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Perhaps the most striking observation regarding national voluntary social welfare organizations, as made by the average person is the great number of such organizations. But even this consciousness must be very vague, - something more than a guess and something less than knowledge. Except for the limited few who thru continually being solicited by such organizations, know more about them, those who think about these organizations may either hopefully see in them manifestations of the ability of the social organization to adjust itself to social conditions, while less hopeful people may be inclined to suspect that many of the organizations really exist to provide a fat salary, - a perennial income for a few promoters.

From the standpoint of their promoters these organizations exist to meet what each organization considers a paramount need of society. Viewed in
this light they constitute no small indictment of our social order, being indicative of the unwillingness on the part of society, blindly to accept its old institutions, traditions and customs. Many go farther than merely to express dissatisfaction. They attempt in a constructive way to meet felt social needs.

Nor are they slow to capitalize their social appeal. Thus, school teachers, social workers, ministers and others are continually burdened with appeals made in the name of some humanitarian cause. In this way, the members of the faculty as well as the heads of the departments are continually receiving such pleas as the following, which came in a letter from Raymond L. Boyle, written from Bloomington, Ill., November eleventh, 1919, to Prof. F.W. Blackmar—saying in part, "A proposition for alleviating the present industrial and political unrest, I know, will receive careful study for possible merit by those to whom the country in this crisis is turning for suggestions—". The letter continues in this vein stating its contemplated purpose engendering interest and enthusiasm in support of a conference to be called
for the purpose of forming a new party. Leaders profess themselves to be actuated by a "vision of the birth of a new Great American Party." The same letter closes with this plea, "Should the answer to the several hundred letters I am sending to Representative Americans warrant, would you give assistance and service to such a conference?" Would it not be delightful to be a "Representative American" and receive from untold numbers of promoters such pleas as this, granting one the privilege of giving "assistance and services" to each of these numerous causes?

Or the plea may come, as many do, from better known and more thoroughly established organizations. Of this type there came to a member of the department of Sociology of the University of Kansas a letter, dated October 17th, 1919, from the National Consumers' League. Under the salutation "Dear Sir," and over a stamped signature of Sidney Colestock, the letter after speaking of the changed ideas in the minds of men, wrought in the trenches and of the need for cooperation among
working people, makes this plea, "As a patriotic and intelligent citizen, the League needs your active and generous help. Will you not send a contribution of $5.00 for the work as outlined in the enclosed leaflet?" The average recipient will not. Might he not as well espouse some cause and, while patriotic and philanthropic senders of such letters as the above, asking for assistance for his cause? However this is not meant to imply that many of these enterprises are not worth while. They may be all they claim to be and more, but the challenging fact remains that multiplied thousands of such pleas as the above are perpetually going out all over the United States to harass the minds of good citizens who are already giving their lives and often at a small remuneration to causes just as worthy as those represented by these typical letters. What, then, is the public spirited citizen to do? Is he to turn a deaf ear to these causes, each of which is apparently consuming a great deal from the totality of human energy, or shall he blindly do as asked without knowing either the validity of the appeal or the merit of its sponsors?
Must he always act, unguided and groping in the dark, as it were, or is there some way of supplying at least a part of the information he so evidently needs.

It is the purpose of this study to ascertain what should be the function of, and reasonable attitude towards national voluntary social welfare organizations, and having determined this function to suggest some devices by which the present arrangement should be modified, so that the conscientious public may be guided and safeguarded in making their generous contributions to welfare programs, when the appeal is made for funds. In order to suggest modifications of the existing organizations which will meet the needs of society it is necessary to study minutely these organizations and know the conditions that exist. A complete study therefore would include all national voluntary welfare organizations of whatever character for the assumption made and position assumed by all such organizations is that they are making some contribution toward the betterment of society. But to
include all such organizations in a study of this size is impossible. Furthermore so complete a study is not necessary from our point of view for many of the national welfare organizations are not making any public appeal for funds, being adequately supported by their own membership. Thus at the outset several classes of national organizations may be excluded, allowing us to concentrate our attention upon those that constitute the heart of the problem. In pursuance of this policy, labor unions and labor organizations, fraternities and lodges, may be omitted from consideration even tho they be national voluntary welfare organizations. All these classes must be admitted to be making valuable contributions to social welfare, but their contribution is in a way indirect, since it is mainly for those within their own group. Furthermore their support is mainly, if not entirely from their own membership. Since all society is benefitted when any part is substantially aided, much credit is due these organizations, especially the lodges and labor unions for trying to improve social conditions within their groups and for taking care of their own unfortunates to the extent that they do.
Another very large and very helpful class of organizations, which we are omitting is the religious organizations of which there are almost an infinite number and variety engaged in all manner of social welfare work. But they are omitted for two reasons, viz.; first, the nature and scope of their work is pretty generally understood, and second, much of their work is in the end accomplished thru organizations which come within the province of this study.

Moreover, there is a large number of learned and professional organizations which contribute much to social welfare. The learned include, scientific, literary and artistic, all of which add to and organize human experience, but we are dealing more directly with problems popularly recognized as social problems. Nearly every profession and occupation has its national organization which also makes indirect contributions to social betterment.

In this way we have excluded those organizations that exist primarily for the sake of their own membership, religious organizations, and those of a learned and professional nature. We have
left for our study those that seem to have a passion for some movement they consider to be generally essential to social improvement. This desire for some measure of social improvement may take its form in several different ways. They may desire to build up and support directly some new institution or practice or they may set for themselves the task of moulding and crystallizing public opinion back of some proposed governmental measure. Some exist to oppose a certain movement or idea that is on foot. Many others seek to carry assistance to people in need or in some direct way to serve unfortunates of the class in whom they are interested.

In making this study one finds a very limited amount of material, for very little has been written directly on the subject considered from this point of view. The reliable information comes mainly from two sources. The first, and more or less composite source is articles in books, magazines, and conference reports on different phases of social work. The other general source of information used in this study
is answers to questionnaires which were sent directly to the organizations. It might be said in passing that many of the articles bearing on the subject do not discuss national organizations nor are they frequently even thinking of them. But for a number of years both in periodicals and in the National Conference of Social Work, means for securing efficient social work and standards for such work have been very important parts of such conference discussions. But from these articles, written on such subjects as the state as a unit or the country as a unit, one may glean valuable suggestions for a consideration of national organizations. But in this as in all similar considerations the adverse exceeds the constructive. Perhaps this is because it is easier to see and feel the social loss in the present administrative and practical inefficiency than it is to suggest constructively a more efficient form of administration of the available machinery.

If the information gained from conference reports and periodicals is not entirely satisfactory, neither is that gained from the questionnaire. The practical problem of making a questionnaire is one that taxes the ingenuity of the most tried.
It must be short and pointed enough to keep itself from falling into the waste-basket. Yet the questions contained must draw out all the significant facts about the organization to which it is sent. Even at best many of the questionnaires are never returned. Many more are returned poorly filled out. Nevertheless the results of the questionnaires do furnish some worth-while information. They are much better than conjectural approximations and mere guesses. This material is suggestive and, if not used too practically, or examined too analytically, furnishes us some interesting and valuable general suggestions.

But before we can approximately determine what should be the function of national social welfare organizations it is necessary to see what other agencies not national, are in the field, and if possible determine the merit of these organizations, in order that for the whole, we may recommend something to make the work more efficient. Every unit of civic administration has its quota of welfare organizations. They have national organizations to contend with. In towns they have local perhaps, county, and often
state organizations. In towns and villages the work is usually in the hands of some voluntary confederated committee, representative private agencies and interests and the churches, or the churches may be handling it independently and usually, it is to be feared, very unscientifically. In cities and towns of larger size there are many private agencies such as the Provident Association of Kansas City, Mo. There may be a large number of these, each acting independently of the other, or they may have achieved some sort of a centralization. Besides the private agencies doing this type of work in many cities now, there is usually a municipal welfare organization which does very much the same type of work as the private agencies just mentioned. Besides the large and well-established municipal and private agencies engaged in social work, there are many more organizations doing some work in this field.

(1) Mr. L.A. Halbert of the Kansas City Public Welfare Association is authority for the statement that in that city there are at least fifty agencies doing social welfare work. In the
larger cities will be found one or more city hospitals working for social welfare and frequently the city will have a farm which is also used for the same purpose.

Not only is the city an important unit for social organization and administration but also the county is an important unit. Illustrative of this, each Kansas County has its county farm which is frequently used for all classes of unfortunates. Some counties have their hospitals which care for certain cases and also serve more or less as county sanitary dispensaries. On the whole the idea of the county as a unit seems to be growing rapidly. For some classes of relief and social work, the town, city or even the county are units too small to make for efficient and economic administration. In such cases the next logical unit is the state. We are all familiar with these state institutions such as the home for the deaf and dumb, a separate home for the blind, homes for the care and education of orphans, and schools for the feeble-minded.
Besides these state schools there are a number of state homes such as the Kansas home for the aged and infirm and three for the insane, state institutions of a penal nature, girls' and boys' industrial schools as well as the state reformatory and the state penitentiary. Lastly, there are certain nation governmental social welfare institutions such as the reservations and the schools for Indians and the old soldiers' homes—Haskell being an example of the former, and the United States Old Soldiers' Home at Leavenworth of the latter.

Thus we see a hierarchy of social welfare organizations in the town, city, state and nation. We also know of the welfare work being done among their own people by lodges and labor organizations as well as the great amount of social welfare work being accomplished by the churches, working both locally and in larger units. The churches, at least may quite frequently be credited with working not merely for their own membership but for any who are in need. Bearing in mind, therefore, all these efforts being made in behalf of social
welfare by so many agencies outside of the scope of our study, we begin to gain some conception of what sort of a situation national voluntary welfare organizations must fit into. But in spite of all the public and private agencies of the town or city or a number of county institutions, and of a quite complete list of state institutions, and, in spite of the work done by the churches, lodges, and labor organizations, these other national voluntary organizations come to us enthusiastically, devotedly pointing out other needs, insistently calling for voluntary support for these enterprises and keeping up their expensive program of propaganda and advertising.

In the list of organizations just considered in connection with the smaller units of organization we find that the private and voluntary are the most numerous. But even the briefest survey of national organizations shows an even greater proportion of private voluntary organizations on a national scale.

Since the town, city and state organizations, (not national), of which we are speaking have
always been accepted as a matter of course, the legality or even the advisability of having such organizations has until recently scarcely been questioned. National voluntary private organizations have inherited very much of the same attitude. In fact the question of their right to exist is not a legal one but a social one. Their status is that they are entirely legal. Society does have the right to ask, "In the field of social economy is it advisable that they exist?" Its right to ask this question is justifiable on two fundamental considerations: first, society owes it to itself always to care for and to protect its own best interests and second that since the total supply of social energy is limited, any great waste of that energy is not justifiable even tho it is in the name of a good cause. Therefore society in her concern to secure a maximum benefit from the available social energy, may control and direct the activities of any agency.

But if society is to speak even in its own interests, it must have an organ with which
to speak. So far, it has asked no questions of these organizations largely because there is no one to speak and ask these questions. Spontaneity has been the order of the day. Our country has furnished most excellent seed bed for the nurture of all sorts of ideas, but since there has been no gardener, our promising garden has become "a wild where weeds and flowers promiscuous shoot."

What is stranger than this uncontrolled variety of organizations is the belief on the part of some that this lack of system is advisable. Certain social workers, looking probably at the merits of their own organizations individually and ideally, come to hold the attitude revealed in the following little paragraph taken from a letter, "Do you not think that practically all social service organizations experienced a sort of rebirth during the war? Of course, if as a result of that rebirth they are all going to duplicate each other, and get in each other's way, that fact will simply be another of the horrors of the war." After speaking more in detail of possibilities of duplication the letter continues, "Surely
the field is big enough for us all." This is the very attitude of mind that must be overcome. Instead of indifferently or optimistically saying "surely the field is large enough for us all," we must analyze both the field and the organizations attempting to occupy the field. Society must step into its organization garden and threading its way thru a very complex tangle, determine what plants are weeds and what are flowers, curbing the growth and influence of one and cultivating and training the other. In short it must bring about efficiency and order where it now finds irresponsibility and confusion. Since we are studying national organizations, our interest lies especially in that direction. In consideration of a field so completely occupied by social agencies, the majority of which are local and are administered and supported locally, the national organizations must either show that they are better able to meet that need than the local agencies which they are or may be trying to supplant, or that they are in reality reinforcing these local
agencies, or finally, that they are ministering to a need in a way not adequately provided for.

