agency being limited in relief funds. 59 The experiences of the FWA in dealing with the same family group in 1932 and 1933 in relation to its function of relief administration, and then in 1934 in its function of case work service, helped the Association to rediscover itself. At the same time it pointed to the necessity for case work service as the complement of relief administration.
The Association found that the problem of providing for children who needed care outside of their own homes had become an urgent one in 1935. This was because their normal homes were non-existent, inadequate or because of the child's own special problem, he could not adjust in his own home. At the time, it was quite difficult to secure foster care through a child agency for a non-Catholic, non-Jewish child who needed such care, because both private and public child placing agencies were without adequate resources. This meant that many children were left in unsatisfactory conditions to become such serious behavior problems that they had to be placed in institutions for delinquents. It also meant that the FWA was spending some of its very limited relief money to support retarded children who should have been in a state institution for the retarded.

During the year, the Association gave service to 2,078 families; 9,247 individuals made up these families, including 4,502 adults and 4,645 children under sixteen years of age. Some 42% received material help costing $92,852, most of which was given in the form of cash, although food, rent, clothing and board were also given. Forty-five percent of the total number of families under care were carried cooperatively with the Baltimore Relief Commission, receiving all or part of their relief from the Commission and service from the FWA. 60

In June of 1935, a change was made in the Association's districts and the number of district offices was reduced from eight to four. For several years the FWA had wanted to change its district boundaries to conform with city ward lines which were used by the City Health Department and other agencies as statistical units. This change facilitated the work so that it could be handled more efficiently and more economically with the fewer and larger units. 61

A new and enlarged Directory of Social Agencies for the State of Maryland was published by the FWA. This was the seventh edition of the Directory, and since the last one was published in 1929, it was badly needed. This edition was made possible by the cooperation of the Federal Works Project Administration which supplied the clerical service.
On November 1, 1935, the General Secretary, Miss Anna D. Ward, resigned from the FWA to become the first Director of the newly formed Council of Social Agencies. As previously mentioned, an unofficial version of such a Council had begun a function in 1931 as a device for promoting cooperation among agencies and joint planning to meet the city's health and welfare needs. In the past the three major private agencies--Associated Catholic Charities, Associated Jewish Charities, and the FWA were continuously in contact with each other, sharing experiences, collaborating in fact-finding and planning jointly. This cooperation convinced these agencies of the need for a Council of Social Agencies and when it was formed, they agreed that it would profit by Miss Ward's leadership.

It was very gratifying to the FWA that in 1935 there was a very definite increase in the number of families coming to it of their own accord for service, having heard of the Association's work through neighbors, relatives or in other ways. There was also a decided increase in the number of families who were referred to the Association by individuals in the community who had a growing appreciation of the service program of the FWA.

The work of the public agencies had relieved the FWA of the great bulk of relief work in the community, but in the last two months of 1935 it received an increasing number of calls from families needing relief only and unable to get it because of the shortage of public funds and the rulings against certain categories of need. The FWA tried, in as far as its funds and facilities permitted, to meet as many of these requests as possible. The Association became quite apprehensive at this point; it felt that the economic needs should be met by public agencies, and earnestly hoped that it would not again be crowded out of its case work program by another overpowering period of emergency.

The Association began the year 1936 with emphasis on the continued improvement of the quality of its case work by supervision and increased training of workers. The increasing demands being made upon it to function in the area of personality adjustments in families, which made up a large part of its work, necessitated a trained staff skilled in
dealing with intricate personal problems. Another service for which it was called upon more and more was planning for motherless families in their own homes. Because securing and supervising housekeepers or mother substitutes took experience and skill, the Association assigned a worker to spend half time doing some experimental work along this line. The FWA had under care during the year, 2,713 different families, or 13,400 individuals, including 6,004 adults and 7,396 children under sixteen years of age. One thousand, seven hundred and fifty-nine of these families, or 65% received help costing $173,818.64 with 857 or 32% being new to the FWA.64

In addition to the demand for case work services, the Association was faced with serious relief problems and needs arising as a result of the changes and retrenchment programs of the public relief agencies. In the first month of 1936, serious situations developed when Federal funds for general public assistance were cut off. Hundreds of families were turned over to the Works Progress Administration (WPA) at a wage considerably lower than their relief allowances had been, and in large families the WPA wage was much less than the amount required to meet the fundamental needs of food and shelter. Through the cooperation of the Community Fund, an additional amount was allowed for relief expenditures.65

At about the same time, the situation was alleviated further when the Department of Public Welfare which, under the Social Security Act of 1935, was already handling relief to the blind and old age assistance now took over from the FWA the entire administration of aid to Dependent Children.66 Moreover, the bond between the FWA and the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society was made even stronger during the year by means of cooperative meetings held twice a month for the discussion of mutual problems. And regular cooperative meetings of these agencies with the Emergency Charity Association and the Department of Public Welfare brought about a better mutual understanding which enabled all of them to render a higher standard of service to their clients.

The Association was called upon to meet the urgent need of supplying clothing for children, who for lack of it, could not attend school.
Again, through the help of the Community Fund, a special grant of $15,000 for this purpose made it possible for the FWA to set up a separate unit to provide the necessary items. From November to March, 2,700 children were outfitted from this special fund.

The Committee on Staff and Training worked toward improving the professional standards of the staff by arranging special opportunities for study for the staff as a whole, and for individual staff members. Four workers were sent for three months each to the New York School of Social Work, two workers for the entire fourteen month's course to the Smith School of Social Work, and two workers to short institutes.67

Of the 1,909 families with whom the Association came into contact in 1937, the largest group was those who wanted help with tangled family relationships or assistance in helping them to adjust their own personalities to the conditions under which they had to live. Successful adjustments were made possible in many of these families through the help of cooperating agencies and the use of their specialized services. The FWA called upon physicians and psychiatrists for their help, the Community Placement Bureau and other employment agencies for individual industrial placements, convalescent homes and many other community resources.

In the 1,909 families, there were 9,137 individuals of whom 4,899 were children. Thirty-one percent of the families coming to the Association made their own application, 18% were sent by persons in the community, and 53% were referred by agencies. Seventy percent were American-born white families, 22% were Negro and 8% foreign-born. Six hundred forty-three or 34% of the wage earners in these families were skilled workmen. Five hundred thirty-nine or 28% were unskilled, 84 were professional or clerical workers and the rest were domestic and unemployables.

Some of the families and individuals needed money and some received material assistance. In many of the families, the FWA worked cooperatively with the public agencies, with the public agencies giving relief and the FWA giving help with problems other than financial ones. The Association cared for many families during the period pending their relief grants and while they were establishing eligibility.
The FWA continued two special services that it started in 1936. The housekeeper or mother substitute service provided mother substitutes in fifty-eight families. These families were those in which the mother was ill, had died or was out of the home for some other reason. The service made it possible for the father to maintain his home and for the children to stay in their own surroundings under the care of an experienced woman, instead of being scattered in institutions or foster homes.

The other special project was that of providing clothing to children who otherwise could not attend school. As the clothing need was the only one met in these families, they were not included in the relief groups referred to before. They were families who for one reason or another were not eligible for public relief but in which there was great poverty. The service was made possible by a special grant from the Community Fund and it was not included in the regular budget nor were the families counted in the Association's statistics. The work was done by a special group of workers employed for that particular purpose. During 1937, 4,563 children were supplied with clothing at a cost of $10,418.68

The FWA received great help from an increasing number of volunteers in 1937. One of the volunteer activities was sponsored by a group of women known as the Women's Discussion Group which met twice a month to discuss current social needs and problems, and their relation to specific families under the care of the Association. Under the leadership of a new group of the younger business and professional men, a series of studies were made pertaining to the work of the FWA, its relation to the work of other social agencies, and some of the unmet needs in the community.69

The FWA was quite elated that it entered the next year with a better trained staff than ever before, and more of the staff continued their theoretical training while on the job. This was important, not only because a greater number of its workers than ever before were graduates of Schools of Social Work, but also because it meant more skillful, more understanding and helpful service to the people who came to it for help.
The Association conceived, as it had in the past, its greatest usefulness to be in two fields, first that of help for specific families and individuals needing its services, and second, that of finding out through its contacts with families the underlying needs and gaps in its social program. In the first field, that of service to families, the number served in 1938 showed an increase over 1937. The FWA dealt with 2,935 different families in 1938, with 124 being served indirectly through services given to other agencies on their behalf. There were 2,811 families directly under the care of the Association, representing children under sixteen years of age. Eight hundred and sixty of these families, or 30.6% received material help costing $90,021.84 in the form of cash, food, rent and clothing.  

People came to the Association from all walks of life, but the important thing at the time was that for the most part, they were the people on whom the great burdens of the depression years had borne most heavily. In what could be referred to as normal times, the families of the Association were beset by all the troubles that mankind knew; but when there was added to them the terrible burden of mass unemployment, the results on family life were appalling. These results were clearly shown in physical and mental disease, malnutrition and lowered standards of living. There were those whose attitudes changed for the worse, overstrained nerves led to friction, and insecurity and helplessness led to threats of revolt. But, it is also amazing to note the courage and sanity maintained by so many of the people during the depression years. Many such people came to the FWA, not to be relieved of their burdens, but to learn new ways of carrying them. This was when the right kind of help skillfully given by the Association made it possible for them to come through the crisis and face the future.

In January of 1938, the Association made the housekeeping service a definite and separate department under the supervision of Miss Grace Sperow. The quality of the women used for substitute mothers was steadily raised and definite training and supervision was given them. There were 104 families under the active care of the FWA who were served by this department in 1938.
The attempt to determine unmet needs revealed, through contacts and experience, continuous serious suffering in the large families whose only income was the inadequate WPA wage. Families ranging from seven to twelve individuals could not exist on a wage of $49.20 a month without serious damage to health and without personality breakdown. Their need constituted a social menace as well as an economic problem. The FWA participated in a study of these families made by the Council of Social Agencies and contributed the services of a full-time worker to secure the necessary facts. As a result of the study, a resolution requesting some form of supplement to these families was sent to the Department of Public Welfare, but because of the inadequate relief appropriations no way was found to meet the need. 72

In the year 1939, 3,248 different families were under the care of the four district offices and the Central Office of the FWA. Three hundred and ninety-three of those were served indirectly by service being given to other agencies on their behalf; 2,855 were under the strict care of the Association. This was an increase of 313 families over the preceding year, and was the largest number served in any one year since 1933 when the public relief agencies came into existence. Nine hundred and fifty-three of these families, or 33% received material help costing $92,958.81. 73

Among the families who came to the FWA, 65% were white, 35% Negro, and in only 6% were the heads of the families foreign-born. Eighteen percent were Roman Catholic, 69% Protestant, and 13% of no religious faith. In 51%, the head of the family was a native of Maryland. The majority of the families were married couples with or without children, although 36% represented broken homes with the parents either separated, deserted, divorced or widowed. Five percent were single men and women whose problems of illness, incapacity, or loneliness created a social problem which they could not cope with. 74

With a large number of the families who came to the FWA the economic situation seemed the insurmountable wall; they found themselves out of work, or with the breadwinner ill, or the children undernourished from long periods of inadequate income and lack of proper
food. There were those situations where after a long period of unemployment a man had secured a job which he could not accept because of a lack of clothing or carfare. Sometimes a series of financial failures had so undermined a man's faith in himself that alcoholism, brutality and other anti-social behavior had wrecked his home life. Discouragement over long privation, bad housing, and undesirable companionship caused many fathers and mothers to lose their standards and ideals. It was largely the children living in this environment who did poorly in school, drifted into bad company and eventually became delinquents.

The Association still felt that part of its function should be to experiment in new areas and to expand its services where there seemed to be a need. It received the opportunity for an interesting experiment when the Judges of the People's Court, concerned with the stories of misery and suffering, asked for a social worker to sit in the Rent Court daily, interview those tenants who seemed to have had a serious social problem and act as a liaison person between the Court and the social agencies. The FWA loaned a worker, Miss Jeanette Smith, for this purpose.

The Judges of the Court felt that this work proved so valuable in its experimental period of three months that they requested the Association to work out a plan whereby it could be continued for a year. They hoped that it would be a means of securing valuable facts regarding some of the deplorable housing situations in Baltimore and that it would lead to a permanent worker for the court.

The Association also cooperated in a Study of the Problem of the Colored Unmarried Mothers. It helped to secure more adequate relief by the Department of Public Welfare through service on committees concerned with supplementing WPA wages, care of the homeless, eligibility requirements of the Department of Public Welfare and change of policy on categorical cut-offs.

The granting of clothing to children under a separate department, with separate funds was continued by the FWA. And the Association continued to urge that the clothing need be considered as a part of the
budgetary deficiency of families by the Department of Public Welfare and that changes be brought about which would eliminate the bulk of this work on the part of the FWA.\textsuperscript{76}

The school clothing project was accepted by the FWA in November of 1936 in order to meet a community need.\textsuperscript{77} The public schools had attempted to provide for the clothing needs of children from their own resources. Failing in this attempt, the public schools then brought in private agencies to take over the project. From the time that the FWA took it over, the project was adequately administered. The clothing was appropriate, of good quality and was economically purchased in job lots. The shoes were purchased directly by the client under a voucher system. An analysis of the costs of the project showed that 80\% of the expenditures were for clothing, 19\% for salaries of special workers, and 1\% for operation. The costs of supervision, administration, office space and miscellaneous items came out of the agency's general budget.

During 1940 and 1941, the FWA continued its services to the families of Baltimore City although it was greatly involved in the question of merger. There was a decrease in the demands made upon the Association, and 269 fewer families were in contact in 1940 than in 1939. This decrease was quite normal considering two factors. One was the continued improvement in the FWA's division of work with the Department of Public Welfare and some changes in the Department's rules of eligibility, particularly with families of workers on WPA. The other factor was the general improvement in the economic and industrial conditions which lessened the strain on family relationships. Forty-one percent of the families served in 1940 received some material relief from the Association. The majority were American-born married couples with children and were of the Protestant faith.\textsuperscript{78}

While the total number of Negro families under care of the Association decreased slightly in 1940, being 31\% of the total case load, the number of Negro families in the Western district had increased to more than half of the work in that district. Much of the difficulty found in these homes was caused by delinquency and anti-social behavior with
its serious reaction on children. Low income, inadequate housing, poor recreational facilities and ill health were important contributing factors.

In April of 1940, the Survey which the Community Fund had investigated in January of its member agencies was completed with the report containing several recommendations. The survey was a study of the work of the agencies participating in the Community Fund of Baltimore, and even though initiated by the Fund it was approved by the Agencies themselves. The members of the field staff were recruited from ten different cities and nearly all of them had had experience in similar surveys, so that they brought with them a background of intimate knowledge of health and welfare work in many leading American cities.

One of the Survey assignments was to answer the question as to whether or not the Community Fund was maintaining a balanced program considering "the generally recognized unmet needs of the community." The Survey Staff was not supplied with any statement of the "generally recognized unmet needs" and it had to ascertain on its own, if there were any. If there were these needs, the staff had to determine what they were and if they were matters of proper concern to the Community Fund.

