

Modern Jewish Discourses of Philanthropy: "No More Charity!"

Noam Zion

Hartman Institute, Jerusalem

– excerpted from:

Jewish Giving in Comparative Perspectives: History and Story, Law and Theology, Anthropology and Psychology

Book Two:

To Each according to one's Social Needs:

The Dignity of the Needy from Talmudic Tzedakah to Human Rights

Previous Books:

A DIFFERENT NIGHT: The Family Participation Haggadah By Noam Zion and David Dishon

LEADER'S GUIDE to "A DIFFERENT NIGHT" By Noam Zion and David Dishon

A DIFFERENT LIGHT: Hanukkah Seder and Anthology
including Profiles in Contemporary Jewish Courage By Noam Zion

A Day Apart: Shabbat at Home By Noam Zion and Shawn Fields-Meyer

A Night to Remember: Haggadah of Contemporary Voices Mishael and Noam Zion
Noam.zion@gmail.com www.haggadahsrus.com

New Types of Jewish Philanthropists: Maimonides Revisited

Introduction: The Discourse of the Modern Jewish Philanthropist

A. Sir Moses Montefiore: Moral Crusaders and Humanitarian Philanthropists

B. Changing 19th Century Jewish Narratives of Giving:
A Mark of Identity, Preemptive Apologetics, and International Social Policy for a People

C. Rebecca Gratz, Sisterhood of Service and Millennial Philanthropists:
Mothering Society and Empowering Women

D. Julius Rosenwald, John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie:
“Scientific Giving,” The End of Charity and the Empowerment of “Self-made Men”

E. Philanthropy as Nation-Building:
Zionism and the American Jewish Civil Religion

F. Partnerships for Civic Engagement and Community Building:
The JDC (Jewish Joint Distribution Committee), *Shatil* (The New Israel Fund), and Post Modern Foundation Philanthropy

Postscript: Tikkun Olam

Appendices:

The Holy Society of Those who Visit the Sick

Tevel B'Tzedek, A World of Justice:

An Israeli NGO's Outreach Program to Nepal and Haiti (2011)

by Rabbi Micha Odenheimer, founder

Theodore Herzl's Pitch to Baron de Hirsch (1895)

Reflections on the Decline of Jewish Philanthropy and Associational Membership
by Derek Penslar

Introduction to the Transition to Modern Jewish Discourses of Philanthropy

"Stop being poor, return to your own resources/ treasures and use your own resources!"

- Reb Nahman in *Tale of the Seven Beggars*

Lewis Margolis, former lay head of a local Jewish Federation and professor in the University of North Carolina's School of Public Health, came on Sabbatical to Israel in 2009 to work in one of the new centers for the study of philanthropy in Israel. As a committed American Jew active in fundraising and policy making, he found deep meaning in the Biblical and rabbinic tradition of tzedakah and even volunteered to help in the early stages of editing of this book. However, he was surprised to learn that many of his secular Israeli hosts, who guide Israeli donors to a more scientific form of giving inspired by American models, discounted the term "tzedakah" as an outmoded undesirable kind of Jewish giving still too prevalent in Israel.¹ To appreciate why many modern philanthropists see "tzedakah" and charity so critically and to understand the new models they pursue is the object of this chapter which forms Part Three of our book.

From the 19th C. on, the discussion of tzedakah in the Western Jewish world and the Western Christian and secular conversations about modern philanthropy flow into one, sometimes with identical themes and methods and sometimes, though less often, differing in emphases. The progressive Western elites, whether Jewish or not, defined themselves most prominently as modern as opposed to traditional (and therefore old fashioned), more than they distinguished themselves as Jewish or Christian. Therefore, Part Three presents shared models, bringing both Jewish and non-Jewish examples. In light of our previous discussions however, we will notice the Jews sometimes add a Jewish inflection by citing sources such as Maimonides' eighth level of tzedakah or the Biblical commandment to love the stranger.

Since the beginning of European modernity in the 16th century new attitudes to philanthropy and social welfare present themselves as **radical rejections of traditional models of charity and tzedakah**, as they narrowly define them. The sea change in the 16th C. condemned begging and blamed the undeserving poor for deserving their poverty and, worse, for exploiting the charitable inclinations of other hardworking members of society. Punitive forms of welfare created almost self-contradicting modes of aid to the needy that shame them morally while begrudgingly helping them materially. However, the Poor Laws with all their constant readjustments were never popular among the donors that is the taxpayers, nor effective in decreasing poverty. Therefore, 19th C. modernists turned to new methods they thought could solve what the Poor laws merely perpetuated. Their faith in real change was fed by both new religious and new scientific dogmas of human activism and optimism as we shall see in detail throughout this chapter.

The hot new term for private contributions to the common good in the 19th C. was "philanthropy," now contrasted with charity. Etymologically, philanthropy is simply the ancient Greek term "*philanthropia*"

¹ In 2011 over 300,000 Israelis protested on the unequal distribution of resources within an increasingly successful market economy that has seen the gaps between rich and poor grow, the privatization of state companies and state lands and their purchases by tycoons and Israel's social, medical and educational services decline in quality while increasing in cost. Prices on staples have risen far higher than in Europe and apartment rental and purchase have skyrocketed, so it is very hard for two working parents to support a family. The demonstrators chanted: "**We demand social justice (*tzedek*) not tzedakah!**" which assumes that tzedakah is condescending charity as opposed to citizens' socio-economic rights to services.

(love of humanity) and its Christian adaptation in the Roman Empire referred to organized charity for the poor. At the time it was orchestrated by the church and carried theological overtones of the service of Christ within the poor. In the 18th C., however, “philanthropy” became identified with a natural sympathy for the suffering of others and the desire to alleviate it. Natan Sznajder, in his illuminating essay “The Sociology of Compassion: A Study in the Sociology of Morals,”ⁱ argues:

“The origins of this new doctrine can be traced to numerous Anglican divines of the Latitudinarian tradition in England between 1660 and 1725. Latitudinarian preachers sought to combat puritan pessimism about human nature, and Hobbesian egoism, elevating universal benevolence as a prime religious virtue.”

Its point is to bring happiness and earthly good, not just to comfort those suffering in this world as they await salvation. Adam Smith’s *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, for example, develops a democratic, universal natural basis for human solidarity through human sympathy. But among 18th C. upper class English and French it expressed *noblesse oblige*, compassion from on high. “Condescension” is here considered to be a positive value as opposed to indifference to the lower classes. In the 19th C., activists in a broad-based millenarian Protestant movement of social reform and social services, often led by women, called themselves “philanthropists.” These women did not distinguish sharply between charity and their new brand social activism. Toward the end of the 19th C. the term was amended among elites to “scientific philanthropy” and was explicitly contrasted with charity and with state Poor Laws. This last kind of modern “philanthropy” condemned the old form of charity as deleterious as well as ineffective, and rejected emotional sympathy as the proper spring to philanthropy. Motives and methods should be dictated by thought, it claimed, not emotion. One must search for more scientific, rational ways to solve the problem of the needy and to control social unrest. For many moderns, the common critique of both charity and tzedakah is their concern with maintenance, with providing mere momentary relief of suffering rather than systematic long-term change. Although welfare – state and private – is not always merely concerned with “maintenance of the poor”, its critics often present it as such, accusing it of promoting “maintenance of poverty” rather than its solution:

“Charity and [modern] philanthropy stand at opposite poles: the one concrete and individual, the other abstract and institutional. But they need not be at odds. As dual impulses, they are the equivalent of the two commitments taken by physicians in the Hippocratic oath: **one vow is to relieve pain and suffering, the other is to cure disease.**”(Robert Gross)ⁱⁱ

Nevertheless, while the self-consciously “modern” or “progressive” philanthropists do reject traditional terms like charity or tzedakah, for many others there is no real difference in the terminology. In fact, most charitable giving in the West is not modern or progressive in its intent at all. The majority of money spent and time volunteered for needy people by individuals and governments today is still basically classic charity that seeks to relieve the pain and satisfy basic material needs of the poor, the ill, the orphan and the widow, the unemployed and the resident alien stranger. This direct care of the needy may be performed under the banner of Christian love of the neighbor, Rabbinic *hesed* or secular humanitarianism. It is however very different in method and conception from what will be explored in the trends identified below.

Having examined this new mode of scientific giving throughout the greater part of this chapter, the postscript will consider the new or renewed coinage of “Tikkun Olam.” This term is used amorphously but enthusiastically for social action and some kinds of tzedakah, primarily by liberal American Jews of the last decades of the 20th C.

Curing the Disease

What is most innovative in 19th C. philanthropy, whether millenarian and performed by Protestant middle class women or “scientific” and directed by male mercantile industrial elites, is the faith that poverty can be solved through strategic political and economic action as well as character education. The 19th C. moral reformers addressed social problems such as drinking, lack of schooling, slavery, poverty and the mentally ill. Their optimism, activism and experimentalism was central to their approach even though the millenarians were happy to use the state to enforce solutions while the scientific philanthropist wanted the state to leave well enough alone and let the proven success of private industrialists to be applied to the problem of poverty.