An examination of the national voluntary social welfare organizations operating in the United States strongly confirms the justice of the above demand for society to step in and exercise its power to promote its own welfare. It is almost impossible to say with any hope of being correct how many organizations of this character there are. In this study the names of nearly five hundred such organizations have been collected. Any attempt at classification of this heterogeneous list of organizations meets with almost insurmountable difficulties. There is a palpable overlapping, even duplication among organizations naturally falling in the same general class. Conspicuous examples of this may be found in the temperance group, the Jewish group, public health group, child welfare group or any one of a number of others.

Nor is it any easier to clarify our understanding by a classification of organizations according to the constituency of their membership. While some are appealing to and hope to acquire
a large list of members as possible, others appeal
to a limited few. An example of the latter is
the American Microscopical Society. There is a
very large number of organizations being fostered
and promoted in the interest of the respective
unassimilated races and people living within our
borders. The membership in some of these is
confined to people of one race or people, while
many others address their appeal to all the
people in behalf of a certain limited group.
In general it is notable that the character
of the constituency is a function of the purpose
of the organization. We find some organizations
with a comparatively small but selected membership,
aiming chiefly to influence legislation, but trus-
ting to their own personality, or the justice of
their plea. On the other hand many organizations,
as desirous as the above to influence Congress or
the state legislatures, find that they must appeal
thru the force of this guided opinion, by scattering
their information and educating the public, to
secure the sanction for the desired enactment.
Others find they must educate and inform the
people in order that they may secure their active support, which usually means the financial support of some cause, while still others exist only for the sake of the dissemination of certain information, which they consider helpful or essential to the welfare of some element of society.

One of the most prevalent characteristics of these organizations is the tendency to employ in their behalf statements of purposes of the most comprehensive character. They seem, individually, to feel that it is the panacea for society's ills. But in truth, upon closer examination, it is usually found that they support only one idea and bring in others for garnish. Therefore when they are being compared on the basis of the statements of their purposes the duplication may be more apparent than real.

Now having noted the vast and varied number of welfare organizations, coincident with the different units of civil administration, and having noted the variety and multiplicity of aims, the varying constituency of membership and finally the different classes of people to whom
appeals were addressed, let us observe one other very important factor. It must be considered in arriving at a fair conclusion as to the social value of so many national organizations. This is simply to raise the question as to what will be the general effect of their unguided and uncontolled activity upon certain standard, well-established and generally accepted organizations whose names need only to be mentioned to command respect and support from the American people.

The latter organizations have made for themselves a good name and enjoy an honorable reputation, which is not only their heritage but which is also our common heritage since they typify in this line a high ideal of efficient service and integrity. Will not their standing and hence the quality of their work be undermined by the mad scramble of so many doubtful organizations in the field? And even tho the organizations be not doubtful, is it highly advantageous socially to allow so many organizations, whose purposes so evidently overlap, to be working and appealing for support in the same field?
We said at the very outset that society as an organism, manifests an almost infinite capacity for adjusting itself to felt needs. This is accomplished by the creation from its tissue certain specific organs to meet these emergencies. But is there not danger that these organs, thus created, may become a greater problem than the so-called "problem" which they set out to help solve? In conclusion it seems that society should protect itself and its efficient agencies by demanding of all societies asking for public approval and support that they should justify their existence by rendering some unique service in the field. In these words we have defined the whole burden of this thesis. Society should demand of new organizations and old as well, that they do not duplicate with other organizations, that they perform their work in the most efficient manner. Lastly society should do all in its power to enable and assist this great number of national organizations to capitalize, in public information and welfare, their wealth and detailed experience.
NOTES.

1. In an address delivered before the Sociology Club of the University of Kansas.

2. Written by Mrs. F. A. Thomas of the War Camp Community Service, to Prof. F. W. Blackmar of the Department of Sociology of the University of Kansas.
CHAPTER II.

AN EXPLANATION OF THE STUDY.

Up to this point we have been considering the nature and method of study of the problem. Let us now turn our attention to the problem itself. An ideally complete and thorough study of national social welfare organizations would require not only a scrutiny of the organizations themselves, but also the most thorough and analytical survey of the field in which they are endeavoring to operate. But in this study, time has denied the privilege of so complete a study. The focal point of effort in this study has been in the organizations, but it has been necessary to make a partial study of the field in order to understand its general features. Indeed, the field with all its possibilities is more difficult to analyze and understand in its entirety than is a study of the organizations working in the field.
Since no study of this character is available, the pioneer is compelled to invent his method as he proceeds. One of the nearest approaches to any compilation of information is given in the page frequently given in the latter part of the Survey, to a number of social welfare organizations. One interested in the subject soon finds many more than are listed on this page. Frequent mention is made of national organizations of all descriptions in the current periodicals. Names, in truth, are easy to secure. But it is much more difficult to secure the name and address of the secretary. A brief study soon reveals the fact that the headquarters of a very great majority of these organizations are located in less than half a dozen of our larger cities. An examination of the latest city directories proves over half to be in New York City alone. Other cities that are foremost as homes for national voluntary organizations are, Chicago, Washington, Philadelphia and Boston. But any numbers that might be given under these conditions can only be indicative of general averages and must not be construed too literally.
In the first place, in running down the list of organizations in a city directory it is not always easy to tell by the name whether the organization is national or not. The names of most organizations do show whether or not their scope is national. Thus in the effort to include all national organizations in the lists a few names were taken, which by the replies made proved to be not national. Sometimes it was not easy to determine whether the organization was a social welfare organization or not. Finally, the name does not always indicate conclusively that the organization is voluntary. But the results of inquiries have demonstrated beyond a reasonable doubt that a very high percentage of the organizations taken show themselves in their names to be (1) national, (2) voluntary, and (3) social welfare.

Any classification of such organizations is inadequate. We have tried to take only voluntary social organizations. As has been pointed out before, they may be classified according to purposes, or according to constituency of member-
ship, or may be classified according to the type and position of parties to whom they are mainly making their appeal, depending whether they hope merely to enlighten the people, or whether they enlighten them to reinforce with directed public opinion certain legislative measures or whether they trust to their own position or the inherent justice of their aim to convince legislative bodies. In this paper the basis of classification is mixed, being neither entirely purposeful, nor entirely on membership, nor entirely on character of people to whom appeal is made. In each case we have tried to put each organization in its most significant category. In the case of such categories as child welfare, temperance and public health, the basis is purposeful. But in the case of organizations of racial elements or peoples, or professional type, the classification is on a basis of membership. Certain others address themselves to legislative elements of our population or religious elements and may be classified on that basis.

The following heads of classification are used in this paper:
1. Conservation, those interested in preserving something of worth, either material or ideal.

2. Educational, which is not fully developed and includes only a short list of national educational societies.

3. Races and peoples, a very long and composite list.

4. Those with various specific purposes, but all hoping and endeavoring to change or modify governmental policy or institutions in some way or another.

5. Learned, which includes:
   a. Professional.
   b. Scientific.
   c. Artistic and cultural.
   d. Institutions and foundations.

Very little detailed study has been made of this group.

6. Medical and Hygienical.

7. Recreational, which is brief and undeveloped.

8. Religious, which includes all types of sectarian and non-sectarian social welfare organizations but no detailed study has been made in this very large group.

9. Lastly, the more specifically social welfare organizations which naturally divide into four classes:
   a. Those whose purpose is to provide material relief and aid for unfortunates.
b. Those that feel called upon to protect some people or cause, a sort of anti-\_\_\_\_ group.

c. Those that advocate some position and constructive plans for social betterment.

d. A small group of organizations working in behalf of women—especially women in industry.

It is of course evident, then, in this classification that certain organizations might well be included under more than one head. Take for instance a child welfare organization desiring to push a constructive social program by way of remedial legislation. That organization might reasonably be put under three different heads, and until one is quite thoroughly familiar with the organization it is extremely difficult to say with much confidence where it belongs. Classification is, of course, only a relative matter and is done more for the sake of the classifier's convenience. In the above case the thing to be determined by the classifier as the most significant feature in the light of his aims will decide the matter. Another complicated example is that of the Jewish Relief Society.
It might come under social aid but the most significant thing to our way of thinking is the fact that here is one more national organization among a distinct ethnical group.

Having secured the names of these organizations, the next great need is to gain a sufficient insight into the organizations, to be able to say with some assurance of accuracy, what they aim to do; what they are doing, and, how, perhaps, they might be improved. The information at hand on these organizations is very meager. Indeed for most of them nothing is available. In order to gain definite information from a reliable source, a questionnaire was sent to each of about three hundred-fifty of those considered the most promising organizations. Since the names and addresses of the official headquarters of these organizations were secured from city directories of the cities mentioned earlier in this paper, our problem was again complicated. The very latest available city directory was for 1917. Since this was so it was manifestly useless to write to the secretaries given in these directories. Instead the
envelopes containing the questionnaires were addressed to the organizations. On the inside the salutation was the impersonal, "Dear Secretary." One is not to be surprised that a great number of questionnaires thus addressed were ignored. As a matter of fact, of the three hundred and fifty organizations written to, not over one hundred and fifty have seen fit to reply.

It was hoped in the introductory statement of the questionnaire to make a double appeal. First, these organizations do a certain amount of advertising and being written up in a thesis should help advertise them. Secondly, their interest in making sure that all information about them was accurate it was hoped, would encourage a reply.

With each questionnaire was included a self-addressed stamped envelope. A copy of the questionnaire is given on the next page.
Dear Secretary:

As a graduate student in the department of Sociology at the University of Kansas, I am studying national voluntary organizations whose purpose is social improvement. In order to secure accurate information from a reliable source, and to check up on other sources or information, this questionnaire is sent to you with the hope that you will do me the great favor to fill out and return to me.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) ELLIS L. STARRETT

A. Correct name of organization
   1. National headquarters
   2. Secretary
      Address

B. Membership
   1. Eligibility
   2. Number

C. Purpose of organization

D. National Organization
   1. When founded
   2. Number of paid officers on staff
   3. Branches of organization (approx)
   4. Is the organization independent of other organizations

E. Financing of organization
   1. Average annual budget
      General purposes for which spent
   2. How raised
      Dues
      Solicitation
      Endowments

F. Publicity methods
   1. Circular letters
   2. Advertisements
   3.

Please send any material relevant to the history or achievements of the organization.

Incorporated?
The chief purpose which it was desired to accomplish in securing answers to these questionnaires is apparent in the general heading. We wanted significant information about each of these organizations. While it was fully realized that replying even quite faithfully could not give an adequate knowledge of an organization, yet it was hoped that the replies to a large number of them would give sufficient information so that some valuable conclusion might be reached. Under Membership we hoped to find out under eligibility and membership how effective the membership appeal is. Further, we hoped the results would show whether as a rule, these organizations have a palpable numerical strength and whether they are adequately supported to cope with the problem they essay to solve. It was necessary to call for a definite commitment on "purpose" because the names of many organizations do not reveal the specific purpose for which they exist. The most important point to be considered under national organization was whether each national organization is a complete whole in itself or whether the national organ-
IZATION IS A DEPENDENT OR CORRELATIVE BRANCH
OF SOME LARGER GROUP, OR WHETHER THE NATIONAL
ORGANIZATION IS A SORT OF HEAD AND CLEARING-HOUSE
FOR LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS WHICH OCCUPY THE GROUND
AND DO THE LOCAL WORK. THE REPLIES ON FINANCIAL
QUESTIONS, IT WAS HOPE, WOULD NOT ONLY REVEAL THE
AMOUNT OF MONEY ANNUALLY SECURED BY THESE ORGAN-
IZATIONS, BUT WOULD TO SOME EXTENT INDICATE WHAT PART
OF THE BUDGET WENT FOR OVERHEAD EXPENSES, WHAT FOR
ADVERTISING AND PARTICULARLY IN SOME CASES, WHAT
PERCENT WAS EMPLOYED IN AN ENDUEVOR TO ACCOMPLISH
THE MAIN PURPOSE OF THE ORGANIZATION. FURTHERMORE
THEY SHOULD REVEAL WHETHER THE APPEAL FOR MEMBERSHIP
WAS MAINLY TO SECURE FUNDS OR WHETHER THE FINANCING
MIGHT NOT BE A RELATIVELY MINOR MATTER. TAKEN WITH
FINANCING, PUBLICITY SHOULD SHOW THE SOCIAL MOTIVES
OF THE ORGANIZATIONS. IF THEIR PUBLICITY METHODS
SHOW THEM APPEALING TO A SUSCEPTIBLE FEW BY SUCH
EXPENSIVE METHODS AS SENDING PERSONAL LETTERS ONE
MIGHT QUESTION WHETHER THE ORGANIZATION COULD SHOW
MUCH PROTECTIVE SOCIAL EFFICIENCY. IT MIGHT IN THAT
CASE, BE THAT THE ORGANIZATION HAS ACQUIRED A FALSE
CONCEPTION OF ITS WORTH, AND BE IN REALITY PAYING
RENT AND SALARY FOR OFFICIALS WHO BELIEVED IN THEIR
job but could do nothing more than keep their doors open. Furthermore the advertising methods should reveal the value attached to all publicity methods in social work. Finally, the question on responsibility came up after the first one hundred of the questionnaires had been sent out. On the remaining two hundred and fifty the question "Incorporated?" was written at the bottom.