In the course of the field work there was occasional reference to the lack of facilities to care for defective delinquents, spastics, and epileptics, and other specialized groups of this sort. There was no evidence found to indicate that these particular needs were extensive and even if they were, they were not within the proper field of Community Fund operation, but were problems that should have been handled by the State of Maryland.

On the other hand, there was found overwhelming evidence to indicate that the outstanding unmet social problem in Baltimore was the Negro problem. This was manifested in many ways, its excessive crime rates and juvenile delinquency, its excessive mortality rates, especially tuberculosis, its excessive relief rates, the unusual difficulty of job opportunities, housing problems, all of which interacted upon each other and created a vicious cycle. The problems were aggravated by the
depression and the period of prolonged unemployment. It was true in Baltimore, as elsewhere, that in times of decreasing employment, the Negro was the first to go and in times of increasing employment, the Negro was the last to be taken back. Unemployment was the largest single causative factor in the other problems of crime, delinquency, health and housing.

The following figures give detailed evidence of the condition of the Negro:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negro population</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro deaths</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro tuberculosis deaths</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro cases of juvenile delinquency</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious crimes among Negroes (arrests)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro relief cases—Department of Public Welfare</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro cases—FWA</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro cases—Henry Watson Children's Aid Society</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The health and welfare needs in the Negro Community were much more serious than for the city at large; generally speaking, the facilities and services to meet these needs were much more inferior to those in the city at large; and in many instances, they were entirely lacking.

In April of 1940, there was no place in the State of Maryland where Negro children could receive sanitarium care for pulmonary tuberculosis. Also, there was no provision whatever in any institution to provide convalescent care for Negro children. In the State, there were 105 beds for convalescent white children, and prevention care for the pre-tubercular during the summer months. This was of course not the proper problem for the Community Fund to handle, but it was so serious that organizations like the Community Fund and other agencies should have given it great consideration in order to ameliorate the depressive conditions. This should have been done not for reasons of sentiment or even of plain justice, but was justified by a sound sense of self-interest for the whole community. There was the danger of spreading infection
to the entire community from a health standpoint.\textsuperscript{83}

The report did call for: (1) an increase in the allotment of the Urban League, to be used for the employment of an additional staff worker to concentrate on expanding job opportunities, (2) employment of a Negro staff person by the Girl Scouts to develop a more adequate program of work among Negro girls in the community, and (3) employment of Negro case workers and nurses by organizations such as the Family Welfare Association, the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society, and the Instructive Visiting Nurse Association to serve, as far as possible, the Negro constituency of those agencies.\textsuperscript{84} However, it referred to the FWA as a good family agency giving a high quality of service to the community, employing a competent, trained staff. The report also stated that the Association's relations with other agencies were good, and that its services were accepted and valued by the general community.\textsuperscript{85}

One of the important events during the year 1940 was the establishment by the Community Fund of a retirement plan for all employees. The plan met a need long felt by the agencies and practically all of the FWA staff who were eligible participated in it.

The FWA entered the first three months of 1941 with a gradual decline, but in April there was a sharp drop in the number of families under care and the decline continued for the remainder of the year. The number of families under care during 1941 was 2,232 or only 168 less than in 1940. However, the number of cases under care were carried for a shorter period of time than in previous years. The reasons for the decline were the same as in 1940, with greater opportunities for employment being the main reason. Many people who had been on marginal wages or who had had only spasmodic employment for years, suddenly found themselves in great demand in industry. Families who had been struggling along on inadequate WPA wages or part-time work were able to get steady employment and meet their financial needs.

Many were able to go back to standards of living of which they had been deprived. Boys and girls, completing school, could go immediately into jobs, instead of facing the discouragement of drifting along with either no job or something which did not interest them. Fathers who
had been forced to spend at least part of their time idling around the streets or the house were at least able to face the world with jobs by which they could support their families adequately.  

Interest in a merger between the HWCAS and the FWA had been expressed by Board and staff members and other interested persons early in the course of the survey. The subject had been discussed off and on for a period of several years. The interest in the subject found in Baltimore was similar to that which existed in a number of communities. It could have been indicative of a movement to find a common denominator of case work in the family and children's field. Because, at the time, many different public welfare services were being administered under single departments.

The conclusions reached in the survey took into account both the basic concepts involved and the important factors in the situation. The recommendations were, after full consideration of all factors, that the Children's Home of Baltimore and the HWCAS merge their programs, that the Maryland Society for Protection of Children from Cruelty and Immorality cease functioning as a separate agency and its protective work be absorbed by the FWA, and that the HWCAS and the Family Welfare Association merge their programs. It was further recommended that the merging of the programs of the four agencies be accomplished at one time. However, each merger recommendation was independent of the others and any one combination of them was valid.

In May of 1940, a special committee to consider merger with the HWCAS was appointed by the Board of the FWA. The committee reported to the Board in January of 1941 that it was not advisable to merge at the time but that it would be desirable for a joint committee of the two Boards to meet together occasionally. A joint committee was appointed and met for several months, with the basic question being, would a combined agency do a better job and give better service for the same cost than separate agencies? There was a favorable factor also; each Board had respect for and confidence in the other and felt that they could work together, although each had individual strengths.

A decision was suddenly precipitated, however, in June of 1941, when after the resignation of the General Secretary of the HWCAS, the
Board of that agency voted for immediate merger, and asked the FWA to make a similar decision. At a special meeting of the Board, called on July 2, to act on the request, the vote was favorable. In October of 1941, a committee and several sub-committees were appointed to work on plans for merger and by April 15 of 1942, the Sub-committee had drawn up the Articles of Consolidation. The last annual meeting of the members of the FWA was held on April 30 at which time consolidation as recommended by the Board was approved.91

They first thought that they had a nice short name like the Family and Children's Society for the new agency. But, a legal member of the agency discovered that Henry Watson in leaving his endowment had stated very clearly and definitely in his will that his name was to be perpetuated in the name of the organization. Therefore, the legal name became the Family Welfare and Henry Watson Children's Aid Society of Baltimore on May 2, 1942 when the State Tax Commission approved the Articles of Consolidation, and the new agency was incorporated.92 Mr. Robert W. Williams was the first president of the merged agency and Mr. Clark L. Mock became the first Executive Secretary.93 The agency is popularly known as the Family and Children's Society.

The process of merger was necessarily attended by problems of reorganization, some disruption of agency routines, and strain on many in the performance of their duties. To reduce as much as possible this inevitable dislocation, the Board of Managers of the new Society acted with remarkable dispatch in adopting by-laws, electing officers, creating committees and setting up the machinery for receiving and disbursing funds.94

The Society was aware at all times that mergers, money, staff and policies profited the community nothing if its services fell down. Therefore, in the process, it did not lose sight of its responsibilities, its reason and object for being, service to those in need. The Society was also fortunate in the outset to have had as its Casework Supervisor Mrs. Elizabeth McCord de Schweinitz. Mrs. de Schweinitz had previously served as case work consultant to the Jewish Family and Children's Bureau in the period following its merger and therefore knew
most of the pitfalls and was able to steer the agency around some of them.

Before the merger occurred, the FWA had a Central Office and four district offices. The HWCAS on the other hand, occupied one office. In the interest of consolidating operations, the FWA moved into the Henry Watson Building at Lanvale and Park Streets which is now the Central Office of the Family and Children's Society. We therefore see that in 1942 besides bringing about merger, the Society had to maintain its services to the community and combine staff and operations of the two agencies. This was carried on into 1943, but 1943 produced, in addition, two new mergers.95

As indicated before, the Report of the Survey Staff in April of 1940 recommended that the Maryland Society to Protect Children from Cruelty and Immorality be absorbed by the FWA.96 Meetings were held between the two organizations relative to merger, but nothing definite was decided. However, after the FWA and the HWCAS merged and became the Family and Children's Society, further meetings were engaged in, and an agreement was reached. On April 29, 1943, the State Tax Commission of Maryland approved the Articles of Consolidation that brought the SPCCI and the Family and Children's Society together. In accordance with the agreement between the two Societies, Mr. George Harwood and his staff became the Department of Legal Protection for the FCS, doing "investigation and prosecution in the children's protective field." Mr. Oregon Milton Dennis, the President of the SPCCI, became a member of the Board of Managers of the new society, as did Mrs. Adolph Guthmacher, each having been a Board member of his respective predecessor society.97

Six months later, on October 23, 1943, the Shelter for Aged and Infirmed Colored Persons of Baltimore City joined the Family and Children's Society. This Society was founded in 1881 and incorporated on February 16, 1881 for the relief of that worthy class of colored persons, who from various causes were finally dependent upon the charity of others.98 The agreement under which the Shelter joined the Society provided that the income from the Shelter Endowment Funds was to be used to insure the maintenance and burial of the former
inmates. Two-thirds of the remaining income was to be paid into the City Department of Public Welfare and one-third to the FCS to be expended for adult Negroes. The agreement further provided that upon the death of the last former inmate both the principal and income was to be expended as allotted above to assist adult Negroes of Baltimore City. At the time that the Shelter was taken over by the FCS, it had no paid workers. Miss Louise H. Robinson, the former president joined the Board of Managers of the FCS.

While the agencies were in the process of bringing about merger, the country went to war in December of 1941. During the period from the first merger in May of 1942 until October of 1943, when the last agency came in, they were involved with many problems of reorganization. However, the FCS began activities that were indicative of the important role that it was to play in the war effort. The Society was called upon to meet with representatives of the government to set up coordinating programs with the Red Cross and Civilian Defense. It assisted the United States Employment Office to organize a vocational training program. Case workers assisted the Selective Service Board in reviewing case histories of draftees to help the Board in its draft decisions. In the area of family services, the Family and Children's Society helped families of soldiers to adjust to war-time conditions, and it aided wives and parents to locate servicemen in cases of illness or personal tragedy.

The FWA, an outgrowth of the Federated Charities, inherited both the idealistic aims of the Federation and a relief function. Although there were some prosperous years in the 1920's, it was forced almost from its beginning in 1919 through the early 1930's to deal with nearly insurmountable problems related to and resulting from the ever spiraling unemployment rate. No matter how much families needed in the way of service, the actual financial assistance they required for every day living had to take precedence. This extensive outlay of funds pointed out very clearly the inadequacy of private charity and its inability to provide material relief on such a large scale.

As a consequence, state and federal agencies had to assume the primary responsibility for direct relief. Thus relieved of this burden,
the FWA found new spheres of usefulness in its endeavor to serve the people of Baltimore. It constantly tried to deal with family and social problems which might be alleviated by its case work service. Moreover, in an attempt to provide the most effective service possible in dealing with old and new problems, the Association adapted discoveries in related fields, particularly psychiatry and psychology, to its professional techniques.

The final report of the Survey Staff referred to the FWA as a good family agency, but as had been the case with the agencies which had preceded it, there came the time when the service rendered could be improved by merging with those of like function. As a consequence, the Family and Children's Aid Society merged. The Family and Children's Society has continued to influence the development of Baltimore's welfare program, and to maintain a real sense of responsibility for the unfortunate who have needed its services.
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CHAPTER VI

THE HENRY WATSON CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY
1860-1942

The history of the Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor, the Charity Organization Society, and the Family Welfare Association, spanning the years from 1849 to 1942, is a history of agencies concerned with the improvement of family life with emphasis primarily on the problems of the adult members of the household. But, throughout this history, especially in times of crisis, the story is one of increased cooperation with several other agencies which came into existence during the period for the purpose of addressing themselves exclusively to the problems of child welfare and protection in the home and in institutions. One such agency was the Children's Aid Society of Baltimore City.

The Children's Aid Society, the second agency of its kind in the country, was founded in Baltimore City in 1860. A Children's Aid Society, the first in the nation, had been organized in New York City in 1853. Prior to the organization of the New York Society, except for some institutional care, very little was being done for the neglected child in America. The presence of children in almshouses and orphanages was widely decried and there was a growing feeling that institutions were no substitutes for life in a family. Charles Loring Brace, influential in founding the New York CAS, observing the conditions in which children of New York existed, became firmly obsessed with the belief that only by removing them from the city could they be saved. The New York Society embarked upon a program that would, over a period of years, send thousands of children into the rural areas of New York and to western states. The New York Society provided a model for others throughout the nation because the new societies
emanated from the same common causes and charitable impulses that led to the organization of the pioneer society. And the mutual causes that led to organization, were aggravated by the crisis brought about by the Civil War which resulted in a greater need for aid to children and mothers due to the death of soldier fathers.

The first meeting for the purpose of forming the Children's Aid Society of Baltimore was held in the Central Presbyterian Church at the corner of Saratoga and Liberty Streets on September 18, 1866. Its organizational group was small, but they were concerned because neglected children had become a serious community problem. It was reported that Baltimore had some 3,000 children who were being brought up in vice and crime who could be reclaimed and provided with good homes. The Society concluded that one of the best ways to aid neglected children would be to remove them from the alleys and hovels of the city to country homes. To quote, its original purpose states, its object shall be to improve the conditions of poor and destitute children of the city of Baltimore, and especially by procuring them homes in the country.¹

At the time, this was a good solution since country homes offered all of the advantages and opportunities for growth that pioneer life presented. Three-fourths of the population of the country lived in the rural areas where land was inexpensive and plentiful. The purposes and practices of the Society in the beginning were therefore based upon the needs and conditions of the times. Its workers took care to give primary attention to children between the ages of ten and fifteen, since these were most desired by farmers. They also understood that this objective would save thousands from jail and the penitentiary.

The new Society had thirty Managers and four officers. The first President was Mr. William B. Canfield; and the first agent was Mr. William C. Palmer.² The Managers were elected annually and they, along with a female Board representing the different Christian churches of Baltimore, directed the organization. The male Board employed a matron for the home which served to shelter the children temporarily prior to their placement in the country. Mr. Palmer, the first agent,
served for thirty-eight years, during which time he found the children and transported them to the homes in the country. The Society was incorporated on the 14th of February, 1862.3

The following described how the children came into care:

We pick up our children in the streets, lanes and alleys of this great city. The police bring us some. The children of those who are sent to jail are sometimes recommended to us. Our Agent inquires among the poor at the soup houses, whether the children of any of them are in such circumstances that it would be a charity to send them to good homes in the country. The Boy's Meeting sends us some and philanthropic ladies and gentlemen bring wretched little human beings to our home, or tell us where we may find them and save them from a miserable and perhaps a vicious condition of life as men and women.4

During the first year, ninety-seven children were placed in homes in the country at an average cost of $19.86 per child. This included traveling charges, the expense of the home, salaries of the officers and all incidental expenses. This record gave the Society the opportunity to acquaint public officials at the state and local levels with the savings involved if public money were appropriated for their good works. The State and City contributed small sums during the early years based upon services of the Society to public institutions. The amount at any one time depended on the number of children removed from the jail or any other publicly supported institution; but this money could not be relied upon by the Society in its planning. Most of the children who were taken to the country were removed from their homes or from the streets rather than from the jails and almshouses.5

Just as interesting and revealing is the story of how the Society found the homes in which the children were placed. Mr. William C. Palmer, described his method in the following manner:

I assure myself in the first place of the Christian character and standing of an applicant, by inquiring of our local Committee in his district; should he reside in a neighborhood where we have no Local Committee, I visit it, and ascertain from its own lips of its welfare, and lastly by a constant correspondence with its foster parents, keep myself at all times informed of its condition. After careful investigation, should it be ascertained that the contract entered into between the foster parent and the child and the Society has been violated, the child is instantly removed.6
This is in contrast to the early placement policy of the New York Children's Aid Society. The CAS of New York was subjected to constant criticism for very little preliminary investigation, follow-up and supervision. Whereas the Baltimore Society was, from its beginning, aware of the importance of such a procedure.