Both groups continued to agree with the 16th Reformation's views that the poor were often corrupt and that moral reformation was necessary through good advice, through education, legislation, or a carefully regulated market mechanism with financial incentives. Implicit in this attempt to eradicate poverty is a new image of the poor which is more egalitarian – not in the sense that all deserve equal economic return (socialism) but in its belief that all have talents of one kind or another and therefore each individual deserves equal opportunities. Birth is not the final determinant of one's place in the division of labor and the hierarchy of socio-economic achievement. This anti-aristocratic view of the poor already emerges in the thought of Adam Smith.

What did *not* yet occur in the 19th C. in wide spread circles was the radical change in the image of the poor promoted by Adam Smith in 1776. Samuel Fleischackerⁱⁱⁱ argues that Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, the flagship manifesto of capitalism, revolutionizes the image of the poor. Smith reversed several of the mental pictures of the poor assumed and promulgated earlier, such as Christian charity's image of their pitiful inferiority, the English Poor Laws' view of their natural corruption, sloth and dangerous parasitism, and even British aristocrats' assumptions about the natural superiority of the upper classes and their culture as opposed to the poor's problematic work ethic and their defective character. Much British economic thought presupposed that the misery of poverty was necessary to motivate the poor to do the menial tasks that no one else would do, and that this is what made high culture possible.

Adam Smith argued that the poor are not intrinsically inferior in their natural talents but rather their low status and problematic character is the result of habit and education. Thus, the social division of labor does not reflect a natural division of intelligence and talent.

"The difference of natural talents in different men is, in reality, much less than we are aware of; and the very different genius which appears to distinguish men of different professions, when grown up to maturity, is not upon many occasions so much the cause as the effect of the division of labour. The difference between the most dissimilar characters, between a philosopher and a common street porter, for example, seems to arise not so much from nature, as from, habit, custom, and education"^{iv} - [even though] "the vanity of the philosopher is willing to acknowledge scarce any resemblance."^v

In fact, the condemnation of their sloth is often misplaced, writes Adam Smith, for the poor are not usually indolent but are “very apt to over-work themselves.”^{vi} Nor, given their many cares for survival, are their drinking habits an inappropriate vice for “man is an anxious animal and must have his care swept off by something that can exhilarate his spirits.”^{vii} Therefore, he dismissed aristocratic

calls for sumptuary laws to restrict the frivolous expenditures of the working poor and middle classes who sought to imitate their “social betters”; for kings and ministers should not legislate laws to control the waste of lower classes when “they are themselves always and without exception the greatest spendthrifts in the society,”^{viii} while the poor are often more frugal saving now so they may rise.^{ix} Thus, Adam Smith contributes to a new moral imagination of the poor as implicitly equal – or at least potentially equal – in both character and talent to the economically and socially more successful classes.

While the scientific philanthropists were still very suspicious of most poor, they did agree enthusiastically with Smith that the alleviation of poverty can be advanced best, if not exclusively, through the mechanisms of the market rather than the state.

A Community that Pulls Itself Up by the Bootstraps

In the second half of our chapter we will begin to see radical change in the attitude to the poor that values not only the talents of some to climb the ladder to success as “self-made men,” but the political power of the marginalized and even oppressed masses to redeem themselves. The path to communal self-redemption has been promoted in the 20th C. in three ways which each affect the role of philanthropy:

- (a) the social welfare state (discussed in book one chapters #11-12)
- (b) the socialist state (not discussed in the trilogy); and
- (c) the state responsive to and supportive of the initiatives of civil society with some good advice and seed money from progressive foundations.

The modern welfare state is rooted in an axiomatic democratic egalitarianism which discards both charity – state and private – and so-called scientific capitalist philanthropy, replacing them with taxes and welfare rights. This approach is reminiscent of the ancient Mishna's municipal tzedakah system that is based on taxation and on official bureaucracies and of the pre-modern local tzedakah institutions in many partially self-governing Jewish communities in the Diaspora. The socialist leadership of the modern State of Israel promoted the state welfare system along with a more utopian ideal of socialist ownership of the means of production. For Israel's first Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion, these modern solutions to poverty were inspired by the Biblical prophets of social justice, Amos and Isaiah. For the founder of non-socialist Jewish nationalism, Ze'ev Jabotinsky, Israel could better learn from the Biblical *Peah* (corners of the field left for the indigent to harvest) and the Jubilee (See book chapter #11).

In the response to the Holocaust and the rise of the State of Israel, American Jewish philanthropy has entered into a coalition with the political movement of nation building, Zionism, to pull up a whole nation suffering from poverty, discrimination and disempowerment by the bootstraps². This model speaks to the Western governmental and UN efforts to solve poverty in the Third World by nation-building that strengthens social institutions.

² **Bootstrapping** refers to a self-sustaining process that proceeds without external help. The phrase appears to have may have originated in the early 19th C. United States in the sense of being an absurdly impossible feat.

Finally, we will consider how the intersection between the market economy and the democratic political system have generated what might be called the "post modern foundation" – philanthropy that plays a major role today both in America and Israel. During the last three decades of the 20th C., private philanthropic foundations in capitalist economies have undergone enormous growth in size and variety and have refocused their mission statements. Built on the models of Andrew Carnegie and Julius Rosenwald, these foundations sought to transform society as a whole. They see themselves as promoters of public interest, working to improve the quality of health, education and welfare for all citizens, including the poor and disabled. Some work in partnership with the State's social welfare institutions and its policies, while some seek to encourage private initiatives led by NGOs and other associations of citizens in civil society. American Jewish philanthropy in Israel has developed partnerships with the government in developing social welfare policy (though the Jewish Distribution Committee) and with Israeli civil society (through Shatil and the New Israel Fund). This "post modern philanthropy" encourages bottom-up civic engagement and community building from below as well as lobbying governments to change policies top-down.

Revisiting Maimonides in the Modern Era

While rejecting old fashioned *pushka* tzedakah and panhandling beggars, the modern Western Jewish philanthropists in the 19th-20th C. have been very happy to adopt Maimonides' highest level of tzedakah and place it on the Jewish masthead of modern tzedakah for many reasons which we have already discussed at length above. But is there any historical basis for that? If we look at the reason Maimonides gives for setting the highest level as making a job, partnership or loan, he seems more concerned with avoiding the embarrassment of asking for aid than with solving the root economic problem. Neither Maimonides nor the Talmud develops in depth the idea of vocational training.

Initially, I had thought that these to be purely modern projections onto Maimonides in order to identify him with modern notions of economic autonomy, and especially productivization of labor. However, my friend and colleague at the Hartman Institute, Micah Goodman, has written a new book^x on Maimonides' *Guide to the Perplexed* that argues for **a strong ideological convergence between Maimonides and modern ideals of human autonomy and economic independence**. While Maimonides did not develop any delivery mechanisms to generating employment for the poor or improving the economy, he did seek to liberate human initiative from dependence on Divine miracles, providence, astrological fatalism, Divine redemption and even obedience to arbitrary Divine will.

“In the framework of defending God’s sublimity, Maimonides invents a new image of a human who shapes his own life, his world, and his consciousness.... an active person who seeks to prevent evil ... by nurturing the development of his reason and his knowledge....**The new religious hero the *Guide to the Perplexed* recalls somewhat the modern project of creating a new human ideal of autonomy and sovereignty.**³ Maimonides’ new human type need not rebel against tradition. It is the greatness of God’s sublimity that makes possible, even mandates, human spiritual independence.”^{xi}

³ However unlike the modern atheists Feuerbach and Nietzsche that liberation of human self-redemption did not require the death of God.

By reimagining God as wholly transcendent, all responsibility for solving problems such as poverty and the injustice of economic exploitation became human domains. By emphasizing the causal order of nature and studying nature's processes as a reflection of Divine wisdom, Maimonides sought therapeutic and preventative remedies accessible to human reason. By imitating God's ways in the world and actualizing the Divine potential for reason within, humans could redeem themselves, for God does not interfere with the laws of nature or of human nature nor coerce human free will (*Guide* III 32).

Maimonides' mechanisms for transforming such problems as poverty and exploitation are threefold in ways that recall 19th-20th C. problem-solving scientific philanthropy and social reform:

- (1) establishing a rule of law that serves rational goals with pragmatic methods;
- (2) appointing an enlightened ruler to maintain order and to promote peace, prosperity and harmony; and
- (3) developing useful and healthy habits of inner self-control and character reformation – individual and societal.

For Maimonides, as for the modern rationalists, evil is neither a natural given nor a fixed feature of human sin. The sources of evil in the world could be analyzed and minimized by use of reason. Maimonides identified three areas that generate what people call evil (*Guide* III 12):^{xii}

(a) There are misfortunes structurally related to nature such as mortality or bad weather which are the result of natural cycles of generation, growth and old age; side effects of human materiality and hence vulnerability to change. These events are bad but not really evil. While science and human organization may reduce or delay their effect, they cannot be eradicated. Given the general utility of nature, these inevitable aspects are not to be protested too harshly. Thus, when mourning, one should cry no more than three days and lament no more than seven, for “no one should take the death of a relative too hard or for too long for that is the way of the world and anyone who makes himself suffer for what is simply the way of the world is stupid” (Maimonides, *Laws of Mourning* 13:11).

