

oped without dealing specifically with such a case. He urges that four elements should be present to sustain the privilege:

"(1) The communications must originate in a *confidence* that they will not be disclosed; (2) This element of *confidentiality must be essential* to the full and satisfactory maintenance of the relation between the parties; (3) The *relation* must be one which in the opinion of the community ought to be sedulously *fostered*, and (4) the *injury* that would inure to the relation by the disclosure of the communications must be *greater than the benefit thereby gained* for the correct disposal of litigation." (Adopted in *O'Toole vs. Ohio G. F. Ins. Co.* 159 Michigan 187; this case was just cited with approval by the United States Supreme Court in *Wolfe vs. U. S.* 78 U. S. S. C., L. ed. Advance Opinions 342, Wigmore's Conditions were adopted in 40 Cyclopaedia of Law and Procedure 2353, and by various courts from there, as shown by the supplements.)

The third and fourth elements show that our law develops in this respect, as the importance of social service workers to society becomes more generally recognized. Similarly, the statutory prohibition against the disclosure of privileged communications between lawyer and client has been become enlarged, generally without any express statutory enlargement, so as to include (1) statements made to a lawyer *before* his retainer, with a view to retaining him, and also (2) to or in the presence of assistants of a lawyer, such as his clerks, interpreters, experts he retains, etc.

As to the social worker, in the early case of *People vs. Monroe* 40 N. Y. Miscellaneous Reports 286; 81 N. Y. Suppl. 972, Judge Leventritt pointed out in 1903 that the term "social settlement" or "social worker" had "not yet found its way into the dictionaries, nor do the legislative records and debates furnish a guide to the meaning intended." However, the terms required judicial construction, as the N. Y. Legislature in an amendment adopted in 1902 to our tax laws, granted an exemption from taxation to "any social settlement, whether incorporated or unincorporated, which shall own or lease for a term not less than three years a building or buildings devoted exclusively to the purposes of such *social settlement*, now existing, or hereafter established in the City of New York. Thanks to the services of such eminent social workers as Jane Addams, Lillian D. Wald, Sophonisba P. Breckenridge, Edith Bremer, Frances Perkins, Grace and Edith Abbott, Joseph P. Chamberlain, Read Lewis, Belle Moskowitz, Judge Julian W. Mack, Judge Lindsey, Lee K. Frankel, Homer Folks, William Hodson and Solomon Lowenstein, the people of this and other States and their legislatures have recognized in a developing extent, the scope and value of the work of the social workers and their services to the State and the law, and the value and importance of recognizing the importance of making communications to them confidential

and privileged, in the interest of society and law enforcement itself. Particularly significant in this connection is the Law's recognition of the parole officer and the juvenile court worker.

Today we are therefore no longer in the position we were in when Judge Leventritt wrote, of not even finding these terms defined in the dictionary, but we have a long article on "Social Work" in the 14th Edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica by Percy Alden, Chairman, British Institute of Social Service and William Hodson, Executive Director of the Welfare Council, President, American Association of Social Workers and now Commissioner of Charities, N. Y., and we have long articles by distinguished authorities with extensive bibliographies, in the "Social Work Year Book"—I cite the edition of 1929—on such subject as "Catholic Social Work," "Jewish Social Work," "Protestant Social Work," "Child Welfare Activities of the Federal Government," "Conference of Social Work," "Domestic Relations Court," "Juvenile Courts and Probation," "Legal Aid," "Immigrants and Foreign Communities," "Naturalization" cross-referred to the preceding article, "Social Settlements," "Social Work as a Profession," "Social Work Under State Governments," "Social Welfare," cross-referred to "Public Welfare—State Agencies," "Family Welfare Societies," etc.

I have even found two able articles in recent periodicals on the relation of Social Work to the Law, quoting high judicial authorities among others, one entitled "Contribution of Social Work to the Law" by Isaac Pacht in 2 Brooklyn Law Review 180-8, and one entitled "Relationship Between Law and Social Work" by Mrs. W. T. Best in "North Carolina Bar Associations Reports" for 1932, pp. 148-161, especially at p. 154.