By the end of the fourth year of operation, 1864, Mr. Palmer had placed four hundred city children in rural counties of Maryland and counties in Pennsylvania and Virginia adjacent to Maryland. This was a monumental task for one man. But, in a letter which appeared in the Annual Report of 1864, he seemed enthusiastic and ready to invent a new method of reporting on the children's adjustment:

Gentlemen:

I have always endeavored to exercise a watchful care over the children placed by us in country homes; protecting them from abuse, neglect and improper example. In this respect our work differs from most kindred institutions; as we rarely bind our children, but place them as members of suitable families, under written contract, which, if violated, at once deprives the parties receiving the child of all other claims to it. In a word, the child is under special guardianship of the Society, until it arrives at age, and I, as your Agent, feel it obligatory upon me, to protect it in whatever position it may be placed by the Executive Committee.

Past experience has suggested the adoption of such precautionary measures as will enable me to keep you at all times informed relative to the welfare of our children. In order to accomplish this to your satisfaction, on the first of October last, I opened a "Country Journal." In this Journal, to which is attached an "Index," I have regularly and systematically copied all letters from Foster Parents, and others, relative to our children, with all verbal information, reports on expeditions to the country, visits to the children in the country homes, &c., &c.

As much as has been accomplished, we have not commenced our work. We should have an "Industrial School" in connection with our home where the street children could be instructed in some useful occupations, with the ordinary branches of an English education; also a chapel and a Sabbath School. By the adoption of the above means, many destitute children would be brought under our influence who are now beyond our reach. I have always conceived it my duty, not only to receive and protect the children to our care, but also to extend to all children coming under my notice, protection and support.
In a word, gentlemen, is it not our duty as a benevolent Society, to extend our means of usefulness beyond the mere procuring of homes in the country for destitute children?

The question is often asked me, "Do you not experience great difficulty in procuring homes for the children?" My reply is, "Not at all." Far from experiencing any difficulty in procuring homes for our children, we cannot fill one-half the applications made for them; and that, too, from families bringing us the most satisfactory testimonials. When we consider the great demand for labor in our rural districts, and the benfits which must accrue to our State and City, by the removal of this class of children to the Country, should not this double benevolence elicit from our legislature and City Council the deepest sympathy?

Would it not be far better economy to aid this Society, than to allow this class of children to grow up in our midst, and thereby not only depriving our farmers of the help they need, but also fill our almshouses and jails with paupers and criminals. I feel encouraged to hope, from our success during the past year, that our Society will this year be better appreciated and understood, and that much good may be accomplished in the name of Him who took the children in His arms and blessed them.

It should be noted that the service offered by the Society was possible because farmers needed free labor. But, at the same time, homes were often made available to the "street" children.

One of the most important factors in placement and reduced operation cost, was the free transportation from the city to the country provided to the Agent and children by the B & O Railroad and the steamboats on the Chesapeake Bay. This meant that the placement of the children was sometimes done as a wholesale project. A vivid story from the report of 1866 tells how a company of children was taken from Baltimore across the Bay to the Eastern Shore of Maryland:

The hour of departure having arrived, formed our little ones into two companies, which marched in good order on board the steamer Kent where we took up our quarters in the Saloon. Embarked in high glee at 7:00 A.M., nothing transpiring to mar the pleasure of our trip, except that of ravenous appetites, which some big slices of bread and butter from the steward's dominions, with some cakes, had a tendency to appease. Upon our arrival at Eastern Point, were met by Leonidas Dodson of our Local Committee (local committees were formed whenever possible in out-lying towns and villages to "pass" on the characters of the
farmers and tradesmen who applied for the children). Mr. Dodson escorted us to the town, about a mile from the landing, where we arrived safely, with bright eyes and muddy shoes. Upon entering the town, our little scamps favored the good people with a voluntary from the Sunday School Opera, with a whistling accompaniment, much to the surprise of the worthy burglers and matrons, who could not conceive how it was possible for the "little wanderers to sing the Lord's song in a strange land."

Arriving at hotel, found arrangements already made by the Local Committee for our accommodation. As we marched into "quarters" quite a crowd collected to see "The Aid Society Children from Baltimore." Our home brigade taking advantage of the confusion caused by its sudden overwhelming charge, captured the stove, which it held under strong guard until supper time. Our youngest, a little Paddy, with a shrewedness characteristic of his nation, marched up to the bar-keeper with "I want ye to warm me hands; they be cold." His demand was readily obeyed, although in a rather novel way—they were bathed in whiskey.

By the advice of our Local Committee filled no applications this evening; tomorrow being a public day, and the majority of the children already engaged to be delivered at that time. After a thorough warming, and replying to any amount of questions, "Are they your children?" "Where did they come from?" "Are they to be bound out?" "I want a girl" came from almost everyone. There is certainly a strong attachment for girls in Talbot County. Made a raid upon the supper table, a movement long to be remembered by our "light infantry;" a jolly supper it was—real farmers fare. Had ravenous appetites, which four experienced waiters exerted themselves to the utmost to encourage; fortunately no deaths ensued. Soon after supper marched to quarters for the night, placing the girls in charge of a female domestic. Our room contained four large beds into which I packed our little chaps, deeming it prudent to keep them together as much as possible, fearing sickness consequent upon said supper. The following morning aroused our boys by times. Set the captains to work, washing and dressing the smaller ones upon their care; the larger waiting upon themselves.

After breakfast, collected all of the children together and presented them to the Local Committee. By the adoption of this course much trouble was obviated as none but applicants were admitted to our room. Having previously informed the Committee, as far as my knowledge extended, of the antecedents, character and disposition of each and every child in my company, awaited the arrival of the applicants. Did not have to wait long. They soon began to gather; when our contracts were properly filled up and signed by them;
after which they were witnessed and endorsed by the Committee and the children delivered to their new friends, much to the sorrow of your humble servant. It was upwards three o'clock before we accomplished our work. It afforded me unfeigned pleasure in being able to state that I have been greatly blessed in the prosecution of my labors in this expedition; having experienced little or no difficulty in procuring our children excellent homes with pious farmers and mechanics, selected by an efficient committee of judicious men, whose characters are unimpeachable and whose only and sole objective is the amelioration of the conditions of the destitute children committed to our care. From the children themselves, I experienced no trouble of any account, having throughout the entire trip manifested happy and cheerful dispositions, and were very obedient. After visiting some of our little ones, placed in this and other expeditions, whom I found doing well, returned home on Saturday, March 3rd. Net expenses incurred, $9.75. 8

Having placed the children throughout Maryland and adjacent counties in Pennsylvania and Virginia, it is obvious that Mr. Palmer could not see them often. Contact was maintained largely through letters which each foster home was obligated to write at least once a year. The Society also stipulated that each child was to receive three months of schooling and be allowed to attend Sabbath School when the weather permitted. Occasionally, however, visits were made as stated in a report to the Board of Managers in 1866. In the report, Mr. Palmer tells of traveling 700 miles, visiting twenty-nine children, at a total expense of $9.90. 9

It became apparent after a period of time that for many of the children this form of "supervision" did not assure their safety and well-being. Some were found cruelly treated and neglected, causing the Board in 1869 to direct the Agent to visit all the children in their new homes. Therefore, Mr. Palmer, in addition to his placement duties, visited 225 homes in 1869 and replaced fourteen children whom he found mistreated.

The Society, during this time, 1869 to 1871, had begun to recognize that not all children were served by being permanently removed from their own homes. A strong feeling was emerging to keep the child in the home, and to rehabilitate the home if possible. In those cases
where this could not be done, the inclination was to develop a different type of home, the foster or boarding home. In this way, the child would have an opportunity not merely to be "pawned off" to someone forever, but to remain under efficient care in an urban home-like environment until a permanent home could be found. Here, the Baltimore Society, was following the nation-wide trend pioneered by the Massachusetts Board of State Charities, under the leadership of its chairman and secretary, Samuel Gridley Howe and Franklin B. Sandborn. According to Howe and Sandborn, the aim of the foster home is to have the child to become an ongoing part of community activities in school, church, neighborhood and recreational groups. This was necessary in order to have the child relate as near as possible to the benefits of home and family life.  

The attention of the Board was also being directed to the fact that few girls were found to go to the country. Placement had been offered those from eight to fourteen years of age; but the number dropped drastically between 1869 and 1871. The reports of the Society are not clear as to why it could not secure girls; but it did provide for them in another way. The following description appeared in the Annual Report of 1871:

Whilst contemplating other and more extended operations, we upon the 13th day of last February commenced in the Home a Sewing Machine School, wherein girls receive gratuitous instructions upon all of the principle machines in use in this city. This has proven a great success, the present daily average attendance being 48. Of the whole number, 400 have received thorough instructions, thus furnishing them the means of employment such as will enable them to support themselves. Most of these girls are orphans, or the children of widows in narrow circumstances. We are led to consider this enterprise of great practical utility, and directly pertinent to the objects of our Society, viz, to improve the conditions of the poor and destitute children.

It should be noted here that innovations designed to meet one problem, often tend to create another. In this instance, for example, the new program was introduced in order to supply needed labor for the machinery and at the same time promote self-support among
children and their families. But a few years later, child legislation was passed to control the use of children in factories.\textsuperscript{13}

In 1872, the Children's Aid Society changed its name in order to inherit money from the estate of Henry Watson. Mr. Watson bequeathed $100,000 to the Society on condition that it should bear his name, and in hope that the income from his bequest would allow the Society to enlarge its usefulness. Henry Watson, a bachelor, died in 1871 at the age of fifty-five years. He inherited his money from his family and was not active in any business at the time of his death. According to the records, he was not a member of any boards of social or philanthropic agencies, nor does his name appear on any lists of contributors.\textsuperscript{14} The inventory of his estate gave no indication that he was a collector of any kind and his books were not numerous.

In the first codicil to his will, Henry Watson said:

I omitted also to give special directions as to the care and preservation of my vault in the burial ground of the First Presbyterian Church, situated at the corner of Green and Fayette Streets, in the City of Baltimore, and... I do now hereby give, devise and bequeath to the "Children's Aid Society of Baltimore" my said vault and my said portraits, and I request that the said Society will take charge of the key of said vault and see that my remains are therein decently deposited and that they will exercise over the said vault such supervision and care as may be necessary to protect the same from trespasses or other injury, and that they will prevent the same from being used in an improper manner, or for the deposit therein, hereafter, of the remains of anyone, except my own, and the remains, if she shall desire it, of my said aunt.\textsuperscript{15}

His vault adjoins that of Edgar Allen Poe in Westminster Presbyterian's Church Yard at the corner of Greene and Fayette Streets.\textsuperscript{16} By an Act of the General Assembly, February 12, 1872, the name of the Society was changed to the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society of Baltimore, Inc.\textsuperscript{17}

The Society continued with its placing out department, but with some decrease in the number of placements. In addition to placement, it now maintained a home where working girls would board and conducted sewing, cutting and fitting classes for girls and women who desired to become seamstresses. It also set up the Transient Meals and Lodging
Department where "poor but worthy" applicants, too old for admission to the girls Home, were given temporary bed and board.

The Agency also made it possible for parents who wished to do so to correspond with their children who had been placed in the country. The letters had to be directed through the Agency and the implication is, that prior to this, parents had no knowledge of their children's whereabouts when they were placed in the country. This indicated a significant change in philosophy and method of the organization. With investigation of child and family, and emphasis on enforcing parental responsibility to the child and the home, the Society employed a visitor in 1897 to implement the expanded activities and to enlarge the usefulness of the organization. The following is a description of the duties of the newly appointed visitor:

Her duties are to keep in touch with charitable child-saving institutions and agencies and to act as a bureau of information to persons seeking advice on behalf of children whose conditions should be bettered; to make a thorough examination of the character and needs of each child, and of the conditions of the family of each child that is committed to the care of the Society, either by Magistrate, relatives or friends; to stimulate relatives and friends to help support the children and to prevent their shifting onto charitable agencies these responsibilities which relatives and friends should themselves bear, and keep under oversight such children as may best be left in their homes--under probation.

While the focus was on meeting the needs of destitute children in their homes, there was also a new emphasis on specificity of function and prevention. The Society established a Bureau of Information to avoid the use of several agencies by one family. The reasoning of the Society was:

It does pauperize a parent or guardian to be permitted to place on some organization the burden of caring for a child whom he could provide for if the way were not made easy for shifting of the responsibility . . .

In order to impress on all applicants for the admission of children the necessity of carrying their responsibility, a Bureau of Information will be established.

By careful investigation of each case, and by systematic comparing of records, it is believed that the evils growing out of the multiplying of child-saving agencies can be minimized.
Mary Wilcox Brown, the newly appointed visitor, thought that the most urgent need of the children in their home was that of a "judicious friend." She made arrangements to supplement what was lacking in the homes of the children by opening Home Libraries for the use of children in a neighborhood. A volunteer worker in the role of a Friend worked with the children, teaching them to play games, the use of books and the advantages of neatness and thrift.

In 1898, all other activities of the agency were given up in favor of devoting its entire resources to child-placing. The year 1898 also saw the retirement of the Society's first agent, Mr. William C. Palmer. Mary Wilcox Brown, the visitor, was his successor, and under her direction the Society restated in 1899, its aims as follows:

1. To have up-to-date information about the welfare of the children of the city.
2. To cooperate with other social agencies.
3. To improve conditions within the child's own home.
4. To give real family life to children who could no longer be with their own families.

In a number of ways, at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th, the second period of the Society's existence was ushered in and it became more cognizant of national trends in child care. Children awaiting placement were cared for in a shelter home known at the time as Linden House. But, emphasis was being given to the development of boarding care. Also, the newly developed principle of case work was introduced and the key-note of the work of the Society was cooperation with other agencies. The Society was profoundly affected by the creation of a Children's Department within the Supervisors of City Charities, the organization of a Juvenile Court in 1902, and the work of the Federated Charities and the Maryland SPCCI.