(b) But greater evil in the world results from what humans do to one another, such as theft and war resulting from envy and anger. Good government can limit such evils.

(c) Most frequent of all is the evil we cause ourselves by over-eating, by frustration over lost honor, and so on. Here psychological wisdom and good habits can teach self-control (*Laws of Character Traits* Chapter 4). Rational analysis can separate what we really need from artificial sources of frustration. Mitzvot are therapeutic activities and Talmud Torah grants wisdom. As a physician, Maimonides preferred preventative medicine to treatment. He prescribed as part of the halakha a balanced golden-mean lifestyle to maximize physical, mental and spiritual health and happiness. Patients must not be passive or prayerful but active in self-therapy, since they often bring evil and disease on themselves (Maimonides, *Letter on Medicine to the Ishmaelite King*).

While rationalists often view prayer as an ineffective or even magical response to crisis, Maimonides sees prayer as occasion for moral self-diagnosis of the evil we bring upon ourselves. Whenever misfortunes approach, one looks to prayer and fasting in so far as they generate personal

and communal self-examination and reform, *teshuvah* (repentance) and the rooting out of corruption:

“That all should know that it is because of their bad behavior that things have grown worse.” (Laws of Fasts 1:2).

“On the fast day the court and the elders go into session at the synagogue checking the behavior of the citizens and removing the obstacles of these transgressions. They warn, confront and investigate those known for robbery and crime and set them apart, those known for violence and so on.” (Laws of Fasts 1:17).

For Maimonides, evil is never a mere misfortune (bad luck) or a fate (astrological). He warns:

“Do not think what the stupid ones of the nations and most idiots of Israel say: The Holy One decrees whether one will be righteous or wicked from their birth. That is not true – rather anyone is worthy to be as righteous as Moses or as evil as King Yerobam, to be wise or a fool, to be merciful or cruel, to be generous or stingy.. and no one compels him or decrees for him...Therefore it is the sinner who caused himself to be lost and therefore he ought to lament and cry for his sins and for what he did to his soul bringing himself bad events...But since it was within our power and with our free choice to do all these evil things - it is also worthy for us to do teshuvah and to abandon our wickedness for the power is now in our hands. Hence it says: *Let us examine our ways, investigate and return to Adonai* (Lamentations 3:40)” (Laws of Repentance 5:2)

Micah Goodman summarizes the rationalist, activist and naturalist approach to problem solving shared by Maimonides and moderns:

“Most of the evil of the world originates in human agency. Yet most humans experience themselves as innocent victims of cosmic evil. Maimonides seeks to transform human consciousness that we are active agents who cause most evil. Therefore humans must realize that they are not victims of evil but masters of themselves...Nature does not necessarily produce an ideal human character, but rather that is the humans’ task – to compete nature’s *telos*.... Education replaces nature....We recreate our own personality....If the sufferer is the cause of suffering, then he is also the solution... Maimonides transforms the image of humanity from the passive one to be redeemed to the active redeemer. In fact, the human is both the redeemer and the redeemed simultaneously.”^{xiii}

A. Sir Moses Montefiore and the Moral Crusaders and Humanitarian Philanthropists of 19th Century

“I humbly pray to the God of my forefathers, my God, the one only true God, to grant that I may henceforth become, a more righteous and better man, as well as better Jew, and that I may daily be more deserving of his abundant mercies...

This day I begin a new era. I fully intend to dedicate much more time, towards the welfare of the poor, and to attend as regularly as possible on Monday, Thursday, and Saturday Synagogue.” (Sir Moses Montefiore wrote the above in his diary while sailing on his first pilgrimage to Jerusalem on his birthday in 1827)^{xiv}

Sir Moses Montefiore was one of the greatest British Jewish philanthropist of the 19th C. He rose with the Jewish mercantile elites to be knighted by the Queen and, thanks to his donations, many agricultural towns in Israel and seven neighborhoods in Jerusalem are named after him. Abigail Green, in her insightful and colorful articles, paints an illuminating and dichotomous portrait of his approach to tzedakah:^{xv}

“In practice, **Montefiore’s philanthropy ranged from traditional forms of Jewish charity through more modern forms of Jewish philanthropy to non-Jewish philanthropic concerns.** Some aspects of his giving reflected his traditional Jewish worldview. On the anniversary of his father’s death in 1821, he “visited his tomb, distributing gifts to the poor and needy, and on my return passed the whole of the day in fasting and religious meditation.”...Groups of Jews regularly promised to dedicate study sessions to Montefiore and his wife, to name religious academies or *yeshivot* in their honor, and to pray for them and their companions. Correspondents assured Montefiore: “your reward will be great and G-d will lengthen your days with happiness and goodness and you will be granted to see the rebuilding of Zion and Jerusalem.”

Yet he concentrated much of his philanthropy not on pious Jews dedicating all their time to studying in Jerusalem but on the productivization of Jews in the spirit of the modern search for solutions to poverty through economic activity. Green reports on Montefiore’s “visit to the **almshouses** that he founded in Jerusalem that demonstrates a typically **Victorian concern with hard work**”:

"I satisfied myself that the inmates were fully deserving of the advantages they were enjoying . . . scrupulous attention is paid to the preservation of order and cleanliness, and the inmates are cheerful and happy, devoting a portion of their time to religious observances and study; but nevertheless not neglecting the industrial pursuits." ^{xvi}

In 1857 Montefiore sent the Jews of Jerusalem a state of the art British windmill, set in the aptly named Yemin Moshe neighborhood, to encourage them to work with their hands and create their own flour mill. Although camels hauled the mechanism from the port, when assembled it was discovered that there was inadequate wind in Jerusalem to keep it operational.

Why did Montefiore make it his own self-appointed task to support and defend Jews – from Damascus to Jerusalem to Russia? In one sense he simply continued bearing the responsibility of wealthy medieval court Jews. In the middle ages and early modern era Jewish wealth had always gone with a *noblesse oblige* calling to take charge of the communal needs. A wealthy person acted as a *shtadlan*, a political representative of Jewish interests, most often economic interests, to the political authorities. Often the authorization for Jews to live in a town or province depended completely on keeping in the

good graces of the monarch or duke who in turn depended on wealthy Jews for loans, trade and taxes. Politics, religion, the economic situation of the Jewish community and the welfare of the poor were always entwined with these court Jews. These roles continued in the 19th C. but their narrative of tzedakah was transformed by new ideologies and new modes of action.

However, the role equivalent to court Jew in 19th C. Western Europe was much more complex. The most important political-economic question for the Jews was the century long debate about their emancipation, their enfranchisement as citizens of partially secularized, quasi-democratic nation states. While the French Revolution voted for Jewish civil rights and Napoleon's conquest closed ghettos across Europe, his defeat led to a counter reaction. A long struggle ensued to extend democratic rights in general, including an acrimonious debate about whether Jews and Judaism were morally worthy of inclusion in the nation state. The debate continued even after the emancipation in Britain and Germany in the 1870s and Jewish citizenship was famously revoked in Germany in the Nurnberg laws in 1935. To prove their modernity and their trustworthiness as citizens, Jews sought to reform their religion, their economic activities and their unique characteristics – language, dress, character, and mannerisms. Yet the same time they were overrun by growing migrations of destitute Eastern European Jews who had not been westernized. The official Jewish self-government had been dissolved with the emancipation, so elite philanthropists took the lead to confront tzedakah issues which were intertwined with the precarious political standing of the whole community. Jewish elites absorbed some of the 16th Reformation's criticism of the parasitic poor as bringing poverty on themselves by their dissolute character and also some of the ancient criticism of commerce. Thus the Jewish vagabond and the Jewish peddler were synthesized into mythic anti-Semitic image that must be solved for the sake of economic viability and political security for the Western Jewish community.

Productivization of the Jewish poor was therefore a crucial and common theme. Promoters of this approach insisted that traditional relief work be replaced by transforming unemployable Jewish poor into workers or artisans who use their hands, rather than merchants or traveling salespersons. This practical program was a response to several trends: the collapse of the Jewish economy, especially in the Russia; the massive population growth and migrations to Western capitals; anti-Semitic critiques of Jewish middlemen as parasites; and the need to placate political anti-Semitism that threatened the civil rights of all Jews. However, it was now also an ideological faith that poverty could be solved by rational business planning. Honorable physical labor and, even better, artisans' crafts which were valued in Protestant and capitalist worldviews were expected to replace Jewish intellectualism, Jewish "monks" (full-time religious scholars and mystics) and a Jewish disdain for using one's hands.