Coming down even more closely to this very branch of the service, we find a relevant recommendation in the Report of the Ellis Island Committee recently appointed by Secretary Perkins, and including such representative members of our N. Y. Bar as Judge Thomas D. Thatcher, lately Solicitor General of the United States, Prof. Joseph P. Chamberlain, George W. Alger, Frederic R. Coudert, George G. Ernst, Hon. James W. Gerard, Read Lewis, Hon. Morgan J. O'Brien (and may I add my own name) in favor of establishing even among government immigration officials a "Division of Information and Immigrant Aid" (pp. 41-7; compare 21, 113-116).

In this connection, the committee recommended at p. 116: "One of the problems which must be faced when the Government undertakes to establish or maintain such centers or bureaus is a conflict of responsibilities in the cases of aliens who voluntarily come to it for information or assistance and who reveal facts that indicate they are liable to deportation or punishment under the law. On the one hand the Immigration and Naturalization Service is charged with enforce-

ing the immigration and deportation laws. On the other it may, in inviting the confidence of the alien, be considered to have assumed some of the obligations pertaining to the relationship of attorney and client. It is obvious that if this confidence is not respected, immigrants and foreign born will fear to come to the Bureaus and the latter will not accomplish the purposes for which they were established. The solution of the problem most likely to serve the best interests of the country must be left to the good sense of the Department of Labor. A regulation making communications to the proposed Bureau of Information and Immigrant Aid privileged, could be drawn, it is believed, following the precedent of the Internal Revenue regulation sustained in *Boske vs. Comingore*, 177 U. S. 459."

Progress and Problems in Social Work Education During the Depression*

By MAURICE J. KARP

Director, The Graduate School for Jewish Social Work, New York

THE depression years brought to social work its greatest opportunity and its greatest challenge. Quantitatively social work has developed to an enormous extent. Municipal, state, and federal programs of relief and reconstruction have been undertaken on an unprecedented scale. Social workers have been called upon by municipal, state and federal governments to head activities and programs which formerly would have been turned over exclusively to politicians or at best "big business men." The press and governmental officials have paid tribute to social work and social workers as never before. Statements have been made to the effect that whereas the other groups in public life, such as industrialist, bankers, economists, statisticians, social and political scientists, and governmental officials had no program and were unequal to the tasks and problems which the depression brought, social work and social workers knew what they were about, knew what they wanted, and how to get it. Social work received an amount of recognition in the last four years which no like period in the past brought to it.

But this recognition was not an unmixed blessing. The huge tasks and relief burdens which social work was called upon to deal with during the last three or four years almost wrecked whatever standards social work, and particularly case work, had developed. The enormous expansion of public relief programs required a personnel which social

This clearly shows that the arrangement we advocate is proper ethically and for purposes of policy and utility.

While, as to Government officers as above indicated, the special regulation may be necessary to render communication obtained by the Welfare Division of the Government service itself confidential and immune, such information is *ipso facto* as above shown to be confidential as concerns the social workers. In order to avoid misunderstanding, however, and to prevent danger of such social workers being called upon to testify in court, a regulation covering both Government officers and the social workers along the lines of the one involved in *Boske vs. Comingore* 177 U. S. 459 ought to be adopted.

work did not have. Untrained and inexperienced people were engaged to carry on social work activities, with the consequent danger of social work being blamed for the inadequate work which these neophytes were doing. Private social agencies contracted their own activities and were forced to abandon some of the most hopeful and promising aspects of their work. While they loaned some of their experienced and trained personnel to the public agencies, it was not always the best people who were released. Some of them unloaded the weakest members of their staffs on the public agencies. The lack of an adequately trained personnel, the huge numbers that required attention, and the absence of clearly defined programs and standards in public agencies threatened to undermine the standards that had been developed.

The danger would not have been so great if social workers and others responsible for the policies in public and private agencies had clearly recognized the difference between emergency work, such as the various municipal relief bureaus and some private agencies were obliged to do, and the kind of case work which had developed during the last decade or two. Unfortunately, social workers of reputation and standing seemed to make a virtue of the necessity and argued that a new era had dawned on social work requiring new

*Presidential Report to the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Schools of Social Work, December 29, 1933.

approaches, new procedures, and the abandonment of the old concepts and standards. Mass work was urged instead of case work. Individual case loads mounting in the hundreds were almost the rule. Young people who had equipped themselves through education and training for a high type of social work were thrust into these impossible situations. They were required to carry or supervise huge case loads, with no hope of doing the type of work in which they were interested and for which they had prepared themselves. Applicants for relief were placed on staffs of municipal relief agencies and frequently worked side by side with trained people, giving the impression in the community that they were doing social work, or case work. Social work thus came to suffer from a discouragement on the part of its trained people, from a disrespect on the part of the aides and emergency relief workers, and from reduced status and confidence in the eyes of the public.