Thus the policy of keeping children in their homes, improving conditions, and not removing them from their homes because of poverty alone had become fixed. The placing of children in country homes continued, but boarding care and foster homes grew in extent. As
confidence in the boarding plan grew, the need for a shelter home was less apparent. In 1908, Linden House was disposed of, and all children awaiting placement were cared for in boarding homes. 24

While the number of children from the city needing placement decreased, the work of the Society in the counties of the State became more extensive. And it was these children from the counties who were being placed in numbers. Therefore, in 1908, the Society under Mr. George L. Jones, the new General Secretary, conceived of a state-wide organization to prevent the unnecessary separation of children in the counties from their parents. Accordingly it formed in 1911 the Maryland Children's Aid Society, with the plan to establish workers in each of the six judicial districts of the State. The Board and Staff of both Societies were the same, but the State Society was incorporated separately and secured a small State appropriation. The first District worker was assigned to Frederick County in 1911, and the work was established in Baltimore County somewhat later in the year. 25

By the time of the Golden Anniversary in 1910, 4,028 children had been placed in foster homes. In 1910, the Society had some 633 children under its care and the year's expenditures represented a total of $18,000. 26 It was also in 1910, that the Society began work with unmarried mothers and a special department was set up for mothers and infants. 27 The Annual Report recounted the experience of the year, including an analysis of the causes of illegitimacy and the necessity of public aid for mothers. It expressed too, how the new profession of social work was exerting an influence, characterized by concern with social and psychological causal factors operating in all human misfortune. The following account described this concept:

The occasion of this organization was that homeless mothers and infants have laid upon this and other child helping agencies, demands which could not be satisfactorily met. The common result was that the mother and child were separated. The child becoming a charge upon public charity if it survived, and the mother was allowed to help or sympathy, to choose any manner of living she wished. To deal with these mothers two paid workers were hired, one a woman of wide experience, possessing
special fitness for the delicate task of making friends, fostering mother love and persuading the mother to adopt the plan, which on full inquiry offered the best results to the mother and infant without separation.  

This is an indication, as has been stated, that the Baltimore Society was moving along with the national trends in child care. The fight to get public aid for dependent children in their homes was made as early as 1897. A law was introduced in the New York State Legislature to grant money that would be allowed for institutional maintenance to parents for their children. Although the bill was defeated, the New York fight led to a nation-wide crusade. The national conscience was aroused and the Federal Government investigated the condition of women and children in business in 1907. The continued outcry influenced President Theodore Roosevelt to call a White House Conference on the Care of Dependent Children in January of 1909. This Conference crystallized the sentiment in favor of mothers' aid and solidified the opposition against sending children to institutions because of poverty alone.  

The cry for the "endowment of motherhood" led to victory, because by 1910, several states had some kind of legislation for mothers' assistance. The success can also be explained in light of the progressive revolt that was at its height in the first decade of the 20th century. The move did not meet opposition from some notable exceptions, but organized charity in general vigorously opposed this legislation. The reasons assigned for the opposition were the overall incompetency of outdoor relief, and the belief that it was unwise at the time to embark upon new experiments in this field.  

In spite of the differences that existed among some of the social workers at the time, the nation-wide interest and the impetus given by the White House Conference in 1909, led to the establishment of the Federal Children's Bureau in 1912. And in Maryland, the national outcry was reflected in legislation, when in 1912 a complete code of laws pertaining to the subject was passed.  

In the span of fifty years, the agency had forget a pattern for maintaining and strengthening parental ties, which was to remain the
focus of its planning for destitute children. The agency also continued to expand and improve its program of foster homes during the period from 1912 to 1920. The war years disrupted its staff, but at the same time, the improved economic conditions of families due to the war also decreased the demands made upon the Society.

In 1920, the Society entered into the third significant period of its history. It entered into a cooperative agreement with the Family Welfare Association designed to eliminate overlapping or duplication of work. All applications were to be referred to the FWA for investigation even where one parent was in the city, in order to keep children in their homes as long as possible. The Henry Watson Children's Aid Society was to function primarily to furnish foster care to children whose homes no longer sufficed to care for them properly. This arrangement resulted in the boarding, at the request of the FWA, of children needing temporary or special care until their homes were again ready to receive them. This did away for the placement in free homes of children for whom there was no possibility of returning to their homes.

During the early period of the twenties, the Society also began to feel the full force of the decreasing value of free foster homes as a resource for the care of children. The changing character of rural life and economic conditions, the compulsory education and child labor laws, were just part of the conditions that limited the kind of free homes that the agency could use. This meant that the agency had to find more homes in the city for its boarding care service. Therefore, the cooperative agreement entered into with the FWA came at a very fortunate time for the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society. It was left more free to focus its attention and efforts on securing these necessary boarding homes.

The new emphasis revealed that the structural form of the Society was no longer in conformity with the demands made upon it. Overlapping of work and confusion of functions had created three practically independent departments, all apparently burdened with work. Each of two departments was dealing with legal wards of the agency; and every one of the departments had under its care some
boarding children. The only remedy was a complete reorganization of the staff and a new assignment of functions on the basis of the emphasis indicated by the work. The Department of Advice and Assistance was limited to the functions of investigating applications and complaints and serving such cases as did not indicate removal from their homes. The Boarding Department was abolished. The Department of Foster Care was created to handle what represented more than three-fourths of the work of the Society, the children in boarding and free homes and the supervision of legal wards. Included under this department was the Division of Home Finding. 34

In 1925, the Maryland Children's Aid Society that was organized in 1911 consisted of a number of more or less autonomous and self-supporting branches and a considerable group of wards who were being cared for by the HWCAS. Its officers and central staff were identical with those of the HWCAS, even though the problems of the two were by no means identical. It seemed best that the State-wide organization should have its own independent existence. Consequently, in April of 1925, this was brought about. A new Board of Managers and new officers were elected and Mr. Edward H. Cavin was appointed Executive Secretary. The two Societies continued to cooperate, with the HWCAS performing the function of placement for the State Society. In this way they hoped to follow through with social case work and a high standard of child welfare work throughout the State without confusing Baltimore City problems with State-wide problems. 35

The savings in time and effort resulting from the reorganization made possible the reduction in case load from an average of ninety children per case worker to sixty-five children. The minimum number of visits per year to children placed out in the counties of the State was increased from two to four per year.

This change and improvement in the Society's service was made possible by two events. The first was the appointment of Paul T. Beisser, the first graduate social worker in any of the Baltimore social agencies, as General Secretary in January of 1925. The second was that it became a member of the Community Fund of Baltimore. The
Fund, with twenty-nine social agencies in its membership, had its first campaign in the fall of 1925, with the HWCAS receiving a twenty percent increase in its funds. 36

By 1927, the Society had reached its culmination in the reconstruction and re-direction of its work. In both 1926 and 1927 there was a decrease in the intake of children and the number of permanent care cases. The statistics for the year 1923 showed 819 permanent care cases, all of them legally committed to the custody of the agency. On December 31, 1927, the number was 384. Some of the decrease was due to the thorough overhauling of the list of cases over a two-year period. There were many children who for one reason or another returned to parents and relatives so that legal custody was no longer justified. Much emphasis was placed on adoption. And fewer children came into permanent care or custody as in the past. 37

Several causes for the lower rate of intake can be given. No doubt the period of prosperity between 1923 and 1927 had something to do with it. Apparently there was also a decrease in the habit and practice of putting away one's children. A more concrete cause was that during 1926 and 1927 the Society was more successful in having the State take over feeble-minded children who were formerly committed to its custody. It was also successful in inducing the Supervisors of City Charities to accept the responsibility for care of children who had been separated from their families by the Juvenile Court in neglect actions, and who were, in reality, proper public charges.

As important as any cause, however, was the definite tendency away from any hasty breaking up of families and the increasing emphasis of the FWA and the HWCAS on keeping families together or re-uniting them after temporary care. 38

It is also important to note in this connection that the Society achieved a more pleasant relationship with the Juvenile Court. There was on the part of the Court a clearer understanding of the agency's new policies and practices. This cordial understanding led to the two working more closely together on the question of forcible detention of children. It was a matter of greater satisfaction to the HWCAS,
when its workers and those of the Court were working together to maintain the child in the home instead of in an institution.

With this increasing emphasis on the home, the Society found it necessary to turn its attention to vocational consultation. It began to devote time to furnishing investigation services to the Special Permit Department of the office of the Commissioner of Labor and Statistics. This was done in an effort to prove the need for social investigation before children were exempted from the compulsory attendance law.

The school system of Baltimore did not have the machinery to aid children who were suffering from social and environmental factors. Such factors, the Society found, were the main causes for the lack of progress or reasons for their behavior differences. There were no visiting teachers or case workers. Truancy was treated from the point of view of enforcement of the compulsory attendance law. Retardation was dealt with as a pedagogical problem for special classes. It was natural, therefore, for children who had reached the age of fourteen, and had not completed the minimum school requirements, to represent a serious problem. To the HWCAS, it was no solution to refer these children to the Special Permit Department and leave it to them to grant or withhold a special working permit. The HWCAS, through its investigation service, wanted to show all the phases of the problem and point out some possible methods of solution.\(^\text{39}\)

By 1929, significant steps forward in the struggle were apparent. The Society had witnessed a complete change in the Juvenile court. The new presiding Magistrate, Thomas J. Waxter,\(^\text{40}\) had completely reorganized the Court in a way to make it a social agency of great significance. The staff had been increased, the physical office arrangements greatly improved and a more adequate administration provided. The two most outstanding changes were improvement in the method of handling complaints and applications, and the securing of the services of a psychiatrist and a physician for clinical examination.\(^\text{41}\)

As a result of the social investigation for the Special Permit Department, a special report was prepared and published in 1929 by the
Commissioner of Labor and Statistics under the title, "The Mentally and Educationally Retarded Child Laborer." The report emphasized that this group of children called for special attention in a social as well as educational sense. Such problems, the report stated, should be identified and attacked at the earliest possible point. A trained, social-case-work type of visiting teacher would better recognize the problems and offer solutions for some of them.42

Considering these main points of the report, the Board of Managers urged upon the Department of Education the establishment of a visiting teacher. The Board offered the services of a staff member for a year as a demonstration. However, the Department of Education was definitely convinced of the need, and proceeded to provide the money for two visiting teachers as an integral part of the school system.43

The prospects which this progress implied were of a distinct satisfaction to the Society. But, to its credit, it did not want to rest on these accomplishments. In May of 1929, the Society decided to conduct a study to ascertain whether its program was in line with the child-caring needs of the city. It also wanted to know to what extent these needs were being met. A Survey Committee was set up to discuss the situation with other agencies dealing with children. These discussions resulted in a common agreement on the desirability of an extensive survey. In joint action a request was made to the Community Fund to secure the services of the Child Welfare League of America to make such a survey.

The Executive Committee of the Fund agreed and the necessary arrangements for the survey were made. The survey called for an analysis of the quality of service rendered by those agencies of the Community Fund dealing with children. Secondly, it called for a study of their relationship to the FWA, the Juvenile Court and the Supervisors of City Charities. The intention of the whole project was to formulate a program of child-caring which would eliminate duplication and unnecessary work. It was also the intention of the originators of the survey, to bring about a program more adequate to
the needs of Baltimore's dependent and neglected children. 44

As a consequence, in 1930, the HWCAS and the other social agencies of the Community Fund were subjected to a thorough survey by the Welfare League of America. The final report of the survey gave an appraisal which enabled the HWCAS to see that it had attained reasonable success in its efforts. And, for the most part, it showed that the Society's program had been following the new developments in child care. Equally as important, if not more so, it emphasized that the City and State Authorities had not developed any significant policy to meet their fair share of the responsibility. As to the private agencies and institutions, the survey cited the wide gaps and serious overlapping. 45

The HWCAS realized from the report of the survey, that it had a distinct responsibility for providing leadership and help. It recognized that this leadership and help should be commensurate with its position as the largest child caring agency in the State. But at the same time, the Society was receiving an increasing load of special care cases. Private institutions, and the other social agencies dealing with children had become more selective. The growing groups of special convalescent cases were left to the HWCAS to handle. Moreover, the Supervisors of City Charities were affected by this selective attitude. Therefore, it increasingly turned to the HWCAS as the only agency able to provide care for their physical and mental cases. This brought about an increase of twenty-three percent in the intake of the Society in 1930. 46

This was only a small portion of the problem that the agency faced at this time. The extraordinary unemployment situation gave every indication of destroying most of the gains made in the past decade. The HWCAS, along with the other social agencies in Baltimore, faced an inevitable train of circumstances which struck at the heart of its program. Physical ills, mental breakdowns, and family discord led to the disintegration of the ties that bind families together. There were broken homes as a result and a situation unfit for the proper nurture and guidance of children. The Society, then working against great odds, attempted to find substitute homes to meet the needs.
However, if conditions in the home were so bad that children were "neglected" in the legal sense of the word, protection should have come through the Juvenile Court. In this respect, they would become, in a real sense, public charges, wards of the community. But, Baltimore City did not have adequate provisions for this group of public charges. The municipal appropriations were so small that the private children's agencies and institutions had to carry a considerable share of the burden. Therefore, these agencies were overburdened with children beyond the limits of their resources. 47

It is interesting to note here, how definitely the plans and successes of the HWCAS were linked up with the fortunes of the Community Fund and the public agencies. And in the 1930's, the depressive economic conditions limited the sources of income for both. The resulting financial burden, due to the increased demands, became more than the Society could carry. This caused the HWCAS to modify its program to meet the emergency needs only. Throughout these early depressive years, due to the disorganized family life among the thousands on relief, the HWCAS was limited in its attempts to carry out its intended program. 48

The program of relief and aid to dependent children under the Federal Social Security Act of 1935, brought some relief to the Society. This Act enabled the City of Baltimore to set up its own child placement service. It required some time before the Department of Public Welfare could properly organize and staff itself. Because of this, it was not until around 1940 that the HWCAS had completed the transfer of more than two-thirds of the children under its care to the City Department of Public Welfare. The Society continued to give foster care to children whose need was temporary. And it gave long-time care to those children whose parents could pay a certain sum of money toward the cost of care. 49

With the Department of Public Welfare assuming responsibility for a major portion of the city charges, the Board of the HWCAS was able to give consideration to its future program. For some time there had been the attempt to resolve the question of relationship between a child placing agency and a family agency. The consideration of this
problem led to a close working relationship between the HWCAS and the FWA. In the discussions that took place during this relationship, the question of merger was considered by the two agencies. The consideration was based on two major factors. First, the basic concept of the work of the two agencies was essentially the same; and second, all of the factors in the local situation were favorable to the merger. Therefore, as a result of the recommendations made by the Survey staff in 1940, the HWCAS and the FWA as discussed in Chapter V were consolidated in 1942 to form the Family and Children's Society.50

Thus, the Society had its beginnings when little concern was being given to children and they were placed in almshouses, jails and orphanages, indiscriminately. This was followed by the crisis created by the Civil War, when families were disrupted by the call to arms and their children thrown upon public charity. It labored under a load of about one hundred children annually until this number was increased by an Act of the Assembly in 1864, when children could be committed to it by the Courts. The Society's finances were of a voluntary sort and precarious, until the gift to the cause of neglected children by Henry Watson gave impetus to this charity and its greater accomplishments. An Act of the Assembly of February 12, 1872 changed the name of the existing Children's Aid Society to that of the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society of Baltimore, Inc.