As has been previously intimated, the impersonality and formality of the questionnaire, the uncertainty as to whether all organizations addressed were of the type being considered, the age of the addresses, the length of the questionnaire and the intimate nature of the information desired rendered a high percentage of returns improbable.

In view of these considerations the results gained are quite gratifying. About one hundred fifty organizations have replied. Of these some are found to be local, a few have sent inadequate information. Some have shown that they do not belong in the class being considered. We have however over one hundred very satisfactory replies. Over fifty percent have generously followed the suggestions made at the bottom of the
questionnaire and sent printed matter telling more about themselves. The principal thing lacking in the study is an adequate understanding of the tasks these organizations have set themselves to perform and the amount they have been able actually to accomplish. Thus while we can learn about the membership, purposes, financing, and to some extent the accomplishments, yet we can not judge exactly the size of the task before each organization, nor estimate its effectiveness in meeting its problem. Within these limitations the data is quite satisfactory and will warrant a number of generalizations which will be quite significant. As an example of a direct answer to the questionnaire, and more complete than the majority since there is an answer made to all points in the inquiry, the letter of the American Humane Association is given here in full:
Ellis L. Starrett,
1336 Vermont St.,
Lawrence, Kansas.

Dear Sir:

Your favor of March 9, 1920 has been duly received. You will note the correct title of this Association on this letter head. Its National Headquarters are in Albany, N.Y., and its Secretary is N. J. Walker, as you will note by letter head. The address is simply Albany, N.Y.

The eligibility for membership consists simply in an interest in a humane propaganda and the prevention of cruelty to children and animals. I cannot give you the exact number of members for the American Humane Association, or for the American Red Star Animal Relief, which is a Department of it. They have recently numbered somewhere in the neighborhood of ten thousand.

This organization was organized in 1877 and incorporated in 1903, as you will note by letterhead. We have some twelve paid employees, and the local Anti-cruelty Societies throughout the United States number over six hundred. This organization is independent of all other organizations, except its Department known as the American Red Star Animal Relief, which operates under the charter of the American Humane Society.
Our last Annual Report indicated a yearly expenditure of about twenty-four thousand dollars. We have been carrying on a work of humane organization and extension, building up weak Societies and organizing new ones. We also publish the NATIONAL HUMANE REVIEW, which circulates among all our Societies and members. Humane Education and extending humane principles are the principal objects of our work, aside from the Red Star which is devoted to military and civilian relief. A slip concerning the Red Star will be enclosed herewith; also one of its leaflets on "Stock Starvation."

We have a small endowment of less than forty thousand dollars. The rest of our income is received from membership fees and contributions. We use very few advertisements, our publicity being derived from our magazine. Circular letters are sent out for membership renewals, and also for contributions.

The preceding practically answers your inquiries.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) W.O. STILLMAN,
President.

This reply differs from most replies received in that it is not made on the questionnaire sheet. In this way the outline form of the questionnaire is lost sight of. But the letter just quoted is better than the average reply and therefore gives some conception of the quantity and quality of information obtained.
on these organizations. Oftentimes the questionnaires are only partly filled out and in other cases similar letters bulletins, and other forms of printed matter and propaganda, have been received. With such sources of information as these one must endeavor to estimate the quality and value of the welfare work being done. But there have been many letters too, which contained information quite as significant as that given in the letter from the American Humane Association. They may be letters explaining how, when, and why certain organizations came into existence or how and why certain others ceased to exist or have been materially influenced and modified in their attempt to adjust themselves to changing conditions in the society which they are endeavoring to serve.

However it is not necessary to depend solely upon the information gained from the replies to the questionnaires. One who is endeavoring to gain the most complete information concerning the value and status of social service organizations, cannot afford to neglect the
writings of experienced workers in the field—workers who have been with them and therefore intimately acquainted with them for a number of years. Their conclusions should be known and considered as well as the conclusions we may draw from the data we have gained thru the questionnaires. While there is very little being written directly on the subject of national welfare organizations, as we are considering them, yet there is much material in recent social welfare literature, that bears very fundamentally upon certain phases of the subject of public welfare organizations. The work and worth of private agencies and public welfare organizations always received lengthy consideration in the annual meetings of the National Conference of Social Work. Furthermore, administrators who are concerned about social efficiency are earnestly discussing the question of what units prove most satisfactory as a basis of social welfare organizations. Therefore, in recent reports of the National Conference of Social Work, are long discussions of the
state as a unit, the county as a unit, and what type of unification is best to coordinate the social work of the cities. Moreover, recent social welfare literature abounds in discussions by men who are not interested in emphasizing any particular unit, considering what is the most feasible and advisable plan for coordinating the energies expended in social work and for securing financial cooperation. We think without going into any lengthy discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of any type of cooperation or the machinery by which it is secured, it might be well to say that there is a widespread and general feeling that there should be worked out some type of confederation which will insure greater efficiency in local work and help to guarantee this efficiency to the good average citizen who without knowing much about why he does it, makes his contribution when solicited.

NOTES.

1. Mr. L.A. Halbert is authority for the statement that a Mr. Shenton has made a study of some three hundred fifty organizations and
Miss Eva H. Marquis, working on Kansas City research board, has collected names and information on over one hundred national organizations.

CHAPTER III.
DATA GAINED FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRES.

By way of arriving at a complete understanding of the information gained thru the questionnaires, let us consider in detail the findings on certain specific points, viz., membership, purposes, financing, publicity methods and registrations.

Of one hundred nine organizations, from whom we have received adequate information which might be considered under these heads, over eighty have given their membership specifically. Others are much more indefinite, e.g., American Humane Education Society, which gives for its membership "several thousand." Similarly the League to Enforce Peace gives its membership as "several million," while the Child Welfare Association reports only "several hundred."

Perhaps for our purposes one of the most significant aspects of this subject is whether
or not the membership is composed of organizations. Some organizations have on their list of membership both smaller or sub-organizations and individual and they may not always have so distinguished them. But the replies in this respect are somewhat checked up or borne out by the answers to the point in the questionnaire on sub-organizations. In some cases the question may call to mind of persons filling out only the individual membership. The American Association for Organizing Family Social Work reports its membership as 180 societies. The Federation de Alliance gives its membership as 200 organizations. The Naturalization Aid Leagues may boast of a membership of 250 organizations. The National Trade Womans League has in its membership eighteen societies. There are, surely, a good many more whose membership is at least composed of sub-organizations. Nevertheless the unescapable conclusion which is here forcibly brought out is that most of our national voluntary organizations are not confederations of local organizations, but are themselves engaged directly
in whatever type of local work they may be promoting, and making their appeal direct for membership and support.

In regard to individual membership there is the greatest variety. Perhaps on the whole we are surprised most to note the large number of small memberships in view of the fact that these are national organizations. Of the one hundred organizations we are considering twenty have not replied to membership. Among the eighty that have reported we find the following classification based on size of membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Membership</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 between 200 and 300</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 between 300 and 400</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 between 400 and 500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 between 500 and 600</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 between 600 and 700</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 between 700 and 900</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 between 900 and 1,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 between 1,000 and 2,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 between 2,000 and 3,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 between 3,000 and 4,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 between 4,000 and 5,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 between 5,000 and 6,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 between 6,000 and 7,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 between 7,000 and 8,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 between 8,000 and 9,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 between 9,000 and 10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 several million</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps this last organization does not keep very accurate records and therefore has no
way of determining exactly what its membership is. From this table we see that twenty organizations have a membership between one and one thousand. The question occurs at once,--How influential can the average national organization be if its membership is as low as one thousand? Next to the group of very small organizations just considered, we find nearly forty with memberships varying between one thousand and ten thousand. The two groups taken together reveal to us that three fourths of our national organizations do not have a membership exceeding ten thousand, which, for the average, is less than one member in ten thousand of the inhabitants of our country. Of the remainder, only two have a membership exceeding a half million.

The information gained on the point of eligibility is quite as interesting and instructive as that in regard to members. Since eligibility was a specific point in the outline, all who replied had an ample opportunity to give the practice of their organization in this respect. One of the chief purposes in including the point
was to determine to what extent in national organizations, their membership is a matter of financial contribution, as would be true if a large part of them set as their standard of membership the payment of dues or a subscription. We find, however, only a small per cent who frankly admit this to be the basis of eligibility—about 11%. Of course it may be argued that if a person pays the dues or makes a subscription he thereby demonstrates his interest in and support of the cause. But about 28% of the organizations reporting have given "interest" as the first or principal requisite for membership. This of course in the majority of cases also means willingness to pay dues. Some have considered the subscribing to principles their crucial test of eligibility. There were 9% of these. In 6% of cases "citizenship" is required. For about 7%, eligibility to membership is a matter of being engaged in a particular work or occupation. For about 11% the members must be of some other organization. Twenty-two per cent of the questionnaires elicited no reply on eligibility, which
may mean any of several things. It may mean that they have never reduced eligibility to black and white. They may be opposed to having their basis of eligibility known. Or they may have considered eligibility unimportant.

On the point of whether these organizations are dependent or independent of other organizations the vote is almost unanimous. It is significant that of all the replies received only one had signified that it is not entirely independent of other organizations. It is well that this be borne in mind in the consideration of our next topic. It makes no difference how much purposes and work duplicate, each organization is pursuing its way and methods entirely free from any administrative supervision.

One of the most significant features, and one of the most surprising facts revealed in this study, is the frequency and complexity of the duplication of purposes within groups naturally falling under the same general statement of purpose. But the purpose in organization given out in statements and propaganda may be a bit misleading
for there is a very decided tendency on the part of organizations to make their statement of purposes quite comprehensive and inclusive. They must, apparently, show a breadth of appeal just as the platforms of the great political parties must be general and widely appealing. One extreme example of this breadth of purpose is made by the Woman's Homestead Association in reply to the questionnaire when they give for their purpose, 'To investigate all institutions.' Another statement of purpose which is at least striking and less specific was made by the American Defense Society in its reply to the questionnaire for it purpose, "Trying to keep practicers of the Sociology many of you people teach from destroying the land." But the National Congress of Mothers and Parent Teacher Associations has set itself to the biggest task by stating for its purpose or object, "Child Welfare in home, church, school and state." Just underneath this object, on the same sheet are given "the Aim and Purposes of the National Congress of Mothers," which embraces absolutely the whole
of social knowledge and effort. They would educate and train mothers; they would make up to unfortunate children all they lack; they would be mothers to the motherless and train mothers to be more motherly; they would improve the home and the school and the interrelationship between the two; they would work for legislation; and they would educate and arouse the whole community to its duty to itself thru its children. From the above it is quite evident that even where we find a very apparent overlapping in statements of purpose, yet when we are fully acquainted with the origin, growth and present immediate objects, we might find that the duplication we are sure we see is only apparent, and that their specific and immediate objectives are quite different. Bearing this in mind let us examine some of the groups in which the apparent overlapping is most pronounced.

Consider for example the whole group of Jewish organizations. Among Zionist organizations we find the following:

(2) Federation of American Zionists.
@Intercollegiate Zionist Association
Other Jewish organizations are:

@American Jewish Historical Society.
@Council of Jewish Commercial Instruction.
@Council of Jewish Women
@Council of Young Men's and Kindred Association.
@Federation for Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies.
@Federation for Galician and Bukovian Jews
@Federation of Jewish Farmers
@Federation of Huminian Jews in America
@Federation of Russian Polish Hebrews
@Hebrews Association for the Blind
@Hebrew Messiahie Council
@Immigrant Aid Society for Jewish Women
@Jewish Big Brothers Association
@Jewish National Fund Bureau
@National Hebrew School Association.
@Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America and Canada.
@United Hebrews of America
@Young Men's Hebrew Association.