This is still the situation by and large. The pressures have by no means decreased. Although efforts are being made here and there to develop something akin to standards for personnel and service, no very great progress has thus far been made. The absence of well formulated and universally recognized standards of education or experience for social workers, such as might be embodied in a system of state licensing of social workers, makes matters worse. Even the requirements for admission of the American Association of Social Workers, effective in July, 1933 and decided upon before the depression, were questioned. Schools of social work were urged to give short courses for emergency workers. Little or no provision was made for differentiating between the well qualified, equipped social worker and the one who was successful in securing a position as an emergency worker, and conceived of himself or herself as a social worker.

In view of all this it may be of interest and value to review the activities of the American Association of Schools of Social Work during the last two years, since it has stood almost alone in the insistence upon constantly advancing standards. Such a review should be helpful also in viewing the present status of education for social work as represented by the schools and in indicating the steps necessary to solidify the gains made and to plan for further progress.

One of the most important achievements of the Association since its organization, a decade and a half ago, is the minimum curriculum for the first year of graduate study adopted in June of 1933. It would be difficult to over-estimate or over-emphasize its importance. When it is borne in mind that in 1930 the schools of social work, then members of the Association of Schools, had only one course

in common,** this step takes on something like its real meaning. The curriculum, though naming prescribed courses thus insuring a common body of knowledge and training among school graduates, nevertheless provides sufficient latitude and flexibility to enable individual schools to stress those elements in social work education in which they are particularly interested. It makes possible a desirable amount of standardization but allows for experimentation on the part of the individual schools.

Thus far the curriculum merely names a number of courses which must be included. There is as yet no general agreement on their content. The appointment of a number of committees, made up of faculty members of member schools, to work out the content of the courses called for in the curriculum, will go a long way toward developing this content, as well as to provide material for discussion of what the desirable content of a curriculum in social work should be. The work of these committees incidentally proved to be an unexcelled opportunity for common thinking and interchange of ideas and experience on the part of the faculties of the member schools.

One by-product of the minimum curriculum has been that the old conflict in the Association between graduate and under-graduate schools has ceased. By adopting the curriculum for the first year of graduate work the Association has gone on record as sponsoring graduate training for social work. It has also made clear that a single year of graduate training does not constitute adequate professional equipment, for it was explicitly stated that this curriculum provides information only and no skills. This is further indicated by the certificate which schools adopting this curriculum will be able to give their students who will complete it. This is a *provisional certificate*, implying that a student who has completed this curriculum has not completed his education for social work but has secured only a minimum of information which everyone should have for the practice of social work. It means, incidentally, that the Association also disapproves of granting the Master's degree after one year's graduate study. In fact schools which were admitted during the last two years were required to specify a two-year requirement for this degree. Similarly, this curriculum also establishes the relation between academic and field work. It clearly specifies that no less than 25% and no more than 33 1/3% of the credit during the first year should be devoted to field work. Some of the schools will be forced to revise their programs for there are a few schools which give less than the required minimum of field work and there are others in which between 50% and 80% of the student's time is devoted to field work. This curriculum is a sort of "New Deal" in social work education. It may be hoped that as a result of this curriculum, which is to go into effect in the Fall of 1935, and as a result of the work which the

**See Table XIX and pp. 328-330, "The Scientific Basis of Social Work," by M. J. Karpf, Columbia University Press, N. Y., 1931.

MINIMUM CURRICULUM AS ADOPTED AT THE DECEMBER, 1932 MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK

with the Accompanying Statement:

That a School offering this curriculum shall be permitted to grant a provisional certificate approved by the American Association of Schools of Social Work to any student who at the end of one graduate year of study, shall have completed this curriculum.