My brother-in-law, the intellectual and cultural historian Jerry Muller, argues cogently that modern Jews across the board assimilated the ancient, medieval and modern prejudice against commerce. Aristotleans,⁴ Catholics, Erasmus, Puritans, and even Voltaireans and Marxists all viewed trade, money

⁴ "Profits from trade were therefore regarded as morally suspect. But of all forms of commerce, none was so suspect and so reviled as finance, the making of money from money. Aristotle regarded the lending of money for the sake of earning interest as unnatural. 'While expertise in exchange is justly blamed since it is not according to nature but involves taking from others, usury is most reasonably hated because one's possessions derive from money itself and not from that for which it was supplied. For money was intended to be used in exchange, but not to increase at interest.... So of the sorts of business this is the most contrary to nature.'" (Aristotle, *Politics*, Book I Chapter 10). With the recovery of Aristotle's thought in the High Middle Ages, the condemnation of usury would come to occupy a central place in the economic writings of Christian theologians and canon lawyers." (Jerry Muller, *Capitalism and the Jews*, 21)

lending and banking as parasitic. Varied Jewish ideologies trumpeted the same approach of productivization: the Jewish enlightenment, the *Maskilim*, taught the virtues of worldly labor; great mercantile philanthropists sponsored vocational schools; Labor Zionists trained middle class youths to become farmers. For example, in 1907, Jacob Schiff the German Jewish philanthropist created an organization called Jewish Immigrants Information to encourage new immigrants from Russia to go to Texas and become farmers. Similarly, The Joint Distribution Committee worked with the Soviets to help resettle 60,000 Jews as farmers in the Ukraine and Crimea from 1924-1938.^{xvii}

The International Jewish Philanthropists of the 19th C.

In Israel as well as in Russia, Moses Montefiore supported Jewish **occupational restructuring** and educational modernization. The premier Russian Jewish movement for training Jewish craftsmen was ORT, which even today orchestrates a vast network of vocational schools for poor Jews around the world. ORT was established as a reaction to the poverty that plagued the Jewish "pale" of settlement, the heavily Jewishly populated areas of Poland-Ukraine that had been annexed by Czarist Russia (after 1772) from which so many émigrés' to the West came. For example, in 1880, the philanthropist Nikolai Bakst started a fund to promote Jewish vocational training and workshops. He was a member of the secular Society for the Diffusion of Enlightenment (founded in 1867 by the Jewish philanthropist Baron E. Gunzberg) in St Petersburg. When the pro-Western Czar, Alexander II, celebrated his twenty fifth year in power, the Jewish railroad builder Samuel Poliakov gained the czar's approval to license a new fund in his honor for promoting handicrafts.^{xviii}

For the 19th century Jewish philanthropists, local and international issues were inseparable both because pogroms in Russia meant more refugees in Western Europe and because their own nation states were empires with worldwide interests which they sought to advance. The British Sir Moses Montefiore, the French Alliance Israelite and Baron De Rothschild, and the German American Jacob Schiff, for example, joined in international missions for their foreign brethren in "backward" countries (such as Russia, Morocco, and Syria).^{xix} They defended the civil rights of Jews, promoted schools to teach them imperialist European languages and professional work skills, and built agricultural settlements for Jews in colonial areas (such as Eretz Yisrael and Argentina). The goal was moral, economic and political reform. These movements are often associated with a paternalistic **moral mission** not only towards local under-classes but also towards faraway lands of "lesser" economic, cultural and religious development. They were also allied with **European imperialism and colonialism** and its white man's burden (Commerce, Civilization and Christianity).

Montefiore's narrative of giving is shaped then, not only by the ideals of a traditional Jew concerned for Jewish welfare, but of an **international humanitarian activist**. He sees himself as a member of a socially conscious elite consisting of Jewish and Christian philanthropists who jointly support Jewish and non-Jewish causes in England and abroad.

"Montefiore saw **Jewish problems as part of a wider spectrum of social and political issues**. ...[There are] links between antislavery activists and other causes such as parliamentary reform, penal reform, and education, as well as issues relating to religious freedom for dissenters, Catholics, and Jews. This complex reflected deep anxieties about the social and political order, and a desire to effect **the moral renovation of the world**. ...[Together] with Nathan Rothschild [he floated a] £20 million loan for compensation to owners of

freed slaves, which enabled the British government to pass the Slave Emancipation Act in 1835. ... Clearly it testified to his personal commitment to the antislavery cause.

“For Montefiore, the link between persecuted Jewry and wider humanitarian concerns remained very much alive in subsequent decades. In 1860, Montefiore provided the impetus behind a campaign to raise funds for destitute Christian refugees in Syria, after thousands had been massacred by the Druze. ...When Montefiore received news of famine in the Holy Land in 1870, he promptly gave £100 to the Jews, £100 for relief of the Christian poor, and £100 for relief of the Muslim community.

“Montefiore’s activities and resonance as a public figure were paradigmatic of a particular kind of **transnational humanitarian activity**, very much of its age—both in terms of the sentiments evoked and in terms of the means deployed. ... It reflected the way he saw himself as **already belonging to that community, manifested in a sense of social responsibility that stretched beyond the Jewish world.**”^{xx}

British imperialism to which Montefiore was very committed prided itself on promoting what would later, in the 20th century, be called “human rights” or democratization but was then understood as the standards of progress based on international commerce and Judeo-Christian values.

“In 1840 news reached London that European consuls had endorsed ritual murder accusations against the Jews of Damascus and Rhodes.

At the first of these public meetings, in 1840, John Abel Smith MP described the Jews as: ‘a people on whose history their [Christian] faith was founded and to whose future restoration both political and religious, they should look forward with undoubted confidence — (cheers) . . . a people connected throughout the world with the progress of commerce and civilization . . . everywhere the promoters of education, and the supporters in their own persons of that civil and religious liberty towards others which they claimed in their own behalf.’

Deploying both the domestic rhetoric of civil and religious liberty, and the more imperial language of **Commerce, Christianity and Civilization**, this speech demonstrates clearly the multifaceted appeal of the Jewish cause. ... Along with anti-slavery, British support for the Jewish cause played an important role in **legitimizing empire**. ...British support for the ‘suppressed’ nations of Greece, Hungary and Italy contributed to **Britain’s self-image as a beacon of civilization.**”^{xxi}

As Abigail Green shows, the international humanitarian narrative could be both religious and nationalist at the same time.

“Support for international humanitarian activity was not motivated primarily by abstract concerns with a secular theory of human rights. ... **International humanitarian activity tended to be motivated at some level by religious concerns.** The religious agenda demonstrated itself above all in the battle for religious and civil liberty. Jews such as Montefiore and Christians were united behind a common political agenda that aimed, above all, at establishing **freedom of conscience** the world over.”^{xxii}

"Like **anti-slavery, Jewish relief was a major humanitarian cause** in mid-Victorian England, and the question of Jewish rights in Muslim lands was a vital test case for British efforts to spread the values of **Victorian civilization** through an **imperialism of human rights.**"^{xxiii}

The technological progress that often fueled the new generation of self-made men was matched by the relentless expansion of the Western imperialism to civilize the heathens of Africa and Asia. Christian mission, Western education and economic expansion of the global market all went together in this ideology of moral, religious and political progress.

B. Changing 19th C Jewish Narratives of Giving: A Mark of Identity, Preemptive Apologetics, and an International Social Policy for a People

In the discontinuity of tzedakah values and forms from the medieval to the modern period, from Eastern Europe to Western Europe, there are at least three new factors in the narratives of giving that appear with Jewish emancipation in the 19th C. Derek Penslar, in his masterful *Shylock's Children: Economics and Jewish Identity in Modern Europe*, delineates these processes with illuminating examples.

First, having lost its corporate status, the Jewish community could no longer tax its members by law. Instead it became necessary to place a greater emphasis on the rhetoric of voluntary personal giving. While Jews were still mostly identified externally, by Gentiles, Jews now defined themselves internally as members of the community (*Gemeinde*), not by strict religious observance, but by voluntarily giving to the Jewish fund for the poor. Tzedakah had become a **secular social marker of identity by choice**. Typical of the modern middle classes, society was now organized through **voluntary associations** which served particular purposes, which in the context of the Jewish community became service organizations that helped the needy. These organizations also provided social acceptance, since the Jews were often excluded from associations of Christians, even when these engaged in secular activities. Gradually, the communal leadership was shared between the plutocrats, like the Rothschilds, and the newly active middle classes who volunteered for communal work.^{xxiv} Thus, tzedakah work, which included both giving funds and volunteering, spread widely and formed a source of commonality for Jewish belonging. Middle class Jews could now determine their community's destiny and not merely be dependent on extraordinarily wealthy and well-connected *Hofjude* (court Jews) in their new guise as mega-philanthropists.

The American Jewish historian Jonathan Sarna points out that the same issue of elite versus middle class Jewish leadership is still being addressed in America today, where there has been an oscillation between narrow-based and broad-based fundraising in ways that reflect and determine the borders of Jewish belonging through giving:

“Historically, into the early twentieth century, large, wealthy donors dominated Jewish philanthropy in most countries. In the United States, for example, Jacob Schiff and ‘Our Crowd’ [the German Jewish elite] held sway over many aspects of philanthropy and communal policy. ... But then the catastrophe of World War II and the great desire of [Eastern European] immigrants in the West to aid relatives left behind led to **mass philanthropy**. For the next sixty years or so, mass philanthropy not only raised a good deal of money, it also served as **a form of Jewish identification**. By contributing to a Jewish charity one announced that one was a paying member of the Jewish community.