There was at the time an almost universal tendency on the part of individuals and social agencies to think first, and perhaps only, of removing children from a bad situation and placing them in a boarding home or institution. The HWCAS operated under a charter which proclaimed its intent "to improve the conditions of the poor and destitute children of the City of Baltimore." Accordingly, it became concerned not merely with giving the best possible care to the wards in its custody, but with those efforts which resulted in meeting the needs of children without taking them out of their homes. The Society found that the child could frequently be served best by discouraging removal and insisting that efforts be made to provide proper care without resorting to foster care. The Society developed its program to the point where it wanted to be judged not so much by the number of place-
ments, but by its efforts and influence in making the child's own home adequate for his care.

Therefore, the fundamental principle that guided the Society during its 82 years of service was that the child can only attain its highest development in the home. And where the child could not be continued in its own home it was of vital importance to provide a good foster home.

During the lifetime of the Society, it had only five Executives at its head,\textsuperscript{51} and to the members, this small number of executives throughout the history of the Society was indicative of its stability and cohesiveness.
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CHAPTER VII

THE SOCIETY TO PROTECT CHILDREN FROM CRUELTY AND IMMORALITY
1878-1943

The other organization that made the welfare of children its primary concern was the Baltimore Society for the Protection of Children from Cruelty and Immorality (SPCCI) organized on June 17, 1878. Children's protective societies in the United States developed along two different lines. The New York Society for the Protection of Children, incorporated in 1875, was the first protective society to be organized in the United States. It was purely a law enforcing body which did not concern itself with the causes contributing to child neglect and abuses. The second type, of which Massachusetts was representative, emphasized the preventive and constructive aspects of the work as well as law enforcement. By 1880, ten other organizations had been formed and were in operation following in general the New York pattern.¹

These Societies were organized in response to the cruel and inhumane conditions in which children were found to be suffering. However, these early protective societies did not consider themselves social agencies. Many advocates of protective societies had long recognized that children needed protection from the menacing influences of society as well as from their own natural guardians. They also recognized that some provisions should be made for public authorities to intervene in cases of cruelty to children as a matter of right and duty. But, there were no public agencies set up to investigate the conditions or bring relief to the neglected and destitute child. It was, therefore, left up to individuals and private organizations to receive complaints of abuse, study the conditions and collect the necessary evidence. This was done with the hope that the courts and legislature would provide protection.²

It is interesting to note that the organization of the New York Society resulted from an incident in which the President of the Society for the Protection of Animals acted under its mandate to save beasts to
point out that a child should be accorded as much protection as an animal. And the animal protective society, prior to the organization of the children's protective society, had organized a children's division. Hence, the primary task of the early children's protective societies was educating the general public and the various legislative bodies to their responsibility to protect children from the wrongs inflicted upon them by a negligent society. The organizations emphasized that only through laws could much of the cruelty to children be corrected. They believed that it was not the behavior of the parents per se that should give the law or protective societies the right to intervene into the lives of families, but the damage to children resulting from this behavior. When, after a period of time, the societies had gained some success in getting child legislation, they more and more turned to reform and preventive measures.

Baltimore was the sixth city to found a children's protective society. When it began developing the idea of a protective agency for children, Maryland was still suffering from the conditions of the Civil War. Begging by children on the streets of Baltimore had reached major proportions until it was equal to or greater than that of adults. Much of this was done to help the family eke out a bare existence. But, many youngsters were subjected to harsh peddling; they were overworked and brutally abused by their parents and guardians. They were often found working in the low variety theatres, singing and dancing, in order to help the family.

The Maryland legislature drafted and passed a law in 1876 that brought some relief to this situation. The law made it a misdemeanor for a parent, guardian, employer, or any person who was responsible for the "custody or control" of minors under sixteen years of age, to allow them to participate in activities that were detrimental to their character or well-being. The Act excluded children from singing, playing musical instruments, rope walking and dancing as a means of employment and from begging, peddling, and vagrancy. It also permitted the magistrates to impose fines for any violations. Even though the law became effective in 1876, it did not accomplish all that was hoped for. The need was seen for a body to enforce this law and any others
coming from the state or municipalities pertaining to wrongs done to children.  

This need was met by Goldsboro S. Griffith, a successful businessman, and an active participant in several of Baltimore's humanitarian societies. Mr. Griffith had observed the successful operation of children's protective Societies in other cities, and felt that Baltimore could benefit by such an organization. He presented his plan for a similar organization in Baltimore at a Board meeting of the Prisoner's Aid Association, of which he was president. He was able to interest five other men of this Board in organizing an association for enforcing the provisions of the Act of 1876. On April 29, 1878, these men met in the offices of the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society and passed a resolution to form an organization patterned after the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. Each of the men present agreed to invite two additional men to their next meeting. The original six, however, constituted a temporary Board of Managers during the period of organization.

The Board appointed a temporary chairman; committees were formed to nominate officers, write articles of incorporation and by-laws, and draft a statement that could be used for publicity purposes. Within a two-month period, the Board met ten times and the organization of the new association was completed on June 17, 1878. It was incorporated the following day in the name of the "Society for the Protection of Children from Cruelty and Immorality in Baltimore City."

At the time of incorporation its statement of aim was:

The prevention of cruelty to children, whether inflicted by those having a natural or acquired authority over them or by others. To prevent children from begging on the streets, and from attending low variety theatres or dance houses. To rescue girls from evil lives, and to prevent the sale of intoxicating drinks to minors.

Therefore, the Society charged itself with the responsibility of preventing by all lawful means cruelty to children as well as protecting them from such evil influences as tend to corrupt their morals. But, their immediate task was that of rescuing children who were suffering as a result of bodily harm by parents and guardians. The Society's feeling was to lift them out of this danger and if necessary, place them in homes where
there were more elevating influences. They strongly believed that the "prosecution" of the law would be the most efficient means of preventing wrongs to children. But, the Society also realized that no law could be effective until public sentiment demanded its enforcement. It was hopeful that the community would help in this enterprise. Thus, an appeal was made to the citizenry to become acquainted with the laws and assist the Society in the task of rescuing innocent victims. Categorically, then the Baltimore Society pursued a middle course philosophy between New York on the one hand and Massachusetts on the other. It was first and foremost interested in protection; but it also had an interest in a program of prevention of cruelty through legislation and social reform.

The Board of Managers became known as the Board of Directors and was the governing body of the Society. The number on the Board was set by constitutional authority; but it varied from time to time by constitutional amendment. The Board was self-perpetuating, for the most part, with the same members being nominated year after year at the annual elections. And during this early period, in case of death or resignation, replacement was made with dispatch. Gradually, the organization took on more form and stability, with less thought given to size and more to a better organization. Also, this large administrative body delegated its direct administrative authority to an executive committee. The committee, consisting of three members, was authorized to meet monthly and report back to the Board of Managers.

The early members of the Board and of the Society in general were of a deeply religious nature. Membership in the Society was confined to citizens of Maryland who were of good moral character. Along with this qualification, members also had to pay an annual fee of not less than $3.00 to the Society. The members of the Society considered themselves in the vanguard of social regeneration and thought that they were the apostles of social reform. Their efforts at reform were to extend to the homes and the brothels, to the variety theatres, to the police stations and children's institutions.

When the program was launched the Board did not know exactly what its duties would be or what courses would be followed to carry out the aims of the Society. Until this was ascertained, the Board had to
hold itself in readiness to meet the problems as they arose. This it did do for the most part, until April, 1883. Before this date, the organization had a series of none-too efficient administrators. James McMillan, a former Board member, became the first paid agent of the Society and took over his duties on September 1, 1878.\textsuperscript{17} Ill health kept him from carrying out his assignment and he resigned on September 20, 1880, after many months of inactivity.\textsuperscript{18} He was succeeded almost immediately by George Sumwalt, who in turn, resigned two months later for a more "congenial position."\textsuperscript{19} The annual reports for the year ending December 31, 1880 to 1882 inclusive, carry the name of Henry Walsh as agent until early 1883, when George W. Parker was appointed.

The Society was still essentially in its trial period when Mr. Parker began his three decades of service in April. Since there had been a rapid turnover in the administration, neither the agent nor the Board had been able to effect any permanent organization. To Mr. Parker goes the credit for setting up records, and working out a coordinated plan under which the Society could operate. He became Secretary, agent and collector all rolled into one. The Board and members agreed that Mr. Parker carried the brunt of a task which really required the services of four persons. In spite of these heavy burdens, the situation was not relieved until 1887. It was then that the Board hired an assistant who in turn became the agent. This made it possible for Mr. Parker to assume the title of Superintendent.\textsuperscript{20}

Serving in the capacity as Secretary of the Board, Mr. Parker was considered a member of that body and had equal voting power with other members. This placed him in a dual role of having a voice in making policy, and at the same time being subject to the orders of the Board as an employee. There were inherent difficulties in such a plan, for at no time during Mr. Parker's employment did the Board consider itself free to discuss the work of the Society in his absence. And ideas of change were not acceptable to him when they were presented in the regular meetings.\textsuperscript{21}

One gets an excellent portrait of Mr. Parker in the monthly reports of his work which he prepared for the Board. He kept rather detailed
notes of his daily and weekly activities which he entitled "Daily Doings" from which he made his reports. A good example of this is the one he did for April, 1883:

On the 26th day of March, 1883, I was appointed as the agent of the Society for the Protection of Children from Cruelty and Immorality, and was officially notified of the same on the following day, and was instructed to take charge of the work on the first day of April, 1883. In the few intervening days, between the time that I was notified, and the first of April, I endeavored to prepare for the peculiar duties to be performed, by making myself acquainted with the laws relating to children, and by acquiring such information as could be obtained, from those persons who had long been engaged in this and similar work. I also visited the several Captains of Police at the different Police Stations, and in the company with Mr. Griffith, Chairman of the Executive Committee, called upon and was by him introduced to the Marshall of Police, and was assured of the hearty cooperation of the entire Police Department. 22

That Mr. Parker was a thorough going, conscientious individual was indicated in his first month in office. The daily activities that began at this time set the pattern for the services that he rendered the Society for thirty-two years. He visited the song and dance houses at night to see that no children were in the audiences or on the stage. His days were filled with visits to the homes of parents or guardians to investigate reports that children were being abused. He went to public institutions, such as Bayview Asylum, where children were housed with adults in surroundings subjected to evil influences. He constantly warned the wrongdoers as to the punishment that could be meted out to them and the steps the Society would have to take if the conditions were not corrected.

Many cases were taken into the courts for infractions of the law, and children were frequently taken from their parents and committed. But, Mr. Parker was not in accord with the practice at the time of taking children from families because of poverty alone. He often interceded for the parents when he believed that the welfare of the children would not be improved by separation. He also interceded when he thought that the parents might benefit by the continued responsibility for the care of their children. He was described as a determined individual who did
not take kindly to change. But, the men and women who knew him best thought of him as a tender-hearted, sympathetic man. He took as much interest in each child as if it belonged to him. He was alert, and receptive to anything that would tend toward the most efficient administration.23

When George W. Parker died in 1915, the Board deliberated several months before finally choosing a successor. There was a difference of opinion as to whether the position should be filled by Frank Radcliffe who had been serving as agent since 1899, or by George Harwood who had come to the Society in 1910. Mr. Harwood had brought to the agency for the first time the practical knowledge derived from a business education.24 He had demonstrated his ability, first on the clerical staff and later as agent, to handle protective work in accordance with the Board's policy. He served as Acting Secretary for fifteen months and succeeded the the position in April, 1916. He remained Secretary and Superintendent until the agency merged with the Family and Children's Society in 1943.

While the early years brought many changes in leadership in contrast to later years, the Presidents of the Board did much to mold the Society's history.25 For example, Louis Hochheimer was noted for his legal work in connection with the Society, often at great personal sacrifice and inconvenience to himself. He had come into the Society in 1883, when the Board was authorized to engage an Attorney to attend to cases that came before the magistrates or courts. His duties as legal counsel were extensive in scope. The Society was pioneering in a new field and the separation of children from parents was not to be taken lightly. The policy was often misunderstood in the community and Mr. Hochheimer's services were demanded almost constantly by the Board. He was needed to help establish legal policies, draft new laws to be submitted to the legislature, and represent the Society in the court room in behalf of neglected children. One of the first laws framed by Mr. Hochheimer was what later became known as the "Destitute and Suffering Minor's Act," passed in 1886.26 It provided for the prompt removal of any child found in harmful custody, as well as for review by the courts of all such expeditious proceedings.
In 1890, The Society helped to bring about a statutory revision of the law on habeas corpus. This revision was considered to be an improvement over the former law in two major respects. The revised law made it mandatory for courts and judges to decide cases on their merit alone. It also served to call to the attention of plaintiffs and their attorneys that children would not be returned to the home unless there was evidence to show that they would be benefited. Before this revision, courts and judges were not bound to render decisions based upon the merits of a case. They were quite free, and often acted accordingly, to arrive at a decision based on their own personal feelings, regardless of the evidence.

The Society succeeded in getting another law passed in 1890—-one which related to the use that had been made of children accompanying persons engaged in begging. Children had been forced to go out into the street begging with persons of real or fake physical illness. The children were, in the process, taken into bars and "bawdy houses," and exposed to conditions of drunkenness and immorality. Begging by children of any kind was considered one of the major factors contributing to their downfall. With this law, persons begging in the streets with children were subject to arrest and jail. The Society noted that this kind of begging ceased as if by magic with passage of this law.

The Society was responsible for revision of the law of 1876. It long had been recognized that more coverage as to age was needed. The revision passed in 1892 expanded the number of factories and trades where children under sixteen could not work for more than ten hours per day. Also in 1892, statutory provision was made for the courts to sentence minors to juvenile institutions, rather than to the regular prisons. This would prevent them from coming into contact with the adult offenders, and the name of the institutions to be used were listed in the law.

The Society was aware that it would have to work closely with the judges and the courts if the newly passed laws were to be successful. Therefore, under the guidance of Louis Hochheimer, it proceeded to establish a good relationship with the judges in the courts. Over the years, the Society's agents were to develop a technique for investigation that commanded the respect of the magistrates and judges. They earned
a city-wide reputation for their knowledge of legal matters where the
rights of children were concerned. Its services were found helpful
during a period when resources were limited and the public and private
family and children's societies had not yet developed a comprehensive
program.

When Mr. Hochheimer became President of the Board in 1904, he
was aware that a change was needed in the organization and administra-
tion of the Society. He recognized the difficulties of having a superin-
tendent at the head of an agency who was also a member of the Board.
George W. Parker's having served as Secretary, Superintendent, agent
and member of the Board, on several occasions, had caused major rifts
in the governing body. One faction called for a separate paid Secretary,
with Mr. Parker's duties as Superintendent to remain the same. Louis
Hochheimer as President, initiated moves to correct this, but he could
never get the majority of the Board to suppor him. He made various at-
ttempts to reorganize the Society to enable it to make the best use of op-
portunities. But the Board accepted new ideas very reluctantly. The
issue with Mr. Parker, therefore, was not resolved until 1915 when he
died. The new Secretaries of the Society were not included as members
of the Board.