		Semester Hours	Quarter Hours
GROUP A (all required)	Case Work	2 or 3	3 or 4
	Medical Information	2 or 3	3 or 4
	Psychiatric Information	2 or 3	3 or 4
		Not less than 6 nor more than 9	Not less than 9 nor more than 12
GROUP B (2 courses required)	Community Organization	1, 2, or 3	2, 3, or 4
	Specialized Case Work	1, 2, or 3	2, 3, or 4
	Group Work	1, 2, or 3	2, 3, or 4
		Not less than 4 nor more than 6	Not less than 6 nor more than 9
GROUP C (2 courses required)	Field of Social Work	2 or 3	2, 3 or 4
	Public Welfare Administration	2 or 3	2, 3 or 4
	Child Welfare	2 or 3	2, 3 or 4
	Problems of Labor or Industry	Not less than 4 nor more than 6	Not less than 6 nor more than 9
GROUP D (1 course required)	Social Statistics	2 or 3	3 or 4
	Social Research	2 or 3	3 or 4
	Social Legislation	2 or 3	3 or 4
	Legal Aspects of Social Work or Social Aspects of Law	2 or 3	3 or 4
		TOTAL 20 or 22	TOTAL 30

In this group two courses may be substituted giving in combined credit no more than the credit allowed for one course

FIELD WORK

Not more than ten semester or fifteen quarter credits of Field Work

NOTE: There should be not less than one semester credit or two quarter credits in any course.

committees on content are doing on the individual courses, social work education will enter upon a new era.

The minimum curriculum has enabled the Association to tighten up on its admission requirements for new schools. It gave the Executive Committee a basis for judging the curricula of applicant schools and provided criteria and guides for schools organizing social work curricula. While the admission requirements of the Association are still much too low they are much higher than they were in the past. It is interesting to note in this connection that with the exception of two schools which failed to meet the requirements and were therefore not admitted, all applicants for membership

welcomed the new requirements because they enabled them to secure conditions and backing from their administrative officers which would have been impossible without these requirements.

One of the requirements which will no doubt do a great deal to clarify the situation and to strengthen educational curricula for social work, is that a school of social work be a separate administrative unit. A good many schools are located in departments of social science, more especially sociology. There is no clear separation between faculties and courses. The result is that a good deal of poor sociology goes for social work and inadequate social work courses are

given as sociology. The lack of differentiation between students and faculties in the different departments meant that the Association frequently could not know which of its member schools had active social work departments. An administrative separation between sociology and social work cannot but serve the best interests of both fields. Indeed there is already some evidence that this is the case. This does not mean, of course, that there should not continue to be the same give and take between the two fields as heretofore. Each field has something to offer the other. But they should be freed from a limiting and handicapping administrative relationship.

The Association has developed during the last two years a very much needed service in connection with the admission requirements for new schools—that of visits to schools applying for admission. These visits, usually made by members of the Executive Committee who are in constant touch with the requirements of the Association, are of great value to the schools as well as to the Association. The Association is thus enabled to provide expert guidance to new schools at a time when such guidance and advice are of the greatest value. In addition, the Association receives intimate pictures and first-hand reports of the conditions, standards and work of the applicant schools. This service will have to be developed and will ultimately require, as indeed it already requires, a full time secretary. With a small executive committee, with a large number of applicant schools, and with the possibility of visits to member schools, if the contemplated program of development is undertaken, the burden will be much beyond the capacity of the executive committee. From personal experience and from comments received from a number of schools which have been visited, it may be safely said that schools welcome such visits and feel that they get a great deal from them. That such visits are of the utmost importance to the Association is, of course, obvious.

The enrollment reports required from member schools have also been developed. As a result, the Association is in a position to know for the first time what individual schools are doing in training social workers. For the first time also accurate knowledge is available of the number of full and part time students enrolled in the schools, the number majoring in social work, the number of graduate and undergraduate students, the number of graduates, etc. It was largely as a result of this information that the Association was enabled to inquire into the activity of two member schools which had so far reduced their programs of training for social work as to raise the question of their eligibility to membership in the Association. These schools ultimately withdrew from the Association. While at first there was some unwillingness on the part of a few schools to submit this information, a statement by the Executive Committee

that failure to send in the reports would be considered evidence of inactivity on the part of the individual school, promptly brought the delinquent reports. These reports now contain but a minimum of the information the Association should have, but they are a desirable beginning. They should be kept up and further developed. The Association needs information of this kind if it is to judge the work of its member schools.