This list of organizations presents a very typical illustration of our problem. There are twenty-three national Jewish organizations in this list. But, it must also be remembered that there are also multitudes of smaller and local organizations, both Jewish and non-Jewish, which the Jews of the United States are asked and appealed to for support. Moreover, there are probably a good many more national Jewish Organ-
izations than the twenty three we have listed. Now we can reasonably assume that any and all the Jewish organizations have good reasons for existence. Yet from the standpoint of social economy we are justified in inquiring whether they are most efficiently accomplishing their purposes and indeed whether or not these purposes are worth the money and effort being expended upon them. But the Jewish givers and in fact all givers should be assured in some way of the efficiency and value of the work to which they are asked to subscribe. Perhaps some plan by which a unity of effort could be secured would help in this direction. It seems that many if not all of them might be coordinated under either the Federation for Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies or United Hebrews of America. However, we can go no further than to raise the question. We cannot say with certainty that such a thing ought to be done. It would require a specific and detailed study of this group to enable one to speak with assurance. No doubt each organization feels that it can make out a most excellent case for itself and its type of work.
Here the basis of unity would be more in the nature of constituency than purposes.

There is a number of groups, however, whose classification in the same group is on a basis of similarity of purposes. In this type of grouping we find more pronounced overlapping. One such group is composed of those organizations whose purposes have to do with public health. Among them we find the following:

- American Association for Hospital Social Workers.
- American Medical Association
- American Public Health Association
- Association for Prevention and relief of Heart Disease
- National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis.
- National Committee for Prevention of Blindness
- National Camp and Health League.
- Society for Instruction in First Aid to the Injured.

While we are able to see a general similarity of general purpose yet each of the organizations has for its immediate purpose working on some specific problem. For the sake of society there should be more cooperation than was manifested in the replies to the questionnaires which show each organization to be very independent of all others. Apparently the
American Health Association is the most general organization on the list. Perhaps it would be well for it or some such organization to endeavor to act as a coordinator and synthesizer of the most up-to-date methods and theories in the field of public health as borne out by the experience of all such societies and workers.

Another typical and very striking example of the overlapping of purposes is to be found in the various national temperance organizations. Our list includes the following:

@Anti-Saloon League
@Intercollegiate Temperance Prohibition Association.
@National Temperance Legislation Bureau.
@National Temperance Society and Publishing House.
@Prohibition National Executive Committee.
@Scientific Temperance Federation.
@Womens Temperance Legislative Bureau.
@Womans Christian Temperance Union.

In connection with this list it is well to bear in mind the large number of church temperance societies and the important part they have played. Then, too the National Prohibition Party has existed and polled a few votes at each election. But here we find so much apparent overlapping a little closer scrutiny reveals
a difference of method. Going down the above list we find the following methods employed:

1. A general opposition to saloons.
2. Encouragement of the study of the liquor problem in colleges.
3. Appealing to legislative bodies in the behalf of the cause.
4. Spreading propaganda in behalf of the cause.
5. Patient, scientific and thorough going research on the problems of liquor consumption.
7. Women's united effort placing behind the movement the dynamic of Christianity.

Judging rather superficially, if there is one organization here especially adapted to securing cooperation and coordination of all temperance forces; it might be the National Temperance Society and Publishing House.

As a fourth list illustrating the duplication of purposes within the group, the Child Welfare group is here given:

© Big Brother Movement.
© Little Wanderers' Association.
© Boy Conservation Bureau.
© Boy Scouts of America.
© National Child Labor Committee
© National Child Welfare Association
© National Congress of Mothers and Parent Teachers Association.
© National Kindergarten Association (Educative)
Here again we find a group of organizations whose specific purposes differ sufficiently to insure individuality. The purposes, which of course determine the methods, vary as follows:

1. To secure a sort of sympathetic adoption by a reliable class of men of boys needing the care of such a friend.

2. To save for the country's highest interests the boy life of our nation.

3. To work thru instructions and recreational guidance to develop boy life.

4. To take care of unclaimed and uncared for children.

5. To secure legislation in behalf of the laboring child.

6. To promote general welfare.

7. To secure a better type of cooperation between parents and teachers.

8. To promote the kindergarten idea.

It would seem that if the child welfare work along these various lines were coordinated, perhaps the National Child Welfare Association would be, because of its general nature, the logical organization thru which to secure such cooperation.

Under the head of social hygiene we find the following:
American Female Guardian Society and
Home for the Friendless.
©American Social Hygiene Association.
Girls' National Honor Guard.
©Girls’ Friendship Society in America.
World's Purity Federation.

Here as usual we find one problem but
a substantial difference of approach or attitude.
Some would establish homes. Others would protect.
Others set for themselves the task of instructing
the public and building up a public opinion.

The above groups amply illustrate the
extent of the overlapping of purposes and five
sufficient examples to indicate the possibility
if not the advisability of more coordinated efforts
within groups with such similar purposes. But our
treatment of this phase of the problem would be
very inadequate and misleading if we did not also
point out some of the many instances, where there
is much less overlapping or duplicating of
purposes. Perhaps we can find no better group
of examples than the quite extensive list of or-
ganizations whose purpose is to oppose and protect
against certain ideas or movements. On other
bases they would be placed in other classifications,
but it is interesting to note such a list of anti's.
They are: 

- American Anti-Boycott Association.
- American Anti-Vivisection Society.
- American Union Against Militarism.
- Anti-Cruelty Society and Refuge
- Anti-Capital Punishment Society.
- Anti-Vaccination League.
- National Anti-Cigarette League.
- National Association Opposed to Women Suffrage.
- National Highways Protective Society.
- West Indian Protective Society.

These organizations must of course stand or fall before us in their individual merits.

Another group of organizations coming under one head in our classification on the purpose basis and yet sufficiently different in specific purposes to prohibit coordination under one administrative organization, is the group which hopes either by appealing to the people or to legislative bodies to advance the cause of human betterment by bringing about a change in government policy or institutions. Thus we find such organizations as the following whose purposes are revealed in the name:

- American Alliance for Labor and Democracy.
- American Society for Constitutional Government.
- American Political Service Association.
©Civil Service Reform
Federal Suffrage Association
©National Popular Government League
©Public Ownership League of America
Short Ballot Organization
Union for Progressive Constitution.

Similar to the above organizations are those whose aim is to promote national solidarity and unity:

- All American Alliance
- ©American Defense Society
- ©American Rights League
- American Society of Patriots
- League for National Unity
- ©National Security League
- United League of America

National unity and safety may be best insured thru some form of preparedness. Advocates of preparedness in some form are:

- American Home Industries League
- Conference Committee on National Preparedness.
- ©Universal Military Training League.

Still other organizations are opposed to this so-called preparedness and feel that national safety lies in the opposite direction.

- ©American Union against Militarism
- Anti-Imperialist League.

The idea of permanent peace has a number of national organizations in support of it in some form or other. Of these we have the following:
In this manner we might continue and give the names of two or more organizations, classified under each of the following heads: national conservation, education, negroes, Greeks, naturalization, Irish, Bohemian, French, Scandinavian, Armenians, Serbians, Chinese, medical, nursing, recreation and others.

In all of these lists we would find substantially the same conditions as those enumerated above except there would not be so many organizations grouped around one idea. Each attack a problem from some particular angle or point of view, but usually in each group are sufficiently agreed in general hopes, aims, and subject, to afford in most cases splendid opportunities for securing much better cooperation.

When we come to consider the group of organizations which have been classified under...
the head of strictly social welfare, we find much larger groups for the field seems much larger and the opportunity is more varied. First, let us name, the organizations whose purpose is the bringing of national relief and aid to certain unfortunate classes:

American Association to Promote Teaching of Speech to the Deaf.
American Invalid Aid Society.
American Relief Society
Association for Relief of Respectable Aged and Indigent Females.
Children of Armenians' Fund.
Federation of Associations for Cripples.
@Funeral Benefit Association of the United States.
Mayo-Mens' Protective and Beneficient Association.
National Library for the Blind
National Fraternal Society for the Deaf
National Special Aid Society
Servants of Relief for Incurable Cancer
Women's National Relief Association
Women's Prison Association
Xavier Free Public School for the Blind.

When one begins seriously to examine such a list of organizations as the above with the view of trying to determine which ones are necessary and good, and what are not, and if he tries to devise some way by which they may be induce to cooperate, then he realizes the variety of purpose and motive back of the whole organizations movement
and why therefore so many organizations exist.
These have such varied programs that any talk
of effective union falls flat from a practical
standpoint: It is silenced by the formidable
challenge of "How?" This great number of organi-
zations might be compared to a large army marching
against a varied and concealed foe and unable to
resolve itself into any order as a whole movement.

The next list is longer than the last
one. It is composed of those that advocate some
constructive measure of social reform and yet whose
specific purposes defy further classification on
any significant basis. While the list contains
fifty-two names it will not be necessary to give
all of those names in order amply to illustrate
what peculiar and varied purposes or aims may be
call into existence some national organization to
work directly for social improvement. Note, there-
fore, the following whose purposes are perfectly
apparent in their names:

American Association for Organizing Charity.
@American Genetic Association.
American Fair Trade League.
American Flag Association
American Home-Craft Society
@American Home Economic Association
@American Humane Education Society.
American Liberty and Property Association
©American Society for Thrift.
Character Development League
Committee on Criminal Courts.
©Cooperative League of America
Golden Rule Alliance of America.
Honest Ballot Association.
Municipal Government Association.
©National Civic Federation.
National Committee on Prisons and Prison Labor
©National Conference on Social Work.
©National Consumers' League
National Cooperative Association of America.
National Federation of Settlements.
©National Highways Association.
National New Thought Center
©National Social Workers Exchange
National Voters League
Postal Progress League
Postal Reform League.
©Voluntary Parenthood League.
©War Camp Community Service.

From this somewhat lengthy discussion and illustration of complexity, duplication and overlapping of purposes, from the great number and variety and kinds of organizations, and from the unquestioned individuality of the organizations it should be apparent how difficult it is to get a perspective of the whole field even on a basis of purposes. But there are other points on which the questionnaire has revealed important information which will be valuable in trying to place an estimate upon the value of the work of such organizations.
One of the important features of this study and one very intimately bound up with purposes, and, therefore reflecting their complexity, is the variety in parties to whom appeals are addressed. Some organizations exist mainly to influence legislation and have accomplished their aims either by being able to show the support of a numerous constituency or by the apparent expediency or the obvious demonstrability or the justice of their contention. Among such organizations are:

The American Association for Agricultural Legislation,
The National Federation of Women's Clubs,
The National Committee on Constructive Immigration Legislation,
The National Temperance Legislation Bureau.

But the organizations addressing themselves to securing legislation are comparatively few in number. Many, many more may have for their purpose or end very much the same sort of social improvement but who, because of lack of influence, or because of opposition within legislative bodies, must build up a strong public opinion before they can secure such laws as they desire. Examples of this sort are:
National Highways Protective Society,
Immigration Reconstruction League,
National Civil Service Reform League,
Short Ballot Organization,
Universal Military Training League
League to Enforce Peace,
Public Ownership League.

Some organizations exist for and appeal to only
very limited portions of our people. Examples
of these may be found among the organizations of
different races and peoples, e.g.,

Federation of Jewish Farmers
Zionist Associations,
Council of Jewish Women,
Bohemian National Alliance,
and many others could be given.

Moreover there are many organizations
who are not chiefly concerned about exerting an
influence over legislative bodies. They rather,
are interested in educating the public to their
way of thinking with the object of influencing
moral standards or ideas and making them effective
in common practice. Among these are such organi-
izations as the

Naturalization Aid League,
American Schools Society,
American School Citizenship League,
All-American Alliance,
American Public Health Association,
Baby Hygiene Association, and
Committee for the Reduction of Infant
Mortality
But there are also many organizations whose educative program is only an indirect end, since their publicity is aimed to enable them better to appeal to the public for the financial support they need to carry on their work. These are relief and social welfare organizations, illustrated by such as the American Relief Society, Federation of Associations for Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children, Women's Christian Temperance Union, and many others who are securing lists of names of people whom they believe will be susceptible to their type of appeal, and sending them letters asking for a nominal sum in return for which, if the amount be sufficient, the donor becomes a member.