Failing to get any positive support, Louis Hochheimer resigned
from the position of President of the Society in 1919. He continued to
serve the Society in a legal manner, but never in an official capacity
again. It must be noted that Mr. Hochheimer was a good lawyer, but
he was generous to a fault. The fact that he died a pauper may have
had some significance for the Society as its financial affairs went from
bad to worse during his period in office.

The Society learned early in its history that it was limited in what
it could do both toward planning for children and raising money to fin-
ance its programs. Often legacies, involving large sums of money,
offered to charitable societies had to be turned down because of the
strings attached. One prime example was the first big legacy which was
offered to the SPCCI by Mrs. Augusta Markley. The acceptance of this
bequest would have meant an immediate change in the structure of the
Society to provide for the protection of animals as well as children.
Moreover, the funds would not have been available until the death of Mr. Markley. 34

While the SPCCI was able to function on the money it took in from private contributors, benefits and legacies, fear of deficits was always lurking at its heels. For many years, the frequently posed question of how to improve the financial status of the Society remained unanswered. In its early history, the agent or superintendent, as one of his many duties, made the rounds to collect money from subscribers. When this became too taxing with his other duties, women were employed to collect on a commission basis. 35

It seemed only natural for the men to turn to women for assistance. In giving thought to how they could serve, it was first suggested that they could work in the wards. But there is no evidence to indicate that they were organized on this basis; rather they were organized as a committee under the sponsorship of Miss Eliza Ridgley, one of the first women to be elected to the Board. 36 They were appointed to visit children who had been placed with families and assisted in securing proper homes for new referrals. They sponsored plays, talked influential people into giving donations and they came forth with money of their own when necessary. Therefore, their services became invaluable in helping to raise money for the Society. By 1914, the Managers considered them a "stimulus" to the development of the program, an "adjunct" to the Society for which the Board was grateful. 37 The women became an Auxiliary within the Society with a standing committee functioning as a part of the administrative body. 38 The Board gave approval to their plans to form an advisory board for the Society. This advisory board was to consist of prominent men and women who would give advice, finances, and use their influence for the advancement of the Society. 39

That the women were sincere in their belief that the Society needed new and prominent people, with influence, skill and professional status, cannot be denied. But there was grave danger that such a new body, serving in an advisory capacity would have created, in effect, a dual board with leadership divided in such a way as to make administration difficult. Thus, the Society, which had a Board of Managers as its governing body, found itself in a position of being counselled by the
women. All of the members did not agree with the suggestion that an advisory board be established as was clearly indicated during the annual election of 1919 when the women and their followers were challenged by an opposition ticket. The women were quite unhappy over the outcome of the election. To show how unhappy they were, they aired their feelings in the press, carried their grievances to the public through printed pamphlets and started mandamus proceedings against members of the Board. They refused to turn over money that had been raised in behalf of the Society. To make matters worse, they refused to pay debts which they had incurred.

The Board tried to counteract the propaganda which it believed detrimental to the Society, by giving the President and Secretary a vote of confidence. It appointed a committee to investigate the points of difference, with the view to "erecting" harmony between the two factions. Failing in this, the committee reported its findings in a two and one-half page report indicating that the women had become a "distinct obstacle" to the furtherance of the work. The ladies were accused of unfounded, malicious statements, forcing costly litigation upon the Board, creating enemies for the Society and lobbying against it. The committee recommended in the report that the Women's Auxiliary be "repudiated in toto" and their organization dissolved. The Board accepted the recommendation and dissolved the Auxiliary by resolution. But, the Board members had to personally bear the expense of printing special reports in an effort to publicize their action.

We should note here that during the lifetime of the Society no part of its structure was to undergo more change than its name. Originally incorporated as the Society for the Protection of Children from Cruelty and Immorality of Baltimore City, it was reincorporated in 1905 under the name of the "Society for the Protection of Children in Baltimore City." There is no indication as to why the Board elected to make this change.

The original certificate of incorporation had given the Board the right to function on a state-wide basis with the main office in Baltimore City. As requests came in from other areas, the work was extended to meet these growing needs by setting up subsidiary offices in outlying counties. Because of this the Board began thinking in terms of a name
that would be more indicative of the scope of its activity. By 1908, the Society was ready to undergo another change and that year, by charter, it became the Maryland Society for the Protection of Children. 43

The last change in the name of the organization took place in 1910 under the leadership of Isaac S. Field. 44 The question was raised at that time as to whether the name of the Society was entirely descriptive of its work. The Board believed that it had digressed in omitting a part of the original wording; therefore, it again agreed to include the term "Immorality" in the title. At the same time, the Board agreed to retain the word "Maryland," and the organization finally settled on the name, the Maryland Society to Protect Children from Cruelty and Immorality.

Since the Society was founded as a child's protective agency, this phase of the program was given the most emphasis. However, from its earliest days, the agency considered the sanctity of the home as being all important. The rights of parents were safeguarded and no move was made unless it was ordered by a magistrate or judge. Any attempt to remove a child from his home was done only when severity merged into downright cruelty or neglect had caused physical harm. The agents, in carrying out the aims of the organization, attempted to gain the desired end by using the mildest measure possible. In many cases, a statement of the law and/or a word of warning were sufficient to bring about needed corrections. When this did not work, there was no hesitancy to use stern measures. The agents were expected to use every lawful means to carry out the purpose of the Society.

In connection with the work of the agency, the Board decided to establish a temporary home for children in 1882. This was to give the child shelter, food and clothing when placement was found necessary. 45 It also meant that the agent had to assume the responsibility of locating suitable homes. Children who were placed were visited and supervised regularly. This gave the agent the opportunity to keep in touch with the children in the homes as well as with those placed in institutions. As a result, the Society took an interest in the conditions of the institutions in which it placed children. Whenever conditions existed that were thought to be detrimental, efforts were made to have them corrected.
In considering the overall question of the agency's program, it should be kept in mind that it was not originally set up to provide case work service. It consequently became so involved in the limited functional approach to the problem that it failed to broaden its program to include the principles of case work. Increasingly, the time of the agent was taken up in placing children, collecting money and serving as Secretary to the Society. This, over a period of time, prevented him from handling half of the cases brought to this attention. However, the case work approach, which gave parents more opportunity to participate in the plans to correct conditions themselves, had developed over the years. Hence the failure of the Society to broaden its program to include case work service brought it a great deal of criticism because, along with protective care, many children needed help beyond that which the Society was set up to give.

As already indicated, the overriding problem throughout the history of the Society was the lack of money. The agency had no scale for wage increases or anything pertaining to personnel practices available to members of the staff. Salaries were always influenced by the state of the treasury. The Board was aware of this and forward steps concerning such policies were recorded in the minutes, but it was not until 1925 when help was assured from the Community Fund, that real consideration was given to the problem. It adopted a salary scale more nearly commensurate with the duties of the various employees. And in spite of its financial insecurity, the Society did begin to grant some sick leave with pay, retirement allowances and vacation with pay.

As late as January of 1926, when the Society became a member of the Community Fund, it had only three members on its staff—the Superintendent and two agents, one of whom did clerical work. In 1928, it took on an additional employee. A full-time stenographer whose salary was met wholly or in part by the Henry Watson Children's Aid Society, was hired in 1932. Also in 1932, the second full-time agent was added to the staff. The total staff peak was from 1938 to 1940, inclusive, when clerical and administrative staff was about equally divided.
This expansion might be related to the fact that the most substantial bequest to the Society came in 1936, upon the death of Mrs. George W. Hetzell. At the time of the settlement, the SPCCI received a block of investments that netted the Society a substantial income from 1936 on.

Thus, we see that as late as the twenties and thirties, the Society's program was still of a limited nature while the FWA and the HWCAS, with improved facilities, were providing for the new needs of the community by expanding their programs of services to families and children. They had accepted the general concept of social case work by recognizing the possibility of handling problems of neglect in the home. Also, unemployment of the thirties helped bring about public relief, which in turn, by its very availability, met some of the problems which had been a causative factor in neglect and made protection societies necessary.

These developments, therefore, reduced the need for such a special agency as the SPCCI. This meant that Baltimore had reached the point where protective work for children no longer needed to be the function of a separate agency. It was with this in mind that the Community Fund of Baltimore called for a study of the work of member agencies in 1940 as discussed in Chapter V.

The survey staff, charged with the task of determining the necessity of continuing the specific services of each agency, gave consideration to the need, the performance and quality of service of each agency. An analysis of the SPCCI showed that less than half of its work was in the field of protective work for children. The analysis also showed that much of the needed service in the protection field was being given by the family and children's agencies, and official agencies such as the juvenile court. Therefore, the aforementioned recommendation that the Society cease to function and merge with the FWA resulted in the committee's conclusion that the community was not justified in maintaining a separate agency for handling the small number of cases actually requiring authoritative work. 49

Historically, then, the Society was first and foremost an agency for the investigation of complaints of neglect, abuse and immoral conditions in which children suffered. This was essentially why it was created in 1878 when there was no other organization which could be considered
an enforcement agency to protect children; and the analysis of the Survey Committee indicated that in so far as policy was concerned, the Society had not deviated from its course.

At the time of the merger with the FCS in 1943, it had given protective services to children for sixty-five years. It did not always make the best use of opportunities to serve adequately or see if it could serve the community better. But, throughout the years, the members gave loyal and faithful service which demanded much in the way of personal and financial sacrifice. In the field of social work, there was new respect for the ability of parents to plan, with the help of an agency, toward the correction of the problems of neglect and abuse. Thus in suggesting merger, the Survey Committee offered the community an opportunity for a new approach to handling problems pertaining to children that would be more satisfying to the Society and the community.
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CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

Since the founding of private charitable organizations in the United States, Baltimore has been one of the pioneer cities in the charity movement. No other cities, with the possible exception of New York and Boston, were ahead of Baltimore in organizing and maintaining permanent agencies to aid children and improve the conditions of the poor. In many areas of the charity movement, Baltimore was in the advance of these cities. This was due to the concern and stability of its leadership.

But in the inception, it was necessary to take note of the fact that one of the most striking features of the early charitable movement is the Biblical quotation, "Ye have the poor always with you." In Baltimore, too, the early attitude prevailed that poverty was "God's judgment against the undeserving poor." Also, during the early period of the movement, the people of Baltimore, as elsewhere, were influenced by the theory of "laissez faire." Many of them consoled themselves with the thought that riches would come if only they made themselves more deserving--if only they were able to work harder and develop more wisdom. And even though most of them were poor they had hope.

With this as Baltimore's background: How was she able to merge as a leader in the field of charitable work? What were the distinguishing characteristics of Baltimore's contributions to the development of social work as a profession?

In answering the first question there are several points that must be considered. First, there were those persons in the movement who stressed that the bareness in the lives of the unfortunate might have much to do with their poor performance. Secondly, most of the leadership and workers were able between 1890 and 1900 to develop a philosophy and an understanding of what social work should try to accomplish.
Individually and collectively they began to adopt national trends and think of what would be best for the community in the end. They came to recognize that the very essence of charity principles was that no one charity society could justly live unto itself. Whatever else a charity organization may or may not do, it should work for the principle of increasing the natural resources and forces of a neighborhood in assisting the needy and destitute. But, they knew that there were no rigid methods applicable to charity work. Life in anything means constant change of method. Therefore, charity organizations and workers should direct the fullest treatment to the needy as individuals and as families. One basic answer was in the relationship between visitors and clients. Many of the visitors came from the elite and represented the class-consciousness of their group. The feeling these visitors showed toward their clients certainly had something to do with the progress made. And after finding out what the exact nature of the interchange between client and worker really was, the attitude of suspicion prevalent in the "giver and receiver" began to vanish.

Baltimore charity workers as other charity workers throughout the country, began to "learn by doing." The societies began to bring together all of the accumulated experience of the field into a scientifically ordered whole. They began to grasp and communicate the "how" and the "why" of what many people in this country and abroad had been struggling with experimentally for several decades.

From this experience, the charity agencies in Baltimore were able to discover better methods, to raise standards through demonstrations of sound practice, and to devise ways of teaching volunteers and paid practitioners. They changed paid charity organization workers from detectives and clerks in a "charitable clearing house" to learners and teachers in an educational endeavor.

This academic approach was due to the close association that Baltimore had with the Johns Hopkins University. No other place in the United States, at the time, offered a similar opportunity for the development of both the intellectual and technical aspects of philanthropy. It was from this source that the Baltimore charitable movement became noted for the wide scope of its work and its readiness to make experi-
ments in any direction in which there was a promise of good results.

As to Baltimore's contributions in advancing the profession of Social Work: First, it enunciated the best thought out reasons for the profession's being. It was as early as 1881 that President Gilman of Johns Hopkins foresaw that graduates from the new social science departments could put their knowledge to work just as physicians used biology and engineers used mathematics.

This view of the role of the professional person and his contribution to the larger society was translated by Charles Bonaparte into a sense of the purpose of professional activity as it related to clientele. It was Bonaparte who stressed that social workers were not detectives to protect donors and punish impostors, but rather counselors who were to understand people as they were and find ways of helping them. He believed that what people had done in the past, whether they were "worthy or unworthy," was not as important as how they might change in the future. This attitude was one of the early uses of the current professional philosophy of "starting where the client is."

Second, the agencies of Baltimore too, became imbued with the idea that their function was to teach. The new discoveries and techniques in social work would be useless unless there was some communication and understanding. Therefore, the need existed to teach the clients, volunteer visitors, paid staff, Board members and the community at large. In their impassioned effort to communicate better ways they discovered that clients learned best when they were not required to be grateful and humble. This is known today as the "positive" approach.

By 1896, a formal apprenticeship program for new staff, volunteers and agents had been inaugurated by most of the Baltimore charitable agencies. However, this was not considered to be the ultimate answer to the personnel needs of the field. The Baltimore leaders began advocating a school of social work and spearheaded the national movement in that direction.

Men who received their doctorates or taught at Johns Hopkins were encouraged by the University to use the Baltimore agencies as
laboratories. These men who volunteered as visitors in the agencies, became professors and directors in the first schools of social work. In the New York School of Social Work, for example, there were Phillip Ayres, a student, and E.R.L. Gould, a professor, at Hopkins. Ayres received his Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins in 1888. He was the Executive Director of the Cincinnati COS and the Associated Charities of Chicago before taking the job in New York. He was one of the persons the Baltimore delegation to the National Conference of Charities and Corrections always conferred with. Mary Richmond, as General Secretary of the Baltimore COS, and Ayres wrote frequently to compare notes on current administrative problems.

Leading textbooks were written by Hopkins graduates, probably the best known being Amos Warner's *American Charities*. Although a student, Warner became General Agent of the COS in March of 1887. He served in this capacity until March of 1889 when he left Baltimore to become a professor of political science at the University of Nebraska. In 1891, he was appointed by President Benjamin Harrison as the first Superintendent of Charities for the District of Columbia. It was while Warner was in Baltimore that he began assembling material for his book. The book was one of the first scholarly surveys in the field. It was the first comprehensive description of the various institutions through which social work accomplished its ends.