One of the gratifying decisions of the Association last year was that of doubling the membership dues. The fact that this action was taken during the depression, when most schools were operating on reduced budgets, was especially heartening. It not only encouraged the Executive Committee but it made a most favorable impression on outsiders. The willingness of the schools to tax themselves heavily in order to enable the Association to carry on the essential administrative work was an indication that they take their Association seriously and are prepared to stand by it. This action was an important aid in securing a second grant from the Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation, which made possible the traveling expenses for the various committees on content, so important in connection with the new curriculum. The dues, though insufficient for the present program, will suffice, nevertheless, for the essential administrative work that must be carried on all the time.

In a review such as this, which must necessarily be brief, only the most important items of progress can be mentioned. Numerous changes of lesser significance must be omitted. It seems desirable, however, to enumerate some of the more important problems which the Association faces at present and the next steps which must be taken for continued development.

Reference was already made to the value of the work of the committees on the content of the courses included in the curriculum. Although everyone recognizes that their findings and recommendations must necessarily be tentative and that sufficient freedom and latitude must be provided lest the Association stifle progress, it is clear that the reports of these committees, when finally adopted by the Association, will represent the first concrete evidence of common thinking of the majority if not all the approved institutions engaged in education for social work. These committees also provide opportunities for participation in the work of the Association by the faculties of the member schools. Every school in the Association is represented on one or more committees. Naturally the larger schools, with larger faculties, have wider representation, but all schools have a share in the thinking of what social work education should consist of.

The work of these committees must be facilitated, funds must be secured to make possible as many and as frequent meetings as are necessary. These committees have a con-

tribution to make not only to the Association but to every school within it.

A matter to which the Association will have to give consideration in the very near future is that of a pre-professional curriculum. At various points in the considerations of the minimum curriculum this question was raised. It was frankly evaded because of the great divergence of opinion among the member schools regarding the need and kind of pre-professional education for social work. Nevertheless it is basic to a professional curriculum and must eventually be faced.

The experience of the Association with the minimum curriculum should be a valuable guide and precedent for attacking this problem. It may require even greater patience, tact and tolerance for differing points of view than the minimum curriculum required. It may be necessary to devise a pre-professional sequence which will give the same kind of latitude as does the minimum curriculum, but it is a problem to which the Association must begin to give thought and attention in the very near future. In a sense the effectiveness and value of the minimum curriculum itself depend upon sound pre-professional training and requirements.

Of equal importance is the matter of a curriculum for the second year of graduate professional education. Such a curriculum is implied in the present standards of the Association. The Executive Committee has been faced from time to time with the need of advising applicant schools with respect to a second year curriculum. The fact that the Association has frankly announced that the first year curriculum is intended to give information only and no skills clearly indicates that a second year of professional training is implied and required. A second year curriculum will, no doubt, be based on a differentiation between the functional fields in social work. Here again is a problem to which the Association must direct its energies as soon as possible.

Another problem before the Association is the strengthening and tightening of its admission requirements. There are a number of items in the present requirements which need clarification and elucidation. Some are much too low for a professional association to sanction. The requirement of a \$10,000 budget or two full time faculty members is much below what the minimum requirements for a professional school should be. The requirements regarding faculty and field work should be made more specific. It would help individual schools if the Association were to declare itself regarding the desirable number of teaching hours a faculty member should carry for effective work; what the ratio should be between part-time lecturers and full time faculty; and various other questions which the Executive Committee has to consider in connection with applications from new schools. While the creation of new schools should not be

discouraged, it is not in the best interests of social work that schools with inadequate faculties and resources should be easily organized. In establishing acceptable standards along these lines the Association could serve its members and the profession in a very important manner.

The action which the Association took at its last business meeting, amending and clarifying the By-Laws with respect to admission requirements, will be of great assistance to the Executive Committee in the future. But this is only the first step. The Committee can not change the stated requirements; it can only interpret and apply them. Although the Committee can, in its interpretations, favor high standards and has done so consistently, that is not sufficient. The time has come for a re-examination of the present standards for admission into the Association. The By-Laws will no doubt require considerable revision on this point.