"Then, over the past twenty years [since the late 1970s] , business-minded consultants persuaded charity heads to focus on big givers for the sake of efficiency. The cost per dollar (or pound sterling) raised was much less with wealthy donors, the consultants observed, and with only so much time to educate donors, they thought it was a better investment in time and resources to educate wealthy ones." As a result, in the United States, the donor base dropped from

900,000 to under 500,000 over the past 20 years, even as the amount of money raised increased." Jewish philanthropy became, once again, dominated by those with means.^{xxv}

Therefore, Jonathan Sarna calls for a campaign to reach out to the small donor, driven not merely by economic necessity, but by a vision founded in mid nineteenth century in Western Europe. A mass philanthropy reinforces Jewish communal identity through participation in tzedakah activities and organizations.

"Today [after the world economic crisis of 2009], at a time when so-called mega-donors are cutting back, new web-based technologies have made it easier than ever before to re-engage small donors cheaply and efficiently. The Obama presidential campaign in the United States demonstrated this conclusively."^{xxvi}

The second factor characterizing 19th C. Jewish philanthropy is somewhat less relevant to 21st C. America. It is the negative side of identity, the **ethnic solidarity that derives from ethnic exclusion**. So giving became a policy of communal self-defense, of managing impressions, and of sophisticated public relations.^{xxvii} Recall that Jews in Western Europe struggled to secure a new status of civil rights which was very fragile, partial and conditional. Civil rights depended on the political image of Jews in the eyes of the German, French, Russian and English speaking nationalist public. That controversial political status was intertwined with the stereotyped and overly generalized image of the Jew. The non-Jewish elites tended to identify all Jews with the threatening presence of swarming Jewish beggars, especially foreign Eastern European vagrants. So the Jewish community was anxious to take care of those Jews, lest they become a burden on non-Jewish governmental agencies. Yet they did not want to care for the poor indiscriminately for that might encourage the arrival of more needy Jews whom they feared they could not support. They wanted aid to the poor to transcend maintenance and to solve the problem of indigence, hence an emphasis was placed on vocational training and business loans. Tzedakah was not about refining the individual giver's pious trait of compassion, nor about neighborly help for those in a temporarily difficult period, but about addressing social issues which affected the whole community – local, national and international. Individual and communal giving was subordinated to newly formulated **Jewish social policies** and integrated into a rational and comprehensive plan of institutionalization. For example, Derek Penslar writes:

"In France, the rationalization of Jewish poor care began in 1809 with the establishment by the Paris Consistory of the *Societe d'encouragement et de secours* to supervise and, it was hoped, centralize all charitable activity on behalf of Jews in the capital. From the start, the society denied aid to those whom it considered **drunks and idlers**. In 1812 the society assisted the government in the location of foreign **indigent Jews for deportation**, and eight years later it responded to a flood of poor Jewish vagrants into Paris by clamping a **two-year residency requirement for the receipt of alms**." In 1813 in Hamburg the community emphasized rehabilitation and prevention establishing a credit union offering loans to Jewish craftsmen.^{xxviii}

More than ever before, it was every Western Jew's self-interest to be generous – in an enlightened and scientific way – to the Jewish poor in their own lands and in lands from which impoverished Jews may soon emigrate to the donors' own land.

The third factor in the new Jewish narrative of giving is the sense of a modern **mission** and the donors' certainty in their path. The successful Westernized bourgeoisie Jews felt their road to stability and

prosperity must be reproduced by the needy. A refusal to imitate bourgeois values of cleanliness and productivity was seen as a sign of moral degeneration. For example, an anecdote reports that Salomon Heine of Hamburg, when asked for a loan, first went to the applicant's home to see if his children's hands were clean and their hair combed.^{xxxix}

An individual's economic status was the most important test of moral probity and it was assumed that each individual can and should reeducate themselves by Western standards.^{xxx} But helping the poor rehabilitate themselves economically was also a source of utility for society, since it strengthens the Jewish community just as the productivization of citizens made the "commonwealth" richer.^{xxxi} For Jews, however, that meant not just finding a job, but changing their occupational patterns, shifting Jews from peddling into crafts and even agriculture. Unlike commerce, this kind of work was considered truly "productive".^{xxxii} At the same time, when middle class Jews took care of their brethren it proved to their Christian neighbors, who had become significant others for them, that Jews also believe in charity and brotherly love. This mirrored middle class Christians who in the 19th C were active in humanitarian missions for social reform.^{xxxiii}

From Helping Poor People to Taking Responsibility for a People: International Social Policy and Social Engineering

The greatest national associations of western Jews to address social policies were the German Hilfsvereine, the French Alliance Israelite, the British Anglo Jewish Association, and later the American Joint Distribution Committee. They understood the problem of poor Jews in their lands (many of whom originated in Eastern Europe) as part of a larger European Jewish problem. As active supporters of their own country's imperialist colonization and as merchants and industrialists in an international market, they thought of solutions in terms of global economic and political policies. Herzl and the international Zionist organization agreed with these perspectives and sought alliances with these national organizations and their main philanthropic donors, however they also dreamt of Jewish political independence as an essential part of a radical solution to the Jewish problem.

"The 'Jewish problem' weighed heavily on the minds of the architects of Jewish **social policy** (1860-1933). ...The activists agreed that Jews would have to solve the problem alone and that they would do so through a mobilization of Jewish capital and expertise. According to this activist worldview, Jewish leadership could no longer be limited to spiritual or communal affairs alone; the socio-economic fabric of Jewish life was in tatters, and the Jews' public responsibilities perforce extended into the private sphere of the family and economy. The sense of common fate transcended national boundaries. Despite rivalries between states, and between Jews living in those states, expressions of international Jewish brotherhood were frequent and sincere. Thus in 1869, on the eve of the Franco-Prussian War, at a meeting of the leadership of the Alliance and German Jewish communities, Alliance president Adolphe Cremieux embraced Morritz Lazarus, the German Jewish scholar and activist, and exclaimed, 'At this moment we are not French or Germans – we are Jews !'^{xxxiv}

Social policies, such as piecemeal local job training for the poor, matured into what Derek Penslar has called, using Karl Popper's term, "**social engineering**". That is projects of planned massive colonization in Argentina, Russia and Eretz Yisrael that required the reeducation of the Eastern

European Jews.⁵ The more democratically structured Zionists were largely in agreement with the goals, if not the destinations, set for such integrated programs which included massive resettlement, occupational retraining and reeducation of Jewish character and identity. This was not only an economic issue but a political one, for as we noted above, European anti-Semitism focused on the Jewish poor as the justification for restricting economic and political rights for the entire Jewish community.

“This [internationalist] vision was realized among Jews in the arenas of international rescue and colonization activity. The most spectacular attempts by Jews to solve their socioeconomic problems took the form of **social engineering**, that is, **planned, large-scale agricultural colonization in a chosen territory**. The most familiar example of Jewish social engineering was the Zionist project that, among its many aims, sought to establish a **productive national economy** based in agriculture and manufacture. The Zionist dream of transforming the Jews' occupational structure and economic behavior was .. a continuation of a discourse that dated to the late eighteenth century. Moreover, Zionist ideology featured a prominent **economic self-critique** that shared many points in common with *fin-de-siecle* Jewish social policy. Zionism's association of Jewish economic health with planned colonization was shared by a variety of Jewish international relief agencies that experimented, from the 1870s through the 1930s, with social engineering in South America, eastern Europe [including the Soviet Union], and the Middle East. Zionism was the only one of these experiments to succeed.” (Derek Penslar, *Shylock's Children*, 223)

The solution was not perceived merely as an economic or political one but also an educational one – **tzedakah must include international reeducation**. For example, as we saw with Moses Montefiore, Western European Jews developed networks of schools such as the Alliance Israelite Universelle schools and the Evelyn de Rothschild girls' schools throughout the Sephardi Mediterranean basin, including Palestine, and going as far as India, to teach European languages and culture as well as crafts and agricultural skills. They also established extensive apprenticeship programs.^{xxxv} The non-Zionist organizations also wished to make of the eastern European and Sephardi Jews a “new Jew” – more self-sufficient and rational, anything but a superstitious and dirty schnorrer, the anti-Semitic image they abhorred yet believed to be true. Therefore, the Western financed Jewish colonial projects in Argentina, Russia and Palestine sought to supply the right resources for their new economic colonies. This meant both selecting the best “human material” to be remolded into a new Jew and transferring new technologies necessary for success.^{xxxvi} For example,

⁵In *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, the Jewish political scientist Karl Popper coined the term “social engineering” to describe how from above a society can be programmed to certain values that reshape fundamental behaviors and attitudes. He made a crucial distinction between the principles of democratic social reconstruction (called “piecemeal social engineering”) and “utopian social engineering.” Plato’s Republic is an example of such utopian social engineering that exclude poets lest they have bad influence on citizens. In the 1920s, the government of the Soviet Union embarked on a campaign to fundamentally alter the behavior and ideals of Soviet citizens, to replace the old social frameworks of Czarist Russia with a new Soviet culture, to create the New Soviet man. The Soviets used newspapers, books, film, mass relocations, and even architectural design tactics to serve as “social condenser” and change personal values and private relationships. For example, to discourage wife-beating, they organized a public ritual of burying the belt. Labor Zionism also set a goal of creating a new Hebrew to replace the Diaspora Jew and the kibbutz was its Platonic Republic. Derek Penslar suggests that on a smaller scale Western Jews sought to social engineer Eastern European Jews into productive Western style Jews. In my judgment Rabbinic Judaism is also a massive project of social engineering begun 2000 years ago to create a Rabbinic Jew as a model for the whole society. Within that project the halakha wishes to design and promote particular attitudes toward labor and tzedakah, just as Christianity seeks to educate a society of *agape* and charity.