Mary Richmond's first book, *Friendly Visiting Among the Poor*, 1899, was on the required reading list for social work trainees. She, along with other leaders in Baltimore, established the first blueprint for the kind of education required for social work. Miss Richmond devoted full time to her duties as General Secretary of the Baltimore COS and it was from the school of experience that she learned social work. She became a national figure in her latter years in Baltimore and left to become the Secretary of the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity, after which she went to the Russell Sage Foundation as the Director of the Charity Organization Department.

Jeffrey Brackett, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Federated Charities, was called to Boston in 1904 to organize the Boston School jointly sponsored by Harvard University and Simmons College.
The organizational pattern that Brackett followed came out of his experiences in Baltimore.

John M. Glenn, of the Baltimore COS, became an exponent of the idea that the involved techniques and advanced training required to do the newer types of social work demanded a wider base of support and more public understanding. His experience in Baltimore led to his becoming the first Director of the Russell Sage Foundation.

Early in the history of the Baltimore movement contact was made with national figures in the field of charity work. This contact with such persons as Octavia Hill, Josephine Shaw Lowell, and Zilphia D. Smith, enabled the Baltimore workers to keep abreast of the latest ideas in the field. Baltimore provided a training ground for numerous social workers, who after receiving a wealth of experience, moved to other agencies throughout the country. These workers and the ones who remained in Baltimore, became active and influential in the National Conferences of Charities and Corrections and the National Conference of Social Workers. Thus, the trend of the profession of Social Work was profoundly influenced by knowledge and experience coming out of Baltimore.

In addition to its underlying philosophy, experiments in methods, and creation of a training program, Baltimore was the source of many germinal ideas. These ideas gradually developed as professional techniques and skills. Principles of political science were utilized in developing a better legal structure for social welfare. Economic theory was applied to determine the relation of individual family income to community well-being. Early sociology was used to help see the meaning of urbanization, population problems, and conflict of cultures in the new immigration and family life.

Baltimore social workers were of the conviction that the most meaningful research in anything involving the behavior of people should rely on knowing the details of individual cases. This encouraged the agents to make their impressions specific and to compare one case with another. It led them to consider what kind of information of "social evidence" a social worker could rely on in making decisions. The Baltimore agencies were among the first to use the word "client" to refer
to the recipients of service and they stressed the use of the word "confidentiality" in regard to information secured in the process of helping. The form and content of the records had developed to a more advanced stage in Baltimore before 1900 than in any of the other cities. The workers of Baltimore were right along with others throughout the nation to recognize that emotions and personal attributes were more important data than income figures and employment histories. These experiments in how best to observe and then make the observations meaningful to others were the first steps that led to Social Diagnosis.

At the same time, it was recognized that in order to create influence toward "restoration" and to attract people with the requisite qualifications, it was necessary to provide adequate tools and working conditions. In place of drab, inadequately heated tenements as offices, attractively furnished buildings were set up. Typewriters, telephones and modernized filing systems were other innovations. In this way, it was possible to make the profession of social work attractive to young persons of ability.

There were other examples that made Baltimore stand out in attracting trained persons and developing social work into a profession. Baltimore was in the lead in establishing adequate salaries to fit the training and skill demanded of its members, and bringing about retirement benefits. These efforts were begun prior to 1920 with greater emphasis stressed in the 1920's and 1930's. The fight led to the working out of commensurate salaries and retirement benefits by the time of merger. This meant that Baltimore also was initial in working for these benefits for social workers nationally.

A second example is that the Baltimore charity agencies, being private, were not subject to the limitations inherent in public agencies. This enabled them to take advantage of the freedom and flexibility of their position to lead in speaking out and taking a stand on public matters. Those public agencies existing at the time lacked this freedom. Therefore, as private agencies, Baltimore, along with others throughout the country, took the lead in establishing standards that public agencies could not.
It should be emphasized again that Baltimore did borrow and learn from the experiences of other societies. Other leaders and societies had been moving in the same direction; but it was the Baltimore movement which most clearly perceived the trend, and was able to explain it graphically so that its significance was comprehended and it could be put into immediate practice. Baltimore was in the vanguard in leading the way to what the best practices of the future would be.

Hence, the profession owes Baltimore recognition for its contribution in developing leaders during the decade when professional identity was being established. Baltimore can also claim recognition for the formulation of a basic philosophy, experimentation in new institutional patterns, establishing educational norms and the nurturing of many germinal ideas.
ORIGINAL CONSTITUTION OF
ASSOCIATION FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE CONDITION OF THE POOR

Article I.

This Institution shall be called "The Baltimore Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor."

Article II.

It's object and design is to discourage indiscriminate almsgiving, street begging, pauperism and idleness; and to elevate the moral and physical condition of the indigent, and so far as compatible with these objects, the relief of their necessities.

Article III.

Every person who becomes an annual subscriber to the funds of the society shall be a member there of for the current year.

Article IV.

The permanent officers of the Association shall consist of a President, ten Vice-Presidents, a Treasurer, A Recording and a Corresponding Secretary, a General Agent, and a Board of Managers to consist of sixty members, nine of whom shall form a quorum for the transaction of business.

Article V.

All the officers and managers provided for in Article IV shall be annually elected by ballot, except the General Agent, who shall be appointed by the Board of Managers and shall hold his office on such terms as may be provided in the By-Laws.

Article VI.

The President and Secretaries shall perform such duties as usually pertain to their respective offices, and as may be especially provided for in the By-Laws.

Article VII.

The Treasurer shall give such security for the faithful performance of the trust reposed in him as the Board of Managers may demand and approve. He shall take in charge all funds belonging to the Association; keep and account of all receipts and expenditures, and pay all duly authorized drafts. At the annual meeting, he shall render particular and correct statement of all his receipts and disbursements, to the Association. He shall also exhibit a summary report to the Board of Managers at their stated meetings and to the Executive Committee whenever called upon for that purpose.
Article VIII

It shall be the duty of the General Agent to devote himself with diligence and fidelity to the interest and affairs of the Association. He shall be ex-officio, a member of the Board of Managers.

Article IX.

The Board of Managers shall be in exclusive control of the funds of the Association, and shall apply them in such a manner as they shall deem best calculated to accomplish its benevolent purposes. They shall have authority to make all necessary by-laws, and from time to time to alter or amend them; to fill all vacancies, appoint all committees, and generally to adopt all such measures as the objects of the institution may require.

Its stated meetings shall be held on the second Monday of January, March, October, and November, and the annual meeting of the Association shall be convened on the Fourth Monday in October, in each year hereafter, when the Board shall submit a full report of the proceedings.

Article X.

An office shall be opened in an eligible situation for the purpose of concentrating and diffusing all information pertaining to the Society's operations and objects, and for the transaction of its general business.

Article XI.

The City shall be divided into twenty districts, each ward forming a district, and each district shall have a committee consisting of three members of the Board, who shall have the general superintendence of the ward, one of whom shall act as chairman.

Article XII.

It shall be the duty of every member of this Association to endeavor in all suitable way, to give practical effect to its principles; especially to discontinue indiscriminate alms-giving and street begging; to provide themselves with tickets of reference, and instead of giving aid to unknown applicants, whose cases they cannot themselves investigate, to refer such applications to the visitor of the section in which the applicants reside, in order that they may be properly inquired into, and, if desiring of aid, relieved.

Article XIII.

The form of tickets shall be determined by the Board of Managers and no other form shall be used.
Article XIV.

Special meetings of the Association may be called by the Secretary at the request of the President, or on receiving a requisition signed by five members. Two days notice must be given of the time of the meeting.

Article XV.

This Constitution shall not be altered, except at a special meeting called for that purpose on one month's previous notice, or at an annual meeting. The alteration in either case to be made by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the members present.
"As the influence of the Association will be for good or evil, will tend to increase, or lessen, pauperism, as the visitors shall perform in their duties discreetly or the reverse; with a view to aid them in their responsible position, and to promote uniformity of action, the following series of Rules and Instructions, supplementary to those prescribed in the By-Laws have been adopted by the Association. They are, with immaterial alterations, such as have been derived from and are sanctioned by the long experience of the kindred Association in New York and are hereby earnestly recommended to the careful attention of all who may engage in carrying out its principles.

Article I. The first principle of this Association is founded in the admission, that the alms of benevolent societies, and of private liberality, are often misapplied and as often abused by those who receive them. As a visitor of this Association be especially careful to do all that a cautious and discriminating judgement may suggest to prevent every abuse of the charity you may dispense. But if after suitable precaution on your part to guard against the misapplication of charity it should appear, that it has been bestowed on objects of pretended distress, or upon those who may be receiving adequate relief from other sources, it will be your immediate duty to report all such cases to your Ward Committee or the General Agent, that the names of the undeserving applicants may be placed upon record at the Central Office and become known to every visitor and member of the Association.

Article II. The persons who will address themselves to your sympathies, though differing in many particulars, may here be divided into three classes. (1) Those who have been reduced to indigence by infirmity, sickness, old age and unavoidable misfortune. (2) Those who have brought themselves to want and suffering by their improvidence and vices. (3) Persons who are able but unwilling to labor and are beggars and vagrants by profession. The well being of these different classes evidently requires a mode of treatment adapted to each; and as this cannot be applied without a knowledge of their character and circumstances, your first duty is to withhold all relief from unknown persons. Let this rule be imperative and unalterable.

Article III. In all cases referred to you for aid, if the applicant resides in your section, remember they have claims upon your sympathy and kind offices which belong to no other visitor of this Association, and if neglected by you they may suffer unrelieved. Without delay visit them at their homes, personally examine every case, ascertain the character and condition, and carefully inquire into the causes which brought them into a state of destitution.
You will become an important instrument of good to your suffering fellow creatures when you aid them to obtain this good from resources within themselves. To effect this, show them the true origin of their sufferings when these sufferings are the result of imprudence, extravagance, idleness, intemperance or other moral causes which are within their own control, and endeavor by all appropriate means to awaken their self respect, to direct their exertions and to strengthen their capacities for self-support. In your intercourse with them avoid all appearance of harshness and every manifestation of an obstructive and censorious spirit. Study to carry into your work a mind as discriminating and judicious as it is kindly disposed and a heart ready to sympathize with the sick and the infirm, the widow and the orphan, the tempted and the vicious. In short, if you would confer great and permanent good upon the needy you first must distinctly understand in what that good consists; and as this knowledge can only be acquired by personal intercourse with them at their dwellings, the second rule becomes as absolute as the first, - Always to visit those for whom your benevolent services are required, before granting relief. Having given these general instructions in relation to the visitorial duties, it may be useful to present a few practical directions concerning each of the classes of the poor before mentioned.

(1) Those who have been reduced to indigence by unavoidable causes. In your intercourse with this class if met with industry, frugality and self respect and a preference for self denial to dependence upon alms, let not your charities become the means of undermining one right principle or of enfeebling one well directed impulse. Alms in such cases must often be given, and the temptation is to bestow freely, but let them be administered with great delicacy and caution. The most effectual encouragement for such persons is not alms chiefly or any other form of charity as a substitute for alms, but that sympathizing counsel which re-enkindles hope and that expression of respect for character which such individuals never fail to appreciate. A wise distribution of charity connected with a deportment of this kind towards the deserving poor will often save them from pauperism when the absence of these may degrade them to habitual dependence on alms for substance.
(2) Individuals who have become mendicants through their own improvidence or vices. The evils of improvidence can never be diminished except by removing their cause; and this can only be done by elevating the moral character of the poor by teaching them to depend upon themselves. Many able-bodied persons apply for alms who earn enough for their own maintenance, but expend their earnings in improper indulgences with the calculation of subsisting on charity when their own resources fail them, who might have obviated this necessity by proper self denial and economy. In respect to these cases, if relief must be given,—and it sometimes must be— it should never be of a kind or to a degree that will make this dependence preferable to a life of labor. And it should not be forgotten that many would be economical and saving if they knew how to be. Let it be your endeavor therefore, to instruct them, to encourage deposits in savings banks for rent, fuel and winter supplies, and by all motives which you can present, stimulate them to habits of thriftiness, industry and foresight. The rule is that the willingly dependent upon alms should not live so comfortably with them as the humblest independent laborer without them."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breakfast</th>
<th>Dinner</th>
<th>Supper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>Bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal</td>
<td>Cabbage</td>
<td>Syrup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn bread</td>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>Bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>Soup</td>
<td>Syrup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biscuits</td>
<td>Soup meat</td>
<td>Bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sausage</td>
<td>Hominy</td>
<td>Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>Bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Meat (left over)</td>
<td>Oatmeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrup</td>
<td>Bean soup</td>
<td>Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn cakes</td>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>Bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrup</td>
<td>Corned beef</td>
<td>Cold corned beef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Cabbage</td>
<td>Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn bread</td>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>Bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrup</td>
<td>Pork</td>
<td>Hominy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Pea soup</td>
<td>Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>Bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn meal mush</td>
<td>Cod fish cakes</td>
<td>Syrup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Tea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSOCIATION FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE CONDITION OF THE POOR
ADDRESS TO THE PUBLIC 1849

The Baltimore Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor having been regularly organized by the election of the undersigned as its permanent officers, they deem it their duty to present to the public a brief outline of the principles, aims and purposes of the Association, and to bespeak for it the confidence and support of an enlightened community.

The primary object of the association is to supercede entirely the loose, uncertain and inadequate mode of administering charity heretofore pursued and practiced amongst us, and through the instrumentality of a well digested and permanent organization to reach and adequately relieve the wants of the necessitous and really deserving poor, and at the same time detect and defeat the schemes of the idle and vicious who make begging a trade or pauperism a profession.

The Association adopts as the basis of its action the two following principles, recognizing them as axiomatic truths of universal application in civilized communities:

First—that the really deserving and necessitous poor—the destitute and afflicted widow—the helpless, homeless, friendless orphan—and the many combinations in which disease or poverty, old age and want, present themselves, have a clear and unqualified right to support from the community and that their right to receive and our duty to give are reciprocal.

Second—that the counterfeit or spurious poverty, idleness, drunkenness, vagrancy and voluntary pauperism have no claims whatever to charitable aid, no right to support from the labor and honest earnings of others, and that their detection and the defeat of their fraudulent schemes for taxing the community constitute a positive moral and social duty.

Having these principles prominently in view, the Association will exercise all its influences to discourage indiscriminate alms-giving, street begging, pauperism and idleness, and endeavor by every means in its power to elevate and improve the moral and physical condition of the indigent.

The plan adopted by the Association for carrying out these benevolent purposes is the one which has been in successful operation in New York for the last seven years. It consists mainly in the establishment of a Central Office, the employment of a General Agent,
and a Board of sixty Managers—three of whom shall be resident of each ward and under whose direction a competent number of visitors will perform the duty of investigating every case of alleged destitution in their respective districts before any aid is granted.

These are in brief the purposes and plans of the Association.

Our sole object in its formation has been to present to our fellow citizens a system through the agency of which the duties of public charity might be faithful and honestly discharged, by which the greatest amount of good might be accomplished with the greatest certainty and at the lowest cost.

We have been actuated by another motive however, in the adoption of our plan. We wish to restore hope to hearts from which it has long been banished—to give to the crushed and desponding poor some rational assurance that they will not in the future be entirely overlooked, neglected or forgotten.