The Association was especially vulnerable on two counts. The first was the lack of control of schools after admission into the Association. There was nothing to prevent a school from relaxing in its efforts to maintain standards once it was admitted, for the Association has no provisions for inquiring into the work of its member schools. This problem has been partially solved by the action just taken whereby a school admitted is given provisional membership for three years and is elected to full membership at the end of that period if it has made suitable progress. The second element of weakness was the double set of standards in the Association: one for schools applying for admission and one for the schools already in the Association. The Association has been justly and severely criticized on this latter ground. While most organizations in their development have the experience of having one set of requirements for their members and another for incoming members, such a policy is indefensible in an association of schools, because its member schools are continuing to train new practitioners and consequently the work of all the schools should be of the highest order. All must therefore welcome the action taken at the business meeting, instructing the Executive Committee to draft an amendment to the By-Laws making the present standards applicable also to member schools. Naturally this will have to be done carefully, with a consideration of the best interests of the schools as well as social work. But it is a necessary and logical step. The Association is to be congratulated on its initiative and courage in this matter.

Closely associated with this question is that of the relation between the Association of Schools and the Association of Social Workers. The presentation made at the evening meeting by Mr. Pettit, Chairman of the Membership Committee of the Association of Social Workers, clearly indicated how important this matter is to the Association.

The American Association of Social Workers is naturally concerned with the large number of persons who are not

yet members and who may perhaps never be able to qualify if its membership requirements are raised or even maintained. Not only does this represent a potential loss of large numbers and large revenues but it also represents, potentially at least, the possibility of another organization of social workers which may even outstrip in membership the present Association of Social Workers. There is no doubt that this is a problem and perhaps also a serious one. But there are those who would question the wisdom of a professional association becoming so much concerned about numbers and income as to forget its main purpose. They would seriously question the value of a professional association of social workers whose standards would be so low as to admit everyone who would want to join. For it would no longer be a professional organization, but one that would seek members to enable it to seek new members, etc. *ad infinitum*.

There are those in both associations, who believe that the two associations should work independently and not influence each other on the matter of their respective standards. Many of us do not share this point of view. We firmly believe that whether we recognize it or not these two associations do and must continue to influence each other. They are the only two bodies officially and directly concerned with raising the standards of social work as a whole. Schools of social work must eventually become the main source of future members of the Association of Social Workers. The latter organization, because of its size and influence can profoundly affect the standards of the Association of Schools by its requirements for membership. If it should lower these requirements there will be less pressure upon schools outside the Association to raise their standards in order to meet the requirements of the Association of Schools. Evidence of this is available on all sides. In self-defense the schools of social work and their alumni will be forced to create another Association of Social Workers which will have standards of admission that will be in accord with decent professional requirements. This would result in a conflict between the two associations which should by all means be avoided. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that the two associations begin to think together on what is after all a common problem. There is no medium at the present time for such common thinking. It is high time that such a medium were created.

Above everything else the Association of Schools must begin thinking in terms of securing the services of a full-time secretary. The time required for the examination of applicant schools, the coordination of the existing committees, the examination of schools that will want to give the Provisional Certificate, and possibly also the examination of member schools on the basis of the modified By-Laws, will be beyond its present resources. No organization depending on

voluntary services can perform these tasks satisfactorily. Nor can they be performed by committees without serious losses. Unless the Association has adequate means for judging the work of schools that apply for admission, as well as to judge their progress before granting them full membership, in accordance with the latest By-Law, and unless it has the means for examining the work of member schools, it will be impossible to raise the standards to where they should be.

There is also great need for continuing studies of the extent and types of experimentation going on in the member schools. A clearing house of such information could be of great value, not only to the schools conducting or contemplating the experiments but also to the others who should be informed on what is going on. The Association of Schools is the logical agency for making this information available to its members. The Association should also stimulate experiments on the basis of the needs which would come to its attention through the contacts which it would maintain with its member schools. There is no other agency in the social work field for this purpose. It logically belongs in the Association, and it must equip itself to perform this service.

An additional service that the Association could render to its member schools, directly or indirectly, would be for it to secure a substantial fund for the purpose of subsidizing and developing the work of existing schools. It is not inconceivable that the Foundations interested in education for social work could be induced to set aside and pool certain funds to be administered by a central agency which would have current and up-to-date information on the work and needs of the different schools. Details of administration so as to protect the fund, its administrators, and the member schools, could be easily worked out. It would, however, be unworkable unless a full time staff were available to the Association.