Furthermore, a full consideration of duplication cannot fail to take into account the very important work being done by such large and established national social welfare organizations as the Red Cross, the Y.M.C.A., the Boy Scouts of America, War Camp Community Service and Salvation Army. It would hardly seem necessary to dilate at any length upon the work these organ-
organizations are able to accomplish. The Red Cross has done a heroic work during the war and is now extending its program to include peace time Red Cross work on a very extensive scale. The Y.M.C.A. is working in city and village with men and boys and has been able to do much in the way of constructive social work. Similarly, the Boy Scouts is effective thru local organizations and is doing invaluable work all over our country in conserving boy life of our country. So we might continue through the list. All are fairly well known and all are engaged in some good work. They, at present, enjoy the confidence and support of the people. But how long will this be the case if a great host of questionable and unguaranteed organizations are allowed to enter with their pleas for support on an absolute par with these well known and well supported organizations.

Having thus considered the overlapping of purposes let us now turn our attention to the problem of financing of the organizations. A thorough study of this part of our subject would furnish as interesting and as instructive information
as any phase of the subject. While there is no small variety of annual incomes, yet the budgets like the membership remain pretty consistently within certain limits. Of the one hundred or more organizations which filled out the questionnaire, not over sixty-seven have stated their annual budget specifically enough so that we can use them. Some have filled out other parts pretty carefully but failed to fill out this part. In some cases they say that such information is only for members. One said it was too much trouble to fill out the questionnaire. But in most cases in which they failed to fill out that part, no reasons were given.

There are two cases that deserve special mention. One is the American Relief Society whose director was Herbert Hoover. They estimate that they spent over nine hundred million dollars. The other case is the Serbian Relief Committee who give an annual budget of over three million dollars. But in totaling we have not included these special cases because they arose out of and existed because of the war conditions and therefore do not represent a permanent program. Among the
sixty-seven organizations reporting we find the following:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>under $1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>between $1,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>&quot; 10,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>&quot; 100,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>over 1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this table we see that over one-half come between the points of $10,000 and $100,000. In fact, the average organization spends about $64,911.02, and figuring on this basis the three hundred fifty organizations to whom we sent questionnaires are spending annually approximately $22,700,000.

These organizations have a variety of ways in which to raise this money. The larger part comes in subscriptions, either voluntarily given or raised by solicitation. Probably the next most important source of income is dues. Possibly this part of the questionnaire has not been as carefully filled out at the other parts since it is doubtful if the average person replying to the questionnaire would consider the sources of income of very great importance. However, the point in the questionnaire on sources of finance, has brought out some interesting information. A sub-
topic under financing is "How Raised?" Under this head we made three suggestions, thus:

**How raised:**
1. Dues
2. Solicitation.
3. Endowments.

Besides replying with regard to these three points those who have filled in have in many cases written other sources of income. Among these are fines, assessments, gifts, fees, sale of magazine, interest and sales. We have a sufficiently complete report from eighty-eight on these points. The tabulation of replies shows the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dues</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Solicitations</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contributions, voluntary</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Endowments</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fees</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sale of Magazine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sales</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assessments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Interest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course it must be borne in mind that several of these may be mentioned for the same organization. While dues leads in the number of instances mentioned, it probably does not net as large an amount of funds to the treasury as do voluntary and solicited contributions which perhaps should come under one head.
The attempt to find out for what this money is being spent met with less success than the attempt to ascertain the sources from which it is raised. One of the smaller items is the salaries of officers and workers, while rent and expenses are mentioned quite frequently. Also in a number of cases propaganda is admitted to be the important item of expenditure. Of the total number of replies eighty-four answered the point concerning paid officers on staff. The topic or suggestion should have been "paid officers and workers" for in some cases there may be workers who could not properly be called officers. In some cases the persons filling out replies have added "and workers" to the topic, thus making it more inclusive. On the point of paid officers on the staff the tabulation of the results show the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Having</th>
<th>Having 1</th>
<th>Having 2</th>
<th>None 2</th>
<th>Having 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Totaling we find that eighty four organizations report the employment of 381 officers and in some cases workers. The average then is over four paid members for each organization. Since we found that the average annual budget is about $65,000 it at once becomes quite apparent that salaries do not constitute an extremely large part or a very important item of expenditure. All who have offices, and most of them do, must be paying rent. Publicity and propaganda must figure pretty largely in the disposing of the annual budget.

In regard to publicity methods, the information is a good bit better than guessing. A checking thru the replies finds the following:

- Circular letters 38
- Advertisements 17
- Bulletins 13
- Magazines 8
- Lecturers or speakers 6
- Reports (proceedings) 4

As we have seen before in the study of financing, and here again since most of the organizations are employing two or more of the mentioned publicity methods much of the money raised by these organizations is ex-
pended in advertising. Carrying advertisements in newspapers and popular magazines or by sending circular letters are very expensive forms of gaining publicity. When one recalls how many appeals in the papers, or as circular letters fall on deaf ears, it becomes apparent that the average expense of a productive circular must be very high. It is impossible to estimate just how expensive these forms would be but there cannot fail to be a very great deal of time, thought, stationery and postage wasted in this way.

Another important question which might be raised in regard to these organizations is to what extent are they responsible or accountable and how might their aims and methods be checked up.

After sending the first one hundred questionnaires, it seemed desirable to secure information as to whether or not these organizations were being incorporated under state laws. Therefore at the bottom was written in script on the remaining two hundred fifty questionnaires,
the question, "Incorporated?" The replies show the following results:

45 are incorporated
22 are not incorporated
20 have not given the information

Thus we find over one half of these organizations are incorporated in some state. About one fourth admit that they are not incorporated. Perhaps it would be more nearly fair to consider those about whom we have information on this point. Then it would appear more nearly two-thirds are incorporated.

Another factor, valuable because it is indicative of their stability, is their ages, determined from replies to the question, "When founded?" That the great majority are comparatively young will be seen by the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Founded Before</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1880</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1890</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1900</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1910</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-1920</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, of the 91 organizations reporting on the date of their founding, 66 have been founded since 1900. This tends to indicate that the
national organization is quite recent. The most popular single year, was 1915, when seven of the ninety one were formed or one in thirteen. The year 1914 is a close second, having seen the founding of six organizations on the list.

**NOTES.**

1. "You people," refers no doubt, to Sociology Departments for the heading of the questionnaire says "University of Kansas, Department of Sociology."

2. The names given include more than just those from whom replies have been received. It is assumed that in cases in which an organization was sent a letter which was never returned, that although no reply was received, yet the name represents a bona fide organization.

The organizations from whom replies have been received are marked with an (@) before them.
CHAPTER IV.

SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

In the foregoing chapters we have considered, first the method and scope of our study, including a survey of the situation in which national voluntary organizations must operate; second, we tried to show the method of study calling attention to the difficulties involved in such a study as this; and third, we have given in summary, adding certain of our own opinions, the findings of the survey.

In this chapter we shall endeavor to set forth some recommendations that have come to mind and seem to be borne out by the information gained by the study. In making these recommendations we realize that in so complex a field, it is hazardous to try to reach conclusions applicable to such a great multitude of cases. In truth the conclusions we here reach are only a simplification and refinement of the problem. We are attempting
to point out three lines of improvement that should be followed. Each of these is, of course, in itself a problem and in no case do we consider that any problem has been solved until that solution has been tried out in the refining fire of practical experience. But in the face of these difficulties we will make the suggestions found in the following pages.

In the first place it seems quite proper that some sort of a national registry should be made available. Even if it were not required that every organization publicly soliciting funds be so registered, yet it should and could easily be made advantageous for them voluntarily to do so. However, our chief interest in making this suggestion is to secure to the giving public at least a modicum of protection by placing at their disposal pertinent information regarding national organizations. A prolonged study only convinces one of the sincerity of the vast majority of the organizations but the same study also greatly emphasises the spontaneity of origin and the room for improving the efficiency of administration.
Perhaps the ease with which new organizations can be created can be no more forcibly attested than by a few pointed remarks made by workers who are in constant contact with these organizations. Mr. Sherman C. Kingsley of Cleveland, Director of the Welfare Federation, remarks that our ideals of religious and intellectual liberty give us great opportunity for self expression and self-realization. He adds, "It is said of one of our eastern cities that it has a secretary and treasurer for every idea." Another worker, E.A. Sier of Cincinnati, pointedly exclaims, "Count that day lost whose low descending sun sees no new organization formed." Mr. Kingsley attributes the origin of most organizations to one or the other of two general causes. First, they may originate out of some individual or group taking care of some case of need, or second, they may arise out of bequests and foundations prescribed by some "dead hand" leaving a fortune for such disposal. He sagely remarks that we not only always have the poor with us, but also those who work for the poor. Along this same line,
II.C. Elmer, of the department of Sociology of the University of Minnesota, says, "Within the past six months I have been approached by representatives of four organizations, and all expecting to cover the same territory, requesting me to aid them in carrying on almost identical investigations. They were all to be supported in the main, by people residing in that territory." Mr. Kingsley strikes the most pessimistic note when he writes, "In these two ways" (speaking of the two sources of organization mentioned above), "mainly, each community finds itself provided with a long list of agencies, each appealing for support, and each gaining for itself the strongest and most influential board it can secure, each making the most of the hot weather, blizzards, hard times, high prices, epidemics, appealing stories and the like and trying to do it first." But it would hardly be fair to Mr. Kingsley or the work not to give the next few sentences of the same paragraph which to a great extent modify the impression made by the foregoing: "These organizations all occupy parts of a common
field. Together they constitute one of the necessary services of the community as at present organized. They care for the sick and infirm, the aged, for dependent and neglected children, for broken families, for people and sections that need neighborliness." It is not probable that in many cases these things are seized upon as mere pretexts to account for the starting of organizations. We believe, rather, that there are a host of factors which may give rise to national voluntary organizations; that both the need which they attempt to meet and their ability to meet that need are assumed and that they feel, because of their motives that the giving public should support their enterprises.

While the study soon convinces one that the origin of many of these agencies, if not groundless, is at least ill-advised, yet the study serves rather, to assure one of the sincerity of purpose that accounts for most of them. That they may be often misled is borne out by such testimony as the following, from Bessie A. McClanahan, of the University of Iowa,
"The goal of all social work, I take it, is the perfecting of social institutions. Social institutions of whatever kind, laws, philanthropic, social propaganda, and social programs, all are the outgrowth of some conception of service. The difficulty is that the vision, perhaps clear enough, to the dreamer, in its transplanting into reality suffers from rude contact with imperfect mortals and ends in one more faulty agency."

(5)

Thus Mr. H.H. Shirer, of the Ohio State Board of Charities writes concerning the increase in government supervision, "This seems to be brought about by the fact that charity covers a multitude of sins and that too frequently so-called benevolent organizations or incorporations 'not-for-profit' are the results of clever planning of some persons who have thrown over themselves the name of an organization and by means of the funds procured, they are able to provide for themselves and their families shelter and a means of a livelihood in the name of charity. Or again, institutions have alleged to exist and subscription solicited and given when it has later been found
out that there are no persons who benefit from such an institution except the promoter." We believe that this type of case is quite rare, but, of course, society should be protected from even such rare cases and exceptions. Dr. Frank Garland, of Dayton, Ohio, relates the experience of the state of Massachusetts when it required public registration of such agencies. "Among the applications have been found a number who were dishonest in their dealings, also a number who had criminal records, and several who were mentally unbalanced. An exceptionally large number were unable to meet personal expenses." But he finds that even in cases where the intentions were all right that the need for supervision is almost as great. He continues, "The outstanding feature, however, in the investigations of applications for charters, is the large number of persons who are well-intentioned who are wholly untrained to deal with charitable problems, and lack experience even in the ordinary affairs of life. Social ambition, good impulses, and the desire to foster a pet idea, are in many instances the impelling motives which lead them
to engage in charity." These opinions and statements should be well considered for they come out of practical experience. The social efficiency of these organizations has been questioned along one other line, viz., that of allowing the organization to become an end in itself, when its period of usefulness is passed. This happens because the promoters naturally believe in their idea and it may come to be a sacred affair to them while society can see no value in it. Thus H.C. Elmer, of the University of Minnesota, writes, "Frequently a small group of persons controlling the policy and activities of a welfare organization, become so enthusiastic over the aim of their organization that the "Aim" becomes the center of their interests, and the actual benefits of their efforts are lost. Their energies are expended in the effort to Perpetuate the organization which has such democratic aims rather than carrying some of the less pretentious aims into effect." Similarly, E.A. Ross of the University of Wisconsin, indicating the wastes of too much organization points out that the organization may become an end in itself. And this is an attitude that might be unconsciously assumed
even by the most conscientious people.