The officers of the Association feel that they have assumed a position involving the most laborious and serious responsibilities, a trust the most sacred that can be delegated by society to a portion of its members; the distribution of the alms of the whole community, the care and guardianship of the destitute poor; and they cannot refrain from an expression of deep solicitude for the success of the institution whose interests have been confided to their management; and they now appeal to the public to extend to them a generous prompt and cordial support. The destinies of the institution are with the public. Without the countenance and favor of the community it cannot be successfully maintained. Every individual has a distinct social and moral interest in the result. Every citizen has a positive duty to perform in reference to it.

The Officers not only ask that a sufficient amount of money may be supplied to meet the just demands of the necessitous poor upon them, but they ask the countenance and moral support of their fellow citizens. They ask every good citizen to lend his aid to carry out the designs of the institution and every individual to give to the collectors appointed for the respective wards such amount as he or she may feel able to give for one year, which shall be in lieu of all contributions for ward purposes or claims of street beggars, and they entreat him not to give in any case to unknown applicants for alms but to refer them to the Visitor of the ward for investigation and action.
ASSOCIATION FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE CONDITION OF THE POOR
ORIGINAL BY-LAWS

I.

The General Agent shall be appointed for one year and shall receive such a salary as shall be determined by the Board of Managers.

II.

The Executive Committee shall consist of one member from each ward or district, to be elected by the Board of Managers, by ballot, and of the President, Vice-President, General Agent, and Treasurer, five of whom shall be a quorum. It shall be their duty to purchase such supplies and to provide for their distribution in such a manner as the Board may authorize or direct. And in the recess of the Board to act generally in behalf of the Board. They shall appoint a Secretary, keep minutes of their proceedings and report the same to each stated meeting of the Board. They shall hold stated meetings on the second Monday of every month except July and August, and special meetings shall be called by the President or General Agent, whenever the same shall be required by the President with the concurrence of the General Agent or one of the Vice Presidents or by any five members of the Board.

III.

Whenever an appropriation of any part of the funds of the Association shall be made, the Recording Secretary shall furnish the Treasurer of the Association with a copy of the resolution directing such appropriation. The proportion of funds appropriated to any ward or district shall only be drawn by the committee of that ward or district or any two of said committee.

Funds not appropriated to any ward or district shall only be drawn by the draft of the President or General Agent, countersigned by one of the Vice Presidents, such drafts having first been authorized by the Board of Managers or the Executive Committee.

IV.

It shall be the duty of the Ward or District Committees to divide their respective wards or districts into sections of so limited extent as to enable the visitor of each section to give his personal attention to the needy therein; to appoint one visitor or more for each section, supply vacancies which may occur, make the necessary arrangements for placing at the disposal of the visitors food, fuel or clothing for distribution, and on some day in the first week in every month (except July and August when the meetings may be omitted in the discretion of the Committees) to
convene all of the Visitors of the sections for the purpose of receiving their returns and conferring with them on the objects of their mutual labors. The Committees moreover shall duly draw upon the Treasurer of the Association for such proportion of the funds as may be appropriated to their respective Wards or Districts; they shall keep account of all their disbursements and only in extreme cases make donations of money; they shall render an account monthly (except in July and August) of their expenditures, to the Board of Managers or Executive Committee, and in default of this duty shall not be entitled to draw upon the funds of the Association. Each Committee shall appoint its own chairman, secretary and Treasurer, and shall transmit the report of the Visitors immediately after each monthly meeting, with any other information they may think desirable, to the General Agent.

V.

It shall be the duty of each Visitor to confine his labors exclusively to the particular section assigned him, so that no individual shall receive relief except in the section where he is known and to which he belongs. The Visitors shall carefully investigate all cases referred to them before granting relief; ascertain the condition, habits of life and means of subsistence of the applicants; and extend to all such kind of services, counsel and assistance as a discriminating and judicious regard for their present and permanent welfare requires. And in cases of sickness, it will be their duty to inquire whether there is any medical or other attendance needed; whether relief is afforded by any religious or charitable society; to provide themselves with information respecting the nearest dispensary, and in all cases when practicable to refer applicants for aid to appropriate existing societies. When no other assistance is provided or available, they shall draw from the resources of the Association; or District Committee, or a member thereof, but such articles of food, fuel, clothing and similar supplies as the necessity requires. In all cases coming to the knowledge of the Visitors, they will be expected to perform the same duties although no application has been made. It shall be their duty moreover to render a report of their labors and also an account of their disbursements to their respective Committees at the stated monthly meetings. No Visitor neglecting these duties will be entitled to draw on the funds of the Association.
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For an understanding of the growth and development of charity organization in the United States, I found the following sources important. The Proceedings of the National Conferences of Charities and Corrections (NCCC) are useful for the national trends in charity work and the individuals who played a significant role. It was the first (1874) to provide a national voice for charity workers in the nation and in 1917 its name was changed to the National Conference of Social Workers (NCSW). Charities, a weekly review of local and general philanthropy, New York, COS, was followed by the Charities and The Commons 1905-06. The Commons was the voice of the social settlement movement. The successor to Charities and The Commons was The Survey, which touched on all phases of social work in the early part of the 20th Century. The Family, American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, is useful for the early periods of charity work. For an understanding of and the development of family social work of the various charity societies, such as those in Baltimore, the reports and records of the respective societies are most valuable. In Philadelphia and Boston, there is the Associated Charities; in New York, Charities Review, the AICP Notes and the annual reports of the CAS. Every aspect of these societies has been covered by the above journals and other national publications. There are also the books and articles written by many of the activists in the movement that in one way or the other cover the multitude of problems that the various societies faced.


The early writers approached the subject from an overall view, discussing a wide range of topics that were major problems in the development of social work. Amos G. Warner, in "American Charities," New York, Thomas Y. Crowell and Company, 1894, was the first to deal with the problems on a national scale, his book being comprehensive and useful to students of what was becoming the profession of social work. He wrestled with the question of inheritance and environment as the basic cause of poverty. Warner was influenced by the concept of misconduct being a cause of poverty. As he put it, 25 percent of the poverty cases were caused by personal misconduct, laziness, shiftlessness and drunkeness; but he concluded that 75 percent were the results of personal misfortune. The writers who followed Warner, as a whole, continued along the same lines, with emphasis varying as time brought about greater knowledge and programs were put into practice. One of the writers whose works are still paramount in social welfare history is Frank D. Watson, "The Charity Organization Movement in the United States," New York, Macmillan Company, 1922. There are some deficiencies, but it is comprehensive and lucid, footnote references are quite numerous, and it is helpful for its overall coverage. Another is Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," New York, Macmillan Company, 1904. Brackett shows a grasp and understanding of the whole area of charity whether it is of a specific society or from a national view. Others are Edward T. Devine, "The Principles of Relief," New York, Macmillan Company, 1904, and "When Social Work Was Young," New York, Macmillan Company, 1939, the latter being a personal recollection of the times, going back some forty years when charity societies were developing, his personal experiences with some of the leaders in the movement and the development of the profession of social work; and Frank J. Bruno, "Trends in Social Work," New York, Columbia University Press, 1948. Bruno, like many of the social workers, was trained in the ministry and his early experience was in settlement work. He relates the trends in social work through the sources in the Proceedings of the NCCC.
Mary E. Richmond was one of the true pioneers in the field of social welfare and one of the few leaders in the movement who did not come from an old established or wealthy family. "Friendly Visiting Among the Poor," New York, Macmillan Company, 1899, A Handbook for Beginning Charity Workers, reflected her experiences learned while in Baltimore. It was after becoming head of the COS Department of the Russell Sage Foundation in 1909 that she published books of a national scope and headed up an annual institute for social workers under the auspices of the Russell Sage Foundation. Through her persistent efforts, the casework system in social work was made more scientific.

Jane Addams, "Twenty Years at Hull House," New York, Macmillan Company, 1911 is an autobiography that goes into the reasons and circumstances of why Hull House was started. Most important is the fact that she began the first settlement House in the United States. This provided an opportunity for the young activist to work with the people in their neighborhoods, her thesis being that in order to help, you must understand those whom you are trying to help; and the only way to do this is to go and live among them to see their problems first hand.

Lilian Brandt, in "The Charity Organization Society of the City of New York," 1882-1907, New York, COS, 1907 discusses the individuals and their reasons for organizing the New York COS. It is interesting to note how much aid and support the New York COS received from the New York AICCP and the State Charities Aid Association. This aid was significant in sustaining the Society and provided it with a cushion that enabled it to become a leader in the movement.

Frederick C. Howe, author of "Confessions of a Reformer," Ann Arbor, the University of Michigan Press, 1963, was convinced that the COS's were more interested in making life pleasant for the rich by keeping poverty out of sight. The poor were looked upon as cases, they were card-indexes and the decision to give aid was based upon the societies' opinion of who was or was not worthy. He thought that the rich members of charity boards could aid more by paying their mill hands and other workers decent wages and protecting them with safety devices. There is a parallel between Howe and Lincoln Steffens; both looked at and thought cities to be corrupt and content.
There are the old and the new sources, with special emphasis on the poor. These include Robert Hunter, "Poverty; Social conscience in the Progressive Era," Macmillan Company, 1904. Hunter was one of the young persons with a personal income who decided at an early age to devote his time to aid the poor. He shares the view expressed in Michael Harrington's book of the sixties that poverty is a way of life, a "sub-culture," not a mere economic condition. However, Hunter was fearful that continued immigration was a threat to the native stock; if it was allowed to continue, it meant racial suicide. Michael Harrington, in "The Other America: Poverty in the United States," New York, Macmillan Company, 1962, looks at the City slums, Appalachia, the South and the migrant workers. From this Harrington concludes that the poor of the sixties are without hope. Ben H. Bagdikian, "In the Midst of Plenty-The Poor in the United States," Boston, Beacon Press, 1964, by and large discusses the same groups and institutions that Harrington does. But he gives greater emphasis to the growth of wealth in the United States, the abundance that now exists and yet the number of poor continues to increase.

There has emerged in the 1960's a number of sources that have added scope and depth to the field of philanthropy and social welfare history. Two things especially stand out; one is the comprehensive biography of the individuals discussed, and second, the extensive coverage of the literature in the field. Robert H. Bremner, "American Philanthropy," Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1962, and "From the Depths: The Discovery of Poverty in the United States," New York, New York University Press, 1964 are particularly noteworthy. In the first book, he deals with the nature of Americans to give and the organization of and history of Philanthropic Foundations in the United States.

In the second, the author points out the reasons that poverty in the United States had always been a disputed subject and that the poor's being periodically re-discovered may be because each generation views the problem in a different prospective and a new light. In his use of the literature, Professor Bremner gives an extensive account of what the leading authorities have had to say about the extent, meaning,
causes and consequences of poverty in America. From Allen F. Davis, "Spearheads For Reform," New York, Oxford University Press, 1967, we get an extensive account of the group of dedicated young men and women who organized America's first attack on urban poverty. Being distressed with the filth, squalor and disintegration which filled the slums of American cities, they wanted to, and did do something about it. The author gives emphasis to the settlement movement and through it how the first attack was mounted against poverty. Mr. Davis disputes Harrington on his claim that the people living in the slums of the sixties are more hopeless than those of the 1890's. He claims that the slums of the 1890's were at least as hopeless and pathetic as those of today. Clarke A. Chambers, "Seedtime of Reform," Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1963 is a study of the reform impulse in American life in the years between the end of World War I and the inauguration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1933. The author, however, discusses the periods prior to the War and after the 1933 inauguration. Through the help of good solid middle class men and women, the private charity agencies were aided in plugging the gap left by the government offering flexible services to communities to meet their needs. The author discusses in detail the education and moral exhortation that they relied upon to achieve their ends. Roy Lubove, "The Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career," 1880-1930, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1965, is not a history per-se, but the author's analysis of developing philosophies, specializations, and individual contribution to private charity agencies.

In Baltimore there are the annual reports and minutes of meetings of the AICP, COS, HWCAS, SPCCI, Federated Charities, FWA, and the FCS. There are also the various special reports and studies. But most important, in the files of the FCS are rough draft copies of what became annual reports, information containing questions and Board discussions of what they were seeking in the special reports. There are also the scrap books, the reports of the District Supervisors, case workers, notes and memorandums. There are the old newspaper clippings, letters and drafts of letters, many without dates. There are the numerous drafts of articles that were published in one of the national journals.
The writer was fortunate during the period of this study to engage in numerous talks, discussions and exchange of notes with persons whose career in Baltimore goes back prior to 1920. Even though they did not know Mary Richmond, John M. Glenn, Mary Wilcox Brown or Jeffrey Brackett while they were in Baltimore, they met them later and came to know them quite well. It is also important to note, that many of the persons interviewed by the writer, were long friends of workers active in the Baltimore movement, whose careers go back to the latter decade of the 19th Century. In attempting to tell the Baltimore story, the writer gave greater emphasis to the rough draft material than to the finished reports. In this, assistance received from the staff of the FCS and the personal interviews proved invaluable in the interpretation and analysis of the materials.

There are many volumes of history on Baltimore City and County. But, the major histories of Baltimore City in the 18th and 19th Centuries with emphasis on conditions of the poor and the means by which they were aided, are: Clayton Coleman Hall, "Baltimore its History and its People," New York, Lewis Publishing Company, 1912; Thomas W. Griffith, "Annals of Baltimore," Baltimore, Printed by B. William Wooddy, 1824; Thomas J. Scharf, "History of Baltimore City and County from the Earliest Period to the Present Day," Philadelphia, Lewis H. Everts, 1881; and Charles Hirschfeld, "Baltimore, 1870-1900: Studies in Social History," The Johns Hopkins Press, 1941.
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Interviews. During the twelve months, September, 1966 through August of 1967, that the writer spent at the Family and Children's Society of Baltimore, he took advantage of the numerous opportunities to talk to the persons listed below. And since that time he has called on them for many points of clarification.

1. Eleanor Balke
2. Blanche Coll-Arlington, Virginia
3. Harold C. Edleston
4. Harry Greenstein
5. Grace Sperow
6. Robert T. Lansdale
7. Esther Lazarus
8. Verl S. Lewis
9. Clark L. Mock
10. Elizabeth E. Muller
11. Bertha M. Shipley
12. Albert S. J. Tarka
13. Anna D. Ward
14. L. Margareta Williams
15. Paul T. Beisser-Springfield, Pennsylvania

Manuscripts. (letters)

FCS
Bonaparte to agent, February 28, 1892.
Bonaparte to Brackett, October 15, 1895.
Bonaparte to Brackett, February 13, 20, 27, 1900.
William W. Maxwell to Richmond, March 31, 1899.
Paul T. Beisser to writer, August 4, 1967.

Newspapers
2. The Baltimore News, March 22, 1892.
   February 7, 1895.
   November 1, 1849.
   November 9, 1849.
November 21, 1849.
December 1, 1849.
December 11, 1849.
December 15, 1849.
December 17, 1849.
December 24, 1849.

4. The Critic (Baltimore) February 2, 1891.
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