The progress which the Association of Schools has made in the last few years is but a mere beginning. Because of the recognition which social work has received in the last few years, because of the constantly advancing standards before the depression, because of the developing public fields in social work, and because of the greater professional consciousness which has come to social workers as well as to the schools of social work, new and increased demands will be made upon the schools in the future. They will have to equip themselves as they are not now equipped for giving a high type of professional education. The Association of Schools is the only agency that can guide and stimulate the schools in the development of their standards. Its greatest opportunities, therefore, for a high type of professional and educational service lie in the future.

Some Problems in the Collection and Interpretation of Jewish Population Data*

By H. L. LURIE

Bureau of Jewish Social Research, New York

IT is generally recognized that accurate population data are essential elements in the analysis of vital statistics, in quantitative measurements of social problems and are basic for social planning. The United States Census Bureau collects and prepares data based upon actual enumerations which may be applied to an understanding of social conditions and social problems for the population as a whole. In addition to counts of living persons, tables on age and sex distribution, family status, country of origin of the foreign born, occupation and employment status, and other essential facts about population are prepared at regular intervals.

Population data and vital statistics prepared by governmental agencies are available for studying problems of the white, Negro, Indians and other groups. Considerable material on the native born and foreign born groups on basis of country of origin can be derived from the general population data. However, the census of population does not attempt to obtain specific data on the Jewish group as such, either on the basis of religious affiliation or other classification. In this respect the United States population data differ from practices of some of the European countries and of Canada which collect population figures by religion and by race. The only official enumeration on a national basis consists of tabulations made from the records of immigrants compiled by the Labor Department of immigrants who enter and depart. The Census of Religious Bodies is an estimate compiled from other data and is not based upon direct enumeration. It offers material on religious institutions but not upon individuals or groups as such. So far as the census is concerned, Jews are not a distinct racial or ethnic stock. They are included in the total white group undistinguished from other native whites and included among the foreign born according to country of origin.

The nearest approach to enumeration of resident Jews made by the U. S. Census Bureau is the information on Yiddish mother tongue of the foreign born groups obtained in the decennial census. In the 1910 census and 1920 census a count was taken both of the foreign born population and of the native born children of foreign or mixed parentage on the basis of the mother tongue of the immigrant. In 1930

tabulation was limited to the foreign born only and data on the native born children of foreign born or mixed parentage for this item have not been reported. The 1930 census gives 1,222,658 foreign born whites reporting Yiddish as their mother tongue. This is probably somewhere between one third and one-fourth of the total group in the United States who may be classified as Jews.

The accuracy of the item on Yiddish mother tongue may be seriously questioned. The 1910 census reported 1,051,767 and the 1920 census, 1,091,820 Yiddish foreign born. The increase in the ten year period of 40,053 appears to be much smaller than the additions normally to be expected from the Jewish immigration less the death of Yiddish immigrants. It has been suggested by those who have attempted to estimate Jewish population that a part of the error may have been due to the fact that a large number of Russian Jews were reported in the 1920 census as Russian rather than Yiddish mother tongue. This factor in the probable inaccuracy of the mother tongue statistics is cited for the purpose of indicating the difficulties likely to be encountered in census enumeration of the Jewish group.

Lacking official statistics and opposing their collection, Jews as individual students and through local and national agencies have promptly proceeded to supply the deficiency by various guesses and estimates ranging from entirely impromptu attempts to laborious collection of schedules. A record of such estimates go back as far as 1790. In recent times the most important contributions to our information on Jewish population in the United States have been made by Dr. Joseph Jacobs from the years 1905 to 1912, and by Dr. Harry S. Linfield whose most intensive study of Jewish population was made for the year 1927.

While there are inaccuracies in all population studies, even where the method of actual enumeration is carefully used, it is obvious that derived estimates in all probability supply much less accurate information. Jewish population estimates according to one or more of the methods to be described have their values. They are frequently but not invariably nearer to an approximation of the actual than guesses of population made without such efforts. In addition to their fallibility as a total count of Jewish population, they lack the detailed information concerning age and sex distribution and other important items obtained in the regu-

*Paper read before the Conference on the Economic Status of the Jews in the United States, May 12, 1934.