When we find such an unguided, hit and miss freedom, in organizing organizations, and since there is very little if any check upon the efficiency and sincerity, we cannot be greatly surprised if they do not show a high degree of social efficiency. Perhaps the points of their inefficiency are best cited in a discussion by F.A. Gier, of Cincinnati, giving the business man's criticism of philanthropic work. He says, "These faults of organization—a lack of unified directed plan for the whole organization, duplicating efforts, inferior standards of work, conflicting standards in similar fields, failure to seize the leadership in your communities, the permission to start more and more separate organizations, jealousies among yourselves and the limiting of area of operation, are making these contributors and the public more skeptical of the value of social service."

The foregoing constitutes on the whole a quite thorough indictment of the present status of organizations. But there is little doubt
that what is true in this case as well as in many others, is that it is much easier to make adverse criticism than it is to suggest in a definitely constructive way the path of progress toward improvement. Director R.E. Hiles of the Ohio Institute for Public Efficiency, sets for himself a part of this difficult task when he says, "Organization is a means to an end. It consists of getting those people who have common ideals and purposes to work together automatically to achieve those ideals and purposes. That form of organization is best which will bring about a maximum of result with a minimum of effort, and develop an ever increasing understanding of community needs." Also the task is constructively pointed out by Sherman C. Kingsley of Cleveland Welfare Federation, in these words, "The question is—do social workers conduct their work in such a way that they, (1) render the greatest possible service to the people concerned, with the money and service at their demand; (2) utilize the experience gained and facts gathered in doing this work in such a way as to give their communities that impulse, that
that enlightenment, and that conscience and guidance which should come from the people, who like the watchman, it would seem, might be asked, "What of the Night?" What Mr. Kingsley wishes and what we all wish to see, is that the organizations would make the most of their experience to positively lead all of us in the work and show us the way to eliminate pathological causes rather than to be content merely to touch upon their effects. Measured by these high standards, even the organizations most discreetly founded and whose purpose and work have remained sincere, are nevertheless to be considered somewhat inefficient.

Facing the fact of such a great spontaneity of origin with all that it implies, and a certain amount of insincerity of purposes and work and a great deal of inefficiency on the part of most organizations when measured by the high social standards suggested above, the question at once occurs, what can and should be done? In answer to that question, being guided by the results of the study, the writer suggests that there be worked out with the Department of the Interior some sort
of a national registry. In fact, Mr. L.A. Halbert of the Kansas City Public Welfare Association in trying to suggest some national agency to act as a centralization institution, and a clearing house for social work, says, "Indeed there are already assembled in the Department of the Interior many of the functions that would tend to justify calling it a National Public Welfare Department." Therefore, in the light of this need, and the available machinery, we suggest that a part of this department be legally constituted a national registry for organizations not only national and voluntary but also local and private. Furthermore we think that registration should be required of all organizations which are appealing to the national public for funds. The privilege of being so recognized and registered should appeal to the organization to the extent that all would seek to be registered. No fee should be charged and the work should be entirely in the hands of public officials.
The suggestion of such a registry, of course, raises certain questions which it may be advisable, to some extent, to endeavor to anticipate. It probably would not be advisable to give this registry the power to deny the right of registration to any organization for in that case the prejudices of some member of the committee (if such committee were formed) might interfere very much with the right of the people to express its desire to serve in a particular way. But requiring registration by those organizations soliciting for funds should be merely a matter of protection. This registration should include the name and purpose of the organization, its officers and their addresses and possibly the average membership. Furthermore it would be expedient to require an annual report for this would not need to entail restrictions because of a prejudice, yet it would in itself go far toward promoting honest, integrity, and efficiency. Perhaps thru publicity given in governmental reports it could be made worth while for all organizations not only to join,
but also to keep up their annual reports for the sake of the advertising gained in the department's annual reports.

Something parallel to this very suggestion has been worked out in the State of Massachusetts when in 1910 they established a State Board of Charity with power to investigate and control all charity organizations. In explanation they say, "The warrant for legislation of this character rests upon the theory supported by authoritative judicial decisions that private funds given for the benefit of the community are a public trust." It seems that this sort of a national registry would work to the advantage of both the organizations themselves and especially to the public without denying just social privileges and rights to either.

In the first part of this chapter we have tried to point out conditions which make some sort of a national registry almost imperative. We have advocated the establishment of such a registry under the Department of the Interior. It seems possible further that the machinery there advocated might be the logical means of
carrying into effect our second recommendation. Few, who have studied the field will question the need for securing results which our second recommendation will endeavor to secure, but the great difficulty is to discover a method of meeting that need. The crying need seems to be for some sort of consolidation or confederation by which to coordinate the efforts and energies of groups of organizations whose purposes are similar. Now, just how this is to be done no one can say. Perhaps no one should say. It might be well however to provide a committee in connection with this national registry, which should be empowered to investigate and make recommendations. Again we must point out that the danger of giving to such a committee full authority is that because of its prejudices, it might deny the right of organizations and activity to certain agencies and thereby, in the long run prove detrimental to the welfare of society by inhibiting certain valuable experiences and experiments in the expression of democracy. But a committee with power to recommend, could point
the way to cooperation within groups with similar purposes, which it would embarass no one to accept and which might go a long way towards securing cooperation and efficiency in administration. This cooperation may be along one or more of three lines: (1) groups with similar purposes may cooperate in the work they are attempting to do; (2) the agencies may do their work comparatively independently but cooperate in the raising of funds in the way that the Inter-Church World Movement has done in the recent drive; (3) the most complete type of confederation is secured when social welfare work is taken out of the hands of private agencies and put in the hands of public agencies which are, of course, supported by public taxation. It is not meant to infer that these lines are mutually exclusive but rather an examination of the present tendencies shows that all three lines of development may be pursued at the same time. Thus, part of the function of administration of a group of agencies may be taken over by the government, and at the same time the agencies may unite both in raising funds and in carrying on welfare work.
The first advantage to be given for centralization of control and unification of effort is its reaction upon the work. Many workers believe that a better perspective will be gained thru larger organizations; that there will be a better division of work; and that there will be better administration. When seen in its larger aspect, and in view of more united effort, social work appears both to be capable of great things and to be wonderfully worth while. (14)

L.A. Halbert of the Public Welfare Association of Kansas City, expresses his vision in these words, "The board of public welfare movement has behind it the dynamic of a great ideal which in a measure explains its history. The movement proclaims a practical Utopia to be realized by doing scientific social work on a large scale. This program is based upon the idea that social science and social invention can revolutionize society. It accepts no misery as inevitable, and no wrongs as irremediable. It aims at a new social order."

Another writer having had some experience (15) with the Ohio Institute which was an effort at
centralization says, "It seems clear that the social forces must put their programs and strength in a centralized form which will be comprehensive and important enough to command the attention and support of the whole community."

Perhaps for the sake of brevity we may be allowed to paraphrase the list of advantages for centralization given by E.A. Ross of the University of Wisconsin under the caption,

**Benefits of Organization.**

1. Accomplishment of ends which are quite unattainable by means of unorganized effort become possible.

2. A common interest cared for intermittently by all.

3. Division of work into its natural parts.

4. Narrowing the field of attention is favorable to a high degree of expertness.

5. Many distinct efforts are fitted into a single comprehensive plan.

6. Coordination into a larger whole ends that needless duplication of effort which often shows itself among agencies which are striving for the same end.

7. Elimination of the wastes of competition.

8. Working in a large and permanent organization appeals to men—size and permanency sustain and encourage in continuing for life work.

9. Not all men are fit for solitary work.
From what has here been said it would seem safe to hope that for the sake of efficiency in doing the work, centralization of administration would have practical benefits.

However, in many cases, where it is not possible to secure coordination of effort, yet it might be possible to secure cooperation in the raising of funds if it were deemed desirable. Perhaps the war has done more than any other event to speak up the progress in this direction. This financial cooperation may mean either the raising of a common fund, out of which each organization participating in the drive is to secure a certain percent, or, the extent of financial federation may go no further than that the organizations working together agree upon the time to make their drive and may even use conjointly the same advertising space or the same solicitors. The latter was used to some extent by the Inter-Church World Movement to gain general advertising. However, it must be borne in mind that the churches have to a large extent agreed upon a program back of which most of them are more or less enthusiastically
lining themselves up. There must be something of a common element in purposes or programs before financial cooperation can be expected to succeed. The efforts of workers have proved that some sort of financial cooperation is advisable. In this work the very persons responsible for raising the funds have been the most insistent in demanding some form of cooperation. This was especially true during the war but a unanimity of attitude was more nearly possible during the war than it is in normal peace times. But any plan of federation, even if only for a financial drive raises the question of what should be the attitude of all organizations towards each other. What will be the effect upon the agencies and upon the giving public if weak and manifestly inefficient organizations enter the campaign on an equal footing with the good and strong? This reveals the need for standardization. The difficulty of standardization or ranking of such institutions, show why it is best not to raise a general fund but rather to require that each donor stipulate what disposition shall be made of his contribution. This latter suggestion would have the added advantage of throwing each organization upon its own
merits and furthermore make it almost imperative for Mr. Average Citizen to become acquainted with the organizations in order to give wisely. This would be possible when he knew that he would be solicited and if a reasonable amount of advertising were done by the agencies.

There are certain fundamental disadvantages as well as the advantages we have just named in connection with any form of cooperation or financial federation. Under Wastes of Organizations, Mr. E.A. Ross lists the following:

1. Overhead expense.
2. In large groups the filing of records and checks.
3. Friction between parts.
4. Formality and red tape.
5. Inflexibility of Machinery.

Continuing, under Abuses of Organizations, he gives:

1. Executive uses for personal ends the power he possesses.
2. Concentration of power in the hands of executive often fails to realize upon the experience and wisdom of the department heads.
3. Tendency to become top-heavy.
4. Over-specialization prevents unity.
5. The organization becomes an end rather than a means.
In looking over the list here given one feels that many of them are rather superficial or at least that they do not occur. Most of them are specific ways of saying that humanity is weak and erring. Social work, if it is to accomplish its task, must have a reasonable faith in its workers. Men and women are the only workers. While we may be aware of both advantages and disadvantages, yet the path of progress seems to lie in the direction of more centralized organization, hoping to realize most of the possibilities and yet avoid many wastes and abuses mentioned. Larger organizations make possible more effective work on a more comprehensive scale yet the effectiveness of work is also conditioned to a large extent by immediate and personal touch between administration, welfare work and the source of financial support. Perhaps the happy medium may be secured when the national organization is the director, guide and inspirer of local organizations and taking care of the national aspects of the program but leaving to the local units the case work and personal contact.
The prevalent attempts to improve social welfare work manifest still another pronounced line of development. It is public social work which is fast coming into prominence. Discussion along this line considers the city, county, state and nation as units. Kansas City, Missouri, has been a pioneer in the movement largely due to the efforts of Mr. L.A. Halbert who organized in that city one of the first municipal welfare boards, Mr. Halbert in an address before the Sociology Club of the University of Kansas, and no doubt having in mind the Central West, made a strong plea for the county as a basis of public social welfare organization. "Mr. H.H. Shirer of the Ohio State Board of Charities says, "It seems to be the present tendency for the government to exercise more and more control over benevolent institutions and agencies."

Mr. C.V. Williams of the Children's Welfare Department of Columbia, Ohio, emphasizes the importance of private agencies. After granting the public control tendency, he says:
"There are many persons who are of the opinion that the care of dependent children should be assumed by the government to the exclusion of private agencies. It do not share this opinion. The machinery which has been developed by private agencies should be conserved. The state can not afford to take steps which would dry up streams of charity and benevolence which these agencies have developed. So long as the states fail adequately to provide for the feebleminded and other classes who are in great need it seems unwise to suggest a plan which would deprive the commonwealth not only of the aid to men and women who are rendering a heroic service without compensation, but also a vast sum of money readily given by the constituents of these agencies. Our private charities should be advised and directed by competent state authority but not suppressed."

In reply to the question as to whether he thought that private agencies should be abolished Mr. L.A. Halbert has answered in the negative, giving as his reason very much the same as that given by Frederic Olmey, Secretary of the Charity Organization Society of Buffalo, when he says, "Let the public do all it will and increase as fast as possible but leave for private agencies the pioneer work."

In can hardly be disputed that private agencies
will react more fittingly to new situations than will the public. Moreover the cultivation of a spirit of benevolence and sympathy as is expressed in private agency work would not have near the opportunity for such expression under an administration entirely public.