“The Joint Distribution Committee’s official history boasted, assembled a fleet of ‘**efficient social engineers**, experts in welfare work and relief, men and women trained in medical sanitation, migration, child care, cultural and economic affairs.’^{xxxvii xxxviii}

The Damascus Blood Libel of 1840 and the Birth of Modern International Jewish Solidarity

Historically, the Jewish efforts to rescue persecuted brethren through tzedakah and political influence were inspired by brotherly solidarity. This is the rationale Maimonides refers to when discussing the fact that persecuted Jews can only expect help from a "brother" (Gift to Poor 10:2) or what Rav J.B. Soloveitchik calls the "covenant of common fate." In the 19th C., it is the Blood Libel in Damascus in 1840 that sparked the modern renaissance of Jewish solidarity, in both form and content.

In the Ottoman Empire, or more precisely its semi-independent province of Damascus ruled by the Egyptian viceroy Mehemet Ali, the French consul sought to protect Damascus’ Christian community from an alleged Jewish conspiracy to kidnap a Capuchin monk who had disappeared as part of a ritual blood ceremony. Jews were rounded up and tortured until they confessed; children of Jewish notables were imprisoned. During this period, the Ottoman Empire was very dependent on Western European loans and consular intervention. Moses Montefiore in Britain and Isaac Adolph Cremieux in France enlisted international Jewish support – financial, moral and economic – to pressure their governments and the Turkish Empire to successfully rescue the Jews of Damascus from the Christians.^{xxxix}

The modern transformation of this age-old solidarity of fate is manifest in its **activist turn and rationalist spirit**. In the spirit of the Enlightenment there is a search for the causes of persecution and the solutions to poverty through education. It evoked one of the first united efforts of the Jews of Western Europe, across national lines. Its efforts involved political lobbying and economic planning directed towards Ottoman Jewry as a whole. Later in the same century, with the 1881 pogroms in Russia, it was invoked for Eastern European Jewry as well.

This appeal still rings loudly in the era of nineteenth century modern nationalism. Such proto-Zionist international nationalism were based on common suffering, not only on common religion. Listen to its echoes in the following sermon/speech, fittingly preached in the City of Brotherly Love, Philadelphia (which in Greek means love of one’s brother).

"Around me are those who have assembled for no other purpose than to express, in language not to be misunderstood, that they feel for their brothers who languish under the cruel bondage of oppression; that every cry of anguish uttered by their fellow-believers elsewhere, touches a sympathetic chord in their own hearts. We have no country of our own; we have no longer a united government, under the shadow of which we can live securely; but we have a tie yet holier than a fatherland, a patriotism stronger than the community of one government. Our tie is a sincere **brotherly love**, our patriotism is the affection which unites the Israelite of one land to that of another. As citizens we belong to the country we live in; but as believers in one God, the inheritors of the law, the Jews of England, Russia and Sweden are no aliens among us, and we hail the Israelite as a brother." (Isaac Lesser, *Persecution of the Jews in the East: Proceedings of a Meeting in Philadelphia 1840*)^{xl}

“We are still one people; bound by the same religious ties worshipping the same God, governed by the same sacred awe, bound together by the same destiny.” (Mordechai Manuel Noah of the United States).^{xli}

This joint political collaboration led these Jewish philanthropic leaders of the West to address the poverty of the Ottoman Jews. It generated plans for a **long-term economic revolution in the solution of poverty through education and through the generation of productive jobs for the structurally unemployed**. It often included planned emigration from one land of persecution and poverty to the next, as when Baron de Hirsch sponsored resettlement and reeducation of eastern European Jews in viticulture villages in *Eretz Yisrael* and in Argentinean ranches on the pampas. But even without emigration there was an **inner moral transformation**. Twenty years after the Blood Libel, the **Alliance Israelite Universelle** (1860) was founded by French Jews as “a center of moral progress, of religious solidarity, and of protection for all who suffer for being Jewish.”^{xlii}

“If you believe that a great number of your coreligionists, overcome by twenty centuries of misery, of insults and prohibitions, can find again their **dignity as men**, with the dignity of citizens; If you believe that one should moralize those who have been corrupted, and not condemn them, enlighten those who have been blinded, and not abandon them, raise those who have been exhausted, and not rest with pitying them ...
If you believe in all these things, Jews of all the world, come hear our appeal.”^{xliii} .

“What was, what is the aim of the Alliance Israelite Universelle (1860)? ... In the first place, **to cast a ray of the civilization** of the Occident into the communities degenerated by centuries of oppression and ignorance; next, **to help them find jobs more secure and less disparaged than peddling**, by providing the children with the rudiments of an elementary and rational instruction; finally, by opening the spirits to Western ideas, **to destroy certain outdated prejudices and superstitions** which were paralyzing the activities and development of the communities.

But in addition, the action of the Alliance [is] principally aimed to give to Jewish youth, and subsequently, to the Jewish population as a whole, **a moral education** rather than a technical instruction, to create rather than semi-scholars, tolerant men, attached to their duties as citizens and as **Jews, devoted to the public good, and to their brothers**, knowing how to reconcile the needs of the modern world with the respect of ancient traditions.”^{xliv}

Thus modern solutions to poverty and persecution were not the work of technocrats but missionaries for moral transformation. Productivity leads to **dignity as men and as citizens** and to solidarity rather than selfish individualism. Jewish alliances are not exclusively about preserving Jewish welfare but were also thought to serve the general goals of the Enlightenment, hence the term “Universelle.”

Abigail Green argues that the Jewish organizational response to humanitarian issues like the Blood Libel in Damascus (1840) created, for the first time, a **democratized international proto-nationalist Jewish public**:

“The 19th C. also saw the emergence of a **new kind of Jewish solidarity**. ‘Modern’ Jewish solidarity was reliant on the **public sphere**. It had moved beyond the religious dimension symbolized by the synagogal collection box, congregational charities, and the traditional preoccupation with tzedakah. Their more modern incarnation was genuinely **international** because the emergence of a Jewish public sphere around 1840 provided a coherence and focus that earlier forms of Jewish internationality lacked. While

notables like Gerson Bleichroderer and the Rothschilds used their **private contacts to lobby** informally, **secular bodies** like the Board of Deputies, the AIU, the Board of Delegates of American Israelites, and the Anglo-Jewish Association (AJA) held **public meetings, drew up resolutions, and dispatched delegations to negotiate with governments at home and abroad**. ... Each [crisis] prompted **international subscription-based fundraising campaigns** promoted by Jewish communal organizations and publicized through the **Jewish press**. .. The ability of international philanthropy **to mobilize very large numbers of individuals**. Such levels of active participation were probably less widespread in political campaigns that, by their very nature, depended on Jewish elites. Large public meetings tended to be held in important cities, while newspaper articles and political lobbying were the responsibility of journalists, community leaders, and secular Jewish organizations. **Only philanthropy was open to all.** ^{xxlv}

The 19th C. Jewish campaigns and voluntary organizations for helping the poor and persecuted Jewish brethren the world over were allied to a broader ideology of Western humanitarianism and their host nations' imperialism. However, widespread participation in them also contributed to a new self-understanding of the Jewish community as more ethnic, political, activist, and problem-solving. The international Jewish response to the Blood Libel prefigures many contemporary political aspects, such as mobilization of Jewish and general public opinion and political power typical of the post 1948 American lobby for Israel (AIPAC) or the Soviet Jewry protest movements. Thus, modes and rationales of tzedakah changed radically but so did Jewish proto-nationalist self-consciousness.

B. Rebecca Gratz, Sisterhood of Service and Millennial Philanthropists: Mothering Society and Empowering Women

Rebecca Gratz (1781-1869) was a high-born Jewess of Philadelphia, a beauty, a do-gooder and a tireless organizer of societies for the improvement of society who may well have been the prototype for Sir Walter Scott's novel *Ivanhoe* and its Jewish heroine, Rebecca.⁶ She models a new kind of Jewish philanthropist in the spirit of many well-to-do religious women of the 19th C. At age 20 she helped founded the Female Association for the Relief of Women and Children in Reduced Circumstances (1801) for those who had suffered in the American Revolutionary War, and the Philadelphia Orphan Asylum (1815). However, seeing the Christian organizations combine charity with evangelizing, she founded the first non-synagogue-based Jewish tzedakah society in America, the Female Hebrew Benevolent Society (1819) to provide needy Jews with food, fuel, shelter, and later an employment bureau and traveler's aid service. She then continued to found the Jewish Foster Home (JFH). A committed Jew, she founded one of the first co-educational American style Jewish Sunday schools (1838).^{xlvi} She also argued for equal rights for the Jews under the Constitution. Typical of Western Jews of her era she combined involvement in voluntary organizations for health, education and welfare that served both general and Jewish populations, used Western models to advanced Jewish needs and fought for Jewish political equality.