Some people object that the public social welfare work is socialism. Mr. Almy answers that tho it may seem to some as socialist, "on the other hand it may head off socialism." Perhaps we should be as much concerned about the direction which public charities are taking as the extent to which they are developed. (23)

Mr. H.H. Shirer, secretary of the Ohio State Board of Charities, ably points out that government authority should be based upon the theory of constructive helpfulness rather than destructive repression. A little further down he takes up the thread in this way, "the cry is being heard that governmental agencies are spending millions of dollars upon the care of unfortunates, but grudgingly spending pennies to find out the
causes of dependency and delinquency and thereby eventually to eradicate some of the occasions for the enormous expenditure of such care." If the public agencies are failing in this direction, they are, it seems betraying their natural prerogative. They should, above all, lead in breadth of view and forward outlook. They should be willing to be responsible for society's conscious efforts to improve herself along these lines. We expect something constructive and valuable to be gained from public welfare work if the administrators are really actuated by social motives.

On the whole we can say then that there are splendid opportunities both for the sake of the work and for the sake of financing in coordination of effort or even in loose federation. The logical end of centralization is public control which when well carried out affords possibilities of comprehensive and far-reaching improvements in the administration of welfare work. But it is also to be remembered that the spontaneity and initiative of private agencies have in the past shown themselves most adjustable to local
social needs and for the sake of spontaneous experiment they should be encouraged as well as guided.

As a further recommendation which we hope would enable these organizations better to perform their logical task in the field of social economy, we would suggest a more extensive use of both conventions and educative advertising. Social workers are truly on the firing line of social need. They, with their officers are sitting in council, determining future plans for social work. But often times these plans are very provincial or, when nationally made, the conference from which they originate contains too limited a variety of social interests. All case work and applied social effort should be a part of the nation's laboratory. The experiences undergone in these local societies should all be brought to bear in determining better standards and better methods of work. The accomplishments of the National Conference of Social Work is good. But is it not a conference that appeals mainly
to the social worker? We are asking for a conference of wider and more varied social interests. To be sure the National Conference of Social Work should play an important part in this larger conference but we feel that besides the professional social worker there should be a strong element of businessmen. There should be educators of wide influence and experience. Sociologists, journalists, doctors and no doubt many others would contribute their part to make such a conference a success. This conference should be so financed and organized as to be able to outline and direct certain lines of research in this way endeavoring to make conscious appeals and improvement more effective. Then too, such a conference would be able to organize and evaluate the experience of the many smaller agencies. How great the opportunity here offered is, may be attested by the statement made by Albert Sidney Johnstone of the South Carolina State Board of Charities, who says, "The task presented to our social agencies is little less than the remaking of the world."
Therefore we maintain that this great conference should contain and appeal to all classes of people interested in social improvement.

A further point that might be well considered within the province of the greater national conference, is that of establishing practical standards of efficiency,—standards which would meet with general acceptance. Perhaps it would not be necessary to require conformity to standards but the mere fact of their existence if the public were kept informed as to what they were, would go far toward protecting the public and stimulating efficiency in organizations that heretofore have known no check.

Besides the need for realizing the maximum amount from social welfare experience thru conventions, another and equally vital need and one that may or may not be worked with the foregoing is that of larger-scale, constructive, educative advertising and dissemination of information. The type of advertising we have had has been too much for the sake of raising funds. Oftentimes it has been rather sentimental
than soundly sociological, i.e., of the type that would build up and educate a cosmopolitan public to the full import of the social welfare situation. A few leaders in the movement know the urgent need for scientific social work. They know their financial limitations which will not allow the most scientific methods. So when they need funds they are compelled to resort to the old type of heart reaching appeal. This whole procedure falls far short of the democratic ideal and the popular understanding necessary to put social welfare work on something more than a merely experimental basis. Along this very line, R.C. Edlund, Director of Baltimore Alliance of Charitable and Social Agencies says, "Publicity is vitally essential to welfare work. . . . . . . Publicity should not merely beg for coin. It should keep people informed." Later on he continues in the same vein, "Charity organizations has not only the responsibility for caring for those needy, but it must make people aware of large numbers of such in their midst." Then he goes on to explain what he considers the
the educative value of the fullest type of publicity and closes with this epigram, "Continuous publicity is a means of democratizing social work and socializing democracy." Thus the whole point resolves itself into the simple statement that more and different advertising should be used to create a palpable social mind on the need for and methods of social welfare work. Robert E. Park, of the Department of Sociology of Chicago, says, "The measure of social efficiency is the extent to which national methods have been applied to the problem of poverty, crime, and disease." He urges that heretofore the appeal has been too much to what he calls the "finer and feeble" sentiments. The appeal, he thinks should be made plain and practical. He puts his objections to the old type of appeal in about these words: There was too much emphasis on individual need and not enough on social utility; they appealed to sentiment rather than action; its purpose was too much simply the getting of financial contribution and not enough towards securing cooperation.
All that has been said about advertising has been a plea for the kind that will socially educate the public and thereby give it a national perspective. The effect of local or regional and purely financial appeals which have been made, has been, according to Park, to render the appeal, "in general too much concerned with effects rather than causes." A local society, because of its limitations, must be content with meeting local needs and doing its bit to cure them, but a well informed and guided public with an awakened social conscience, will rise in its right and might and ask to see behind the effects to the causes, and knowing the causes will demand that those causes which make the great burden of social work necessary, be removed. Intelligent use of the press will serve that end.

NOTES.

2. Ibid., 1918, p. 626.
5. Ibid., 1916, p. 302.
10. Ibid., 1918, p. 626.
17. Ibid., July 1916, p. 6-8.
20. In address before Sociology Club, University of Kansas.
22. Ibid., 1916, p. 306.

###
CHAPTER V.

CONCLUSION.

In this study we set out to ascertain the value of voluntary social welfare organizations in the field of social economy. In the four preceding chapters we have endeavored to determine thru the survey and by gleanings from the writings of experienced social workers, the services rendered and possibilities for service by these agencies. In the first chapter we explained our study in which we made a rather superficial survey of the field in which national agencies operate. The most obvious need revealed in this chapter was that before these organizations can be understood a thorough and exhaustive study should be made of the organizations other than national which are doing social work in the United States or any given community.
In the second chapter we showed what we hoped to accomplish by the questionnaire and in a general way how complicated is the tangle of agencies which we are studying and further how difficult it is to introduce system into such a complexity.

Chapter three containing the results of the questionnaire in summary, illustrated in detail the complexity implied in the second chapter. The conclusion here reached is that various groups of these national voluntary organizations should be studied minutely, if their worth to society is ever to be determined with any degree of accuracy. The fourth chapter contains some suggestions which, if followed out we think would improve greatly the service rendered by our national welfare organizations. We have sought to protect the public from the evils arising from these organizations and yet preserve to it all the benefits that may be derived from their endeavor and experience. The purpose of the registry was protective. The discussion and
suggestions made along the line of centralization and coordination, was an attempt to guide spontaneous effort in systematizing social work in groups of similar purposes. The logical end we concluded of the fullest centralization of control is public social welfare work. The first part of this phase goes no farther than to venture to point out that the problem is to find some way of bringing about spontaneous coordination and standardization. When public welfare work is resorted to, then the problem to retain the initiative and originality characteristic of private agencies.

We believe that these social organizations should be able to contribute more in the way of suggestions to society and that thru a greater convention of all social interests, each of our national organizations would be better able to see the part it should play in the whole social program.

Better methods of advertising should render the work not only of national organizations but also for all agencies much more valuable to society. In these latter suggestions, national
agencies, while not the only ones to whom the remarks are made applicable, are the ones whose efficiency we are at present interested in seeing increased.

On the whole we do not consider that we have solved the problem but rather we hope we have more clearly defined some of the important elements of the problem and thus perhaps added just a little bit toward the clarification of the complex and confusing issues that constantly challenge the attention of thinking men.
APPEIXDIX A.
LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS.

In the following list are included the names of the national organizations or those supposed to be national, which have been collected in this study. Those to whom questionnaires have been sent are marked with a # and those from whom satisfactory answers have been received are marked ©.

Our of the two hundred fifty questionnaires sent perhaps ten percent came back indicating that the addresses used were wrong. Answers have been received from about five percent stating that they are not national.

The names of the organizations are given under the classification headings employed in the study.
Conservative.

American Bison Society.
American Folk-lore Society.
© # American Forestry Association, The
American Game Protective and Propagation
Association.

# American Life Saving Society.
American Museum of Safety.
American Museum of Natural History.
American Numismatic Society.
© # American Reclamation Federation
American Science and Historic Preservation
Society.
Association for the Protection of the Adirondacks.
Battalion des gardes Lafayette.
Faneuil Improvement Association.

# Friends of our Native Landscape.
Fulton, Robert, Monument Association.
Fulton, Robert, National Water Gate Association.
George Washington Memorial Association.
Grant Monument Association.
National Conservation Association.
National Geological Society.
National McKinley Birthplace Association.
National Historical Society.
National Plant, Flower and Fruit Guild.
© # National Reclamation Association.
Naval Historical Society.
Stamp Saving Society.
Thomas Paine, National Historical Society.
U.S. Historical Society.
Washington's Headquarters Association
Watt, James, Association.

Education.

American Educational Alliance.
# American Schools Association.
© # American School Citizenship League.
© # Association for Improved Instruction of
Deaf Mutes.
© # Emile Pedagogical Society.
© # National Council of Education.
# National Kindergarten Association.
# National Society for Promotion of Industrial Education.
# National Vocational, Art, and Industrial Federation.
Public Education Association.
# Workingmen's Educational Association.

Races and Peoples.

Albanian.

# Albanian Relief Fund.

Armenian.

Armenian Benevolent Union.

# Armenian Colonial Association.
Armenian Medical Relief Association.
# American Armenian Relief Fund.

Australian.

# Australian Society of America.

Belgian.

# Committee for Relief in Belgium.

British.

British American War Relief Fund.

# Bohemian Bohemian.

# Bohemian National Cemetery Association.
# Bohemian National Alliance.

Chinese.

# Chinese Christian Association.
# Chinese Empire Reform
# Lin Chin Association.
French

@ # Federation de L'Association Francaise.
# French Benevolent Society
French Canadian Democratic Association.
@ # French Christian Women's Association.
Huguenot Society of America.

Greek

# Greek League.
# Pan-Hellenic Union in America.
# Y.M. Greek Association.

Hebrew.

@ # American Jewish Historical Society.
# Council of Jewish Communal Instruction.
@ # Council of Jewish Women
@ # Council of Y.M. and Kindred Associations.
# Federation for Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies.
# Federation of Galacian and Bukovian Jews.
Federation of Jewish Farmers.
# Federation of Roumanian Jews in America.
@ # Federation of Russian Polish Hebrews.
# Hebrew Association for the Blind.
# Hebrew Hessianic Council
# Immigrant Aid Council of Jewish Women.
# Jewish Big Brother Association
@ # Jewish National Fund Bureau.
# Jewish National Workers' Alliance.
# National Hebrew School Association.
Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America and Canada.
# United Hebrews of America.
@ # Young Men's Hebrew Association.
@ # Zion's Commonwealth.
@ # Zionist Organization of America.

Holland.

Holland Society
@ # Netherland Benevolent Society.
Indian.

@ # American Indian League.
@ # Indian Industries League.
@ # Indian Rights Association.
Improved Order of Red Men.
# Marquette League for Indian Welfare.
@ # National Indian Association.

Irish.

Friends of Irish Freedom.
# Gaelic League of Ireland.
Irish Industrial League.
# United Irish League of America.

Italian.

# Federation for Assistance of Italian Emigrants.
Society for Italian Immigration.

Japanese.

Japan Association.

Korean.

# Korean National Association of North America.

Lithuanian.

Lithuanian Alliance.

Negroes.

# American Church Institute for Negroes.
Home and Foreign Department of African Methodist Episcopal Church.
# Interstate Old Folks Home for Aged and Infirm Colored People.
@ # National Association for Advancement of Colored People.
# National Association for Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children.
# National Colored Peoples' Cooperative Beneficial Union.
# National League on Urban Conditions among Negroes.
# Tuskegee Institute.

Russian-Slav.

# American Friends of Russian Prisoners.
# Russian-American Relief Association.
# Russian Immigration Association.

Slavonic Immigration Society.

Scandinavian.

# American Scandinavian Foundation.
# Scandinavian Home Association.

Swedish Aid Society.

# Swedish Historical Society.
# Swedish Mission Friends' Aid Association.

Serbian.

# Serbian American League.
# Serbian Child-Welfare League.
# Serbian National Defense League.
# Serbian Relief Committee.

Spanish.

# Hispanic Society of America, Museum and Library.
Spanish-American Benevolent Society.

Swiss.

Swiss Benevolent Society.
# United Swiss Societies.

General.

# Committee for Immigration in America.
# Naturalization Aid League.
# National Liberal Immigration League.
# National Committee on Constructive Immigration Legislation.
# American Luther Board of Relief in Europe.
# German American School Association.
# International Society of Orient and Occident.
League for Oppressed Peoples.
Luther Immigration Society.
@ # National Allied Relief Committee.
@ # National War Relief Committee.
© # North American Civic League for Immigration.
# Teutonic War Relief Committee.

Governmental Affairs.

All American Alliance.
American Academy of Political Science.
@ # American Association for International Conciliation.
# American Civic Association.
# American Colonization Society.
@ # American Defense Society.
# American Free Trade League.
American Flag Circle Around the World.
# American Home Industry League.
# American Peace and Arbitration League.
# American Peace Society.
@ # American Political Science Association.
@ # American Proportional Representation League.
# American Protective Tariff League.
© # American Rights League.
# American Society of Patriots.
@ # American Union against Militarism Anti-Imperialist League.
# Conference Committee on National Preparedness.
# Civil Service Reform Association.
# Federal Suffrage Association of the United States.
# Good Government Association.
# Immigration Restriction League.
Intercollegiate Socialist Society.
# League for National Unity.
@ # League to Enforce Peace.
Legion of Peace.
© # National Association for Constitutional government.
National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico, The
© # National Court, Guardians of Liberty.
© # National Popular Government League.
@ # National Security League.
# National Urban League.
© # Pan-American Society of United States.
Pan-American Union.
@ # Public Ownership League of America.
# Short Ballot Organization.
# Tariff Commission League.
Union for a Progressive Constitution.
© # Universal Military Training League.
# Womans National Peace Party.
@ # World's Court League.
@ # World Peace Association.

Learned--Professional:

Actuarial Society of America.
American Copyright League.
American Geographical Society.
American Historical Society.
American Mathematical Society.
American Ornithologists Union.
American Philosophical Society.
Associated Authors and Compilers.
Calendrical and Chronological Association.
Congress of Forums, The
National Geographic Society.
National Historical Society.
School for Social Woikers.
Theosophical Society.
White Rats' Actors Union of America.

Learned--Scientific.

A
Academy of Natural Sciences.
American Association for Advance of Science.
American Chemical Society.
American Entomological Society.
American Ethnological Society.
American Institute of Architects.
American Institute of Phrenology.
American Metric Association.
American Oxygen Association.
American Pharmaceutical Association.
American Society for Psychical Research.
American Social Science Association.
Egyptian Research Account Society.
International Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters.
Mining and Metallurgical Society of America.
National Academy of Sciences.
National Agricultural Society.
National Association of Audubon Societies.
National Association of Commissioners of Agriculture.
National Geographic Society.

Learned—Cultural.

American Academy of Arts and Letters.
American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
American Art Society.
American Federation of Arts.
American Federation of Musicians.
American Fine Arts Society.
American Society for Composers, Authors, and Publishers.
American Water Color Society.
Art Alliance of America.
Authors' League of America.
Drama League of America.
Fashion Art League of America.
Fine Arts Federation, L
League of American Pen-Women.
Music League of America.
National Academy of Design.
National Gallery of Art.
National Society of Craftsmen.
National Society of Mural Painters.
National Society of Music.
Society of American Artists.
Society of Arts and Crafts.
Society of Arts of the Institute of Technology.
Society of American Dramatists and Composers.
Learned—Institutes and Foundations.

American Civic Institute.
American Institute of Actuaries.
American Institute of Child Life.
American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology.
American Institute of Homeopathy.
American Institute of Scientific Research.
American Institute of Social Service.
American Scandinavian Foundation.
Archeological Institute of America.
Carnegie Corporation.
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
Carnegie Institute of Washington.
Christian Unity Foundation.
Egyptian Exploration Fund.
Emerson Institute for Boys and Young Men.
Gordon Bible Institute.
Independent Police Endowment Association.
Industrial Training Benevolent League.
Institute for Public Service.
International Institute for Young Women.
Ladies' Physiological Institute.
Life Extension Institute.
Lowell Institute.
National Institute of Arts and Letters.
National Institute of Efficiency.
National Institute of Social Sciences.
National Radium Institute.
Race Betterment Foundation.
Red Cross Institute for Crippled and Disabled Men.
Rockefeller Foundations.
Russell Sage Foundation.
Smithsonian Institute.
Wells Memorial Institute.
World Peace Foundation.
Medical and Hygienical.

American Academy of Medicine.
# American Association of Hospital Workers.
# American Child Hygiene Association.
# American Laryngological Association.
# American Medical Association.
# American Medic-Pharmaceutical League.
# American Osteopathic Association.
# American Public Health Association.
# American Social Hygiene Association.
# American Society for Medical Sociology.
# American Urological Association
Association for Prevention and Relief of
Heart Disease.
Association of Government Surgeons.
Association of Tuberculosis Clinics.
# Childrens' National Tuberculosis Association.
# Committee for the Reduction of Infant Mortality.
Dental Aid Society.
# Health Education League.
  International Alliance of Physicians and Surgeons.
# National Association for Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis.
# National Camp and Health League.
# National Committee for Mental Hygiene.
# National Committee for Prevention of Blindness.
# National Mid-Wives Association.
# Neurological Society.
# Nutrition Clinic for Delicate Children.
# Society for Advancement of Chinese Study.
Society for Expert Biology and Medicine.
# Society for Medical Jurisprudence.
  Society for Instruction in First Aid to the Injured.
Society for Protection to Physicians.
# Society for Serology and Hematology.
# Vivisection Investigation League.
Recreational.

# Amateur Athletic Union.
# American Open Air School Association.
# American Sunshine Association.
# Community Drama Association.
# International Sunshine Society.
Playground and Recreational Association of America.
Vacation Association.

Religious—non-sectarian.

American Bible Society.
American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.
American Church Mission Society.
American Institute of Christian Philosophy.
American Mil lenial Association.
American Missions Association.
American Protestant and Library Association.
American Section of Theosophical Society.
American Tract Society.
Association for Promoting the Interests of Church, schools, colleges and seminaries.
Bible League of North America.
Board of Mission Preparation.
Chaplains' Aid Association.
Christian Association for the Advancement of the Interest of Labor.
Christian Missionary Alliance.
Christian News Association.
Christian Peace Union.
Christian Pension Fund.
Christian Temperance Society.
Christian Workers Library Association.
Clergyman's Retiring Fund Society.
Daily Vacation Bible School Association.
Free Religious Association of America.
Gospel Committee for Work among War Prisoners.
International Bible Student's Association.
International Medical Missionary Society.
International Sunday School Association.
International Union of Gospel Missions.
Laymen's Missionary Movement.
Lord's Day Alliance of the United States.
Missionary Education Movement of United States and Canada.
National Alliance of Unitarian and other Liberal Christian Women.
National Christian League for the Promotion of Purity.
National Gospel Workers' Aid Society.
National Interchurch Temperance Federation.
New York Bible Society.
Pastoral Aid Society.
Religious Education Association.
Salvation Army in the United States.
Seaman's Christian Association.
Society for Providing Evangelical Literature for the Blind.
Society for Promoting Theological Education.
Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions.
Sunday Kindergarten Associations.
Theosophical Society.
United Society of Christian Endeavor.
United States Soldiers' Christian Aid Association.
United Sunday School Society.
Women's Auxiliary of the Christian Temperance Society.
Women's Christian Temperance Union.
Women's National Sabbath Alliance.
World's Student Christian Federation.
World's Sunday School Association.
Young Men's Christian Association.
Young Women's Christian Association.

Social Welfare—Relief and Aid.

Agency for Assisting and Providing Situations in the Country for Destitute Mothers with Infants.
# American Association to Promote Teaching Speech to the Deaf.
American Girls Aid
# American Invalid Aid Society.
American Red Cross, The
American Relief Administration, The
# American Relief Society.
American Theater Protective Association.
Associated Charities.
# Association for Relief of Respectable
Aged and Indigent Females.
# Artists Aid Society.
# Christian Aid Association.
# Children of America's Fund.
# Federation of Associations for Cripples.
Florence Crittenden League of Compassion.
# Friendship House Association.
# Funeral Benefit Association of United States.
# Mayo-Men's Protective and Benevolent Asso-
ciation.
# National Fraternal Society for the Deaf.
# National Library for the Blind.
# National Special Aid Society.
# National White Cross League.
# Servants of Relief for Incurable Cancer.
Volunteer Children's Home.
Woman's Charity Society.
# Woman's National Relief Association.
# Xavier Free Public Society for the Blind.

Social Welfare--Protective, Preventive.

Alliance against Accident Fraud.
# American Anti-Boycott Association.
# American Anti-Vivisection Society.
# American Female Guardian Society and Home
for the Friendless.
#.American Society for Prevention of Cruelty
to Animals.
# American Waldensian Aid Society.
# Anti-Capital Punishment Society.
# Anti-Saloon League of America.
# Anti-Vaccination League.
# Association for Befriending Children and
Young Girls.
# Association to Prevent Corrupt Practices
at Elections.
Girls Friendly Society in America.
Girl's National Honor Guard.
Goddard Anti-Policy Society.
Guardians of Liberty.
Intercollegiate Prohibition Association.
Junior American Guard.
Legal Protective Federation.
National Anti-Cigarette League.
National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.
National Highways Protective Society.
National Protective Legion.
National Temperance Legislative Bureau.
National Temperance Society and Publishing House.
Non-Smokers Protective League of America.
Prohibition National Executive Committee.
Scientific Temperance Federation.
United Temperance Society.
West Indian Protective Society.
Woman's Christian Temperance Union.
Women's Temperance Building Association.


American Association for Agricultural Legislation.
American Association for Organizing Charity.
American Fair Trade League.
American Flag Association.
American Genetic Association.
American Geneva Society.
American Home-Craft Society.
American Humane Education Society.
American Liberty and Property Association.
American Peace Centenary Committees
American Posture League.
American Secular Union and Free Thought.
American Social Hygiene Association.
American Society for Thrift.
Beneficial Pledge Society.
Benevolent Society of the United States for Propagation of Cremations.
Big Brother Movement.
Big Sister Movement.
Boy Scouts of America, The.
Brotherhood Welfare Association.
# Character Development League.
# College Equal Suffrage League.
Colonial Society of America.
# Cooperative League of America.
Equal Franchise Society.
# Equal Suffrage Publicity Corporation.
# Farmer's National Congress of United States of America.
# Golden Rule Alliance of America.
# Honest Ballot Association.
# Intercollegiate Socialist Society.
# International Christina Police Association.
International Congress on Social Insurance.
# International Peace Society.
# International Reform Bureau.
Jeffersonian Alliance.
# Municipal Government Association.
# National American Woman Suffrage Association.
# National Benefit Association.
# National Civic Federation.
# National Committee on Prisons.
# National Committee on Prisons and Prison Labor.
# National Conference of Social Work.
# National Congress of Mothers and Parent Teachers Associations.
# National Consumer's League.
# National Cooperation Association of America.
National Desertion Bureau.
# National Federation of Settlements.
# National Highways Association.
M National Lend-a-Hand Society.
National Marine League of United States.
# National New Thought Center.
# National Social Workers Exchange.
# National Voters' League.
Navy League of United States.
Postal Progress League.
Postal Reform League.
Race-Betterment League
Simplified Spelling Board.
Soldiers' Pipe Fund.
Southern Sociological Congress.
Survey Associates.
Technical Publicity Association.
Tide Over League.
United Societies for Local Self-Government.
United States Trade-mark Association.
Voluntary Parent-hood League.
Volunteers of America.
War Camp Community Service.
Woman Suffrage Party.
World's Purity Federation.

Woman's Organizations.

American Women's League for Self-Defense.
American Woman's Republic.
Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage.
Little Wanderer's Association of America.
National Child Labor Committee.
National Congress of Mothers.
National House-wives League.
National League for Women's Service.
National League for Women Workers.
National Training School for Girls.
National Women's Trade Union League.
Professional Woman's League.
Woman's Homestead Association.
Woman's Seaman's Friends' Society.
Women's Health Protective Association.
Working Women's Protective Union.
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