Gratz fit the new mold of pre-Civil War "philanthropists," as they called themselves, who were typically middle class and of middle income. These were often respectable women who had no right to vote or to manage their own financial affairs. Yet, inspired by the Second Great Awakening, they became missionaries for the betterment of their world – spiritually, ethically, politically, and economically. For them, philanthropy was privately funded by subscription and fundraising activities to pay for the expenses of their institution (such as foreign missionaries, preachers, churches and aid to the needy), but it often lobbied for public legislative reform for penitentiaries, insane asylums, or the abolition of drinking and slavery. Thus, religion and politics were combined without coercion in philanthropic organizations devoted to public benefit rather than profit. The means were democratically run voluntary associations which encouraged an engaged citizenry to improve civil society. Civic virtue was the secular ideology of such movements in the spirit of Ben Franklin; but they were interpenetrated with strong beliefs about evangelical self-improvement, human perfectibility and missionary millenarianism. Alongside this reformist religious ideology, they advocated a special role for women – "republican motherhood" (the "benevolent empire"). Women fulfilled their "natural role" of nurturing the needy and morally reforming the sinners by exercising their virtues of selflessness, but they did so in the public realm outside their homes in activist organizations.^{xlvii}

The Theological and Historical Background to Humanitarian Activism and Moral Missions

⁶ Washington Irving, the writer, a family friend of the Gratzes would have told Scott about her.

The underlying 19th century narrative of philanthropy led by elite male mega-donors and by grassroots humanitarians – often led by women – was a religious and rational scientific faith in free will and progress. Within Western societies progress was measured by its in-reach to the under classes who gradually received the vote, joined public education, and were moralized by temperance unions and religious revivals led by the middle classes and supported by the upper class philanthropy. Legislation inspired by scientific approaches to the poor, the prisoner, and the mentally ill promised amelioration of every problem through human will and reason. Under the banner of a broad progressivism, religious and scientific ideas melded to inspire these movements which were often called by their participants “philanthropy.” That term could refer not only to the charitable gifts of the super wealthy but also to the moral reform movements that sought to abolish slavery or modernize penitentiaries.

“History textbooks usually describe the moral crusades of the early nineteenth century as "reforms" rather than "philanthropies." (Interestingly, reformers themselves often characterized their work as "benevolent" or "philanthropic.") Antebellum reformers saw themselves as **missionaries** who could remake their world; as with other philanthropists, helping others and transforming oneself were two sides of the same coin....^{»xlviii}

The **theological** contribution of the Second Great Awakening to this 19th century moral crusade was the renewed belief in free will and change. It involved a direct repudiation of the Calvinist and Lutheran denial of free will that is part and parcel of their belief in original sin and led to very pessimistic views of the poor's chances of rehabilitation. The leaders of these movements were often evangelicals with a strong belief in “millennialism” – the thousand year reign of gradual social-ethical-religious improvement before the Second Coming of Christ on earth. Charles Grandison Finney, the nineteenth century's most famous American revivalist preached:

"God hath made man a moral free agent."

"The will is free and ... sin and holiness are voluntary acts of mind."

"To the universal reformation of the world they [true Christians] stand committed."

"Moral free agents" were responsible for their personal salvation and, by extension, for their earthly behavior. But they also had a duty to remake society."^{xlix}

These moral reformers in the American South before the Civil War believed that:

“**Free will shifted the responsibility for salvation from God to the individual.** It was up to the individual sinner to decide whether he or she wished to be saved; the individual, in other words, determined his or her own fate. ...

"Almost all believed that it was possible not only to change the world, but also to perfect it. 'True Christians' who immersed themselves in numerous reform efforts saw few contradictions between philanthropy and self-improvement."¹

Here again, as in the 16th century, the assumptions about human nature identified the poor as moral agents responsible for their own transformation. The American version of this phenomenon reflects:

“An emphasis on values and behavior - what nineteenth-century Americans called "**character**" - underlay this notion of individual responsibility.⁷ People of "good" moral character enjoyed worldly

⁷ Inspirational personal testimonials. "I was a drunkard. As I was, so may you become. I went to the almshouse. I beat my wife and abused my children. I looked and felt as bad as you do. Look at me now ... healthy, happy, and respectable

success and attained salvation; people of "bad" moral character deserved to fail and to be damned for eternity. Proponents of free will believed that one's character was not fixed, that it could be changed. It was this very belief that motivated many reform movements. Thus, reformers tended to focus on changing individual behavior."^{li}

But 19th C. reformers were optimistic about their chances of success. These “missionary philanthropists” added an essential part to their narrative which animates most great reformers and revolutionaries, claiming that the messianic era is at hand *and* humans must help hasten its emergence:

“Millennialists⁸ believed, quite literally, that the millennium - a thousand-year period that would precede the final judgment - was "approaching near." While they offered competing estimates as to when the millennium would arrive, they agreed that when it did, peace, justice, and righteousness would reign. Even philanthropists who worked outside the confines of mainline Protestantism - indeed, even those whose orientation was essentially secular - embraced variants of millennialism. All believed that a better world was not only possible but also inevitable.”

Both British and American Protestants understood the expansion of the British Empire, at the height of its extent and power, and the recovery of America after the Civil War and the effect of the Industrial Revolution as signs of God's providence for the new chosen people – American or British – and their worldwide mission. The historian Wendy Gamber writes:

“Millennialism was not a new doctrine; however, it gained strength in the years following the American Revolution in part because it reinforced common attitudes. It seemed to confirm the notion - dear to the hearts of many Americans - that the United States had been chosen by God to fulfill a great mission. Millennialism also complemented widely shared beliefs in progress and economic development: national prosperity and technological advances, according to this line of thinking, represented evidence of God's favor. Perhaps most important, millennialism provided a justification for action. Antebellum adherents believed that people should work to realize their vision of a perfect society rather than passively waiting for the millennium to arrive. After all, the revivalist Charles Finney claimed that true Christians committed themselves to the 'universal reformation of the world.'"^{liii}

German and American Jews, Reform and even modern Orthodox, bought into the messianic mission of Israel becoming “a light unto the nations” (Isaiah) by collaborating with the moral enlightenment of the West which brought Jewish emancipation in 19th century. The Reform Rabbi Samuel Holdheim, for example, promoted “religion allied to progress” and reiterated “the messianic task of Israel to make the pure knowledge of God and the pure law of morality of Judaism the common possession of blessing of all the peoples of the earth”. He sought to achieve this without converting them to Judaism and denying them their historic language and characteristics (Sermon, 1853).^{liii} The modern Orthodox Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch vehemently opposed Reform Judaism because it called for the reform of Judaism in the spirit of the enlightenment. However, he

... good clothes ... money in my pocket. All comfortable and happy at home; no more rags and starvation there. Come and sign the pledge, as I did, and you'll be a happy man." (Wendy Gamber, “Antebellum Reform: Salvation, Self-Control, and Social Transformation, in *Charity*, 144)

⁸ “Millennial” refers to the ideal “thousand” year reign of Jesus upon returning to earth. For some millennialists, the ideal kingdom of God begins even before the second coming and it is human beings who prepare the world to receive Jesus the monarch at its end.

too adopted such views by redefining Judaism as always having been in favor of progress and culture. He claimed the task of every Jew was to contribute as a traditional Jew to the tasks of the enlightenment which he believed were bringing about a fundamental change in the world.

“Our aims also include the conscientious promotion of education and culture, and we have clearly expressed this in the motto of our Congregation: ‘An excellent thing is the study of the Torah combined with the ways of the world’ [*Yafeh talmud torah im derekh erez*].”

“The more, indeed, Judaism comprises whole of man and extends its declared mission to the salvation of the whole of mankind, the less it is possible to confine its outlook to the four cubits of a synagogue and the four walls of a study. **The more the Jew is a Jew, the more universalist will his views and aspirations be**, the less aloof will he be from anything that is noble and good, true and upright, in art or science, in culture or education; **the more joyfully will he applaud whenever he sees truth and justice and peace and the ennoblement of man prevail and become dominant in human society**: the more joyfully will he seize every opportunity to give proof of his mission as a Jew, the task of his Judaism, on new and untrodden ground; the more joyfully will he devote himself to all true progress in civilisation and culture.” (1854)^{liv}

For Protestants and Jews the **democratic** form taken by this kind of “philanthropy,” as it was called by its purveyors, generated many popular moral reform movements that enlist the middle classes as well. The movement promoted self-improvement and character education such as temperance unions, emancipation of slaves such as the abolition movement, reeducation of the poor through productivization, institutional reform of prisons and insane asylums for treatment,^{lv} granting of citizenship and civil rights to more segments of society such as women and Jews, opening public schools for the masses, and enlightenment of the colonized countries. State legal and institutional reform goes hand in hand with the activism of citizens and the advocacy by voluntary societies. Thus, 19th century **humanitarianism** is promoted not only by aristocratic do-gooders who, like the ancient Greek philanthropists, contribute their private wealth to public good thus enhancing their own honor as altruistic elite. Its concern is **mobilization for political advocacy on humanitarian grounds**, led by middle class individuals who help constitute the newly dominant phenomenon of public opinion.

“A definition of '**philanthropy**' that couples giving with voluntarism may at first glance seem startling. In the twentieth century, the term has become synonymous with giving, particularly the enormous gifts of men like John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, or [to give it a more contemporary spin] George Soros and Bill Gates. Ironically, this definition, this coupling of lavish generosity with lavish wealth which has come to symbolize the essence of philanthropy would have puzzled most nineteenth-century Americans, particularly in the decades before the Civil War.

"For them, the term meant giving and volunteering, the personal excursions that large numbers of Americans regularly made into charity, communal self-help, and social reform, mingling their donated time and often modest sums for public ends. Rather than the privilege of the few, it was the practice and prerogative of the many. Black social activists, white abolitionists and educational patrons, even female labor reformers adopted the term, defining themselves as '**philanthropists and lovers of equal rights**' in their campaigns. If we abandon our contemporary biases and follow their lead on the basis of their definitions, the import of these activities changes dramatically. Rather than the exclusive realm of privilege and wealth, it leads directly onto the public stage on which men and women, rich and poor, black and white publicly contested for authority and power during the nation's youth."^{lvi}

The **prophetic vision was one of universal moral and spiritual reformation** to be promoted by God's chosen people through a Torah of justice, sending forth peace and prosperity from Jerusalem into the world. This undeniably inspired 19th -20th C Jews and Christians to develop philanthropic humanitarianism, but it is only in this era the ancient vision becomes a narrative for guiding a practical program by which human agents may realize the dream in their own millennial age.

The Sisterhood of Personal Service and Women's Empowerment

The Sisterhood of Personal Service was organized in the late 1880s at the initiative of liberal German rabbis in New York City congregations. It led the way in modernizing Jewish welfare support for destitute Jewish immigrants, mainly from Eastern Europe. These upper class women stepped out of their domestic domains to serve as nonprofessional social workers and welfare administrators, acting as autonomous agents of the male run United Hebrew Charities. Hannah Einstein, president of the sisterhood, describes her organization's activities:

"[The Synagogue Sisterhood of Personal Service activities include:] distinctively charitable work (including outdoor relief) through its staff of volunteer friendly visitors; religious schools; industrial and cooking schools; day-nurseries and kindergartens for children between three and six years of age whose mothers are obliged to work away from home during the day; employment bureaus for a class of applicants physically unfit for hard labor and without knowledge of a trade or business; and workrooms where various trades are taught to unskilled women. In addition to these, there have been founded social clubs and culture classes for the young women employed during the day, and afternoon clubs and classes of all kinds, including school-children's classes for vocal and instrumental music.

"The women of the Sisterhoods have become volunteer agents, and assist the probation officers appointed by the juvenile court in making complete investigations of delinquent children's characters and home surroundings; and, by keeping a close watch during the period of probation; they have been the means of saving many a child from commitment." (Hannah Einstein, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, 1905)

This phenomenon, while relatively new for Jewish women, was just a late offshoot of a broader movement of 19th C. Protestant middle class women. Such women worked both through religious organizations and secular reform movements, emerging on the political and social front as extremely active on behalf of others, even though they themselves did not yet have the right to vote. They lobbied for everything from missionary work abroad to legal reform in the prisons, and from the establishment of mandatory schools and insane asylums to the abolition of slavery. Their activism contributed very powerfully to moral reformation, for example, through temperance unions or reforming penitentiaries to become correctional facilities, not only places for penal incarceration.^{lvii} All the while they served to empower the women themselves by forming national organizations^{lviii} with vast fundraising arms and sophisticated political lobbying – just like those run by men. At the same time, they saw themselves as functioning in a womanly way, bringing in a feminine perspective to nurture and heal the world. Their ideology has been called “maternalism” – the belief that women as mothers have natural affinities for compassion that might serve society in general because of their affinity for morality, religion and compassion. For example, claiming that a woman's "peculiar texture of her mind, her strong feelings and quick

sensibilities ... especially qualify her, not only to sympathize with suffering, but also to plead for the oppressed” (Elizabeth Heyrick, British Quaker antislavery campaigner, 1828).^{lix lx}

As conservative and essentialist as that ideology might sound, it worked to justify a radical policy of women leaving the private domain to enter the public sphere in an area often ignored by male political leaders. **By helping others, one empowered oneself. That empowerment involved gaining recognition of the social value of women’s political and social activities and their organizational competence.**

American Jewish women too, though somewhat belatedly, came to assert themselves in tzedakah work as agents of distribution, moral reeducation, and supervision over the Jewish destitute. Their resources came from communal funds collected by the male leaders of the New York Jewish communal organization. In “From Priestess to Hostess: Sisterhood of Personal Service in New York City,”^{lxi} Felicia Herman masterfully captures the self-awareness and self-empowerment of these newly founded synagogue-based sisterhoods. The sisterhoods were revolutionary both by comparison to traditional tzedakah organizations that preceded them and to their future namesake, the synagogue sisterhood that replaced them in the 1920s and beyond. The later form of synagogue sisterhoods served as a social club for women, concentrating on activities for members within the synagogues, such as hosting the Shabbat Kiddush refreshments, arranging flowers and embroidering Torah covers.

The original Sisterhood of Personal Service went out into the streets to arrange "outdoor relief" (such as public soup kitchens) and entered the homes of impoverished immigrants to serve their needs, offer advice on self-improvement and Americanization. By entering the destitute homes, these Jewish women played the role of “friendly visitors,” a technical term used by these voluntary charity organizations (COS) to describe their role in monitoring welfare fraud, identifying individualized needs of immigrant families using scientific criteria, and teaching the poor how to behave morally in order to integrate into the modern American bourgeois ethos. Then, as emissaries of the exclusively male-run Hebrew tzedakah funds who raised the money, it was the women of the sisterhood who guided its distribution as they saw fit.

Besides their good work for the beneficiaries of aid, they transformed themselves as Jewish women in several ways. First, they prioritized service over financial contributions and thus reinforced the traditional value of *gemilut hasadim*, acts of loving kindness. They experienced this hands-on work as a step above their mothers and grandmothers. The historian Felicia Herman explains that women felt that **“the Sisterhood members' personal service was ethically superior to earlier forms of benevolence** and the Sisterhood's members' "devotion and personal helpfulness was a far nobler charity than that of the purse." Sisterhood members were exhorted *not* to "allow the muscles of your charity to become flaccid from want of exercise. There is a charity greater than that of giving, the charity of doing."^{lxii}

Second, the sisterhoods sought to build bridges of friendly relations with Jews of other classes and other ethnic backgrounds whom they helped. In this way, they grew and enriched themselves by stretching out their hands in outreach work.

"What distinguishes Sisterhood work is the contact of the rich with the poor, not in the position of patron and dependent, but as friends. These things are of mutual benefit; they encourage and

uplift the needy, and broaden the sympathies of the rich. [Sisterhood work was] to overcome the estrangement of one class of the Jewish population from another and to bring together the well-to-do and the poor, in the relation, not of patron and dependent, but of friend and friend. Friendly visiting is the important one [because of the] personal contact with the poor and needy."^{lxiii}

Third, they created a sisterhood with its own egalitarian ethos since women were valued for their personal service, not for the funds at their disposal.

“[Jewish women from the synagogue] who have nothing to spare for such purposes to join the Sisterhood on a feeling of absolute equality with those who have... Our reward has been abundant. Not only has our success inspired others ... but we, ourselves, have found how blessed it is for *sisters to dwell together in the unity* of humane endeavors.”^{lxiv}

Hannah Einstein, president of the sisterhoods, echoed Rabbi Gottheil's original rationale for founding the [Temple Emanu-el] Sisterhood:

“The idea that women banded together by the broader kinship of sisterhood and united for the purpose of serving humanity would make for a better womanhood.”^{lxv}

Fourth, as Felicia Herman notes, the women were in many ways subservient to the scientific methods of philanthropy demanded by the funders. The all male United Hebrew Charities was, as we saw above, very harshly rationalistic in its concern lest tzedakah itself encourage pauperism. However, they also sought to embody an alternative women's way that softened and personalized the larger world of social welfare. On one hand, the sisterhood insisted they were as cold and calculating in their discriminating charitable work as modern theory demanded:

"What distinguishes Sisterhood work is the improved method of investigation pursued along the lines of modern scientific charity ... The Sisterhoods never work from impulse, but in relieving, take into consideration the remote as well as immediate consequences of existing conditions, and treat each case on its own merit."^{lxvi}

On the other hand, Hannah Einstein asserted, in 1899, that the "natural sympathy and tact of woman made her invaluable, in gaining the confidence and responsiveness of the person whom she would relieve."^{lxvii}

Fifth, in many ways it was revolutionary for women to act in the larger political economic world, which had traditionally been the exclusive realm of middle and upper class men. To enable this move, women shaped their welfare work as seemingly continuous with their “natural” feminine domestic roles. They employed the same maternal authority and sense of duty to justify their involvement:

"In days gone by, the Jewish woman's sphere was pre-eminently the home. Indeed, was she not called the high priestess of the home? Times have, however, changed, and woman's sphere has broadened. New duties have come to her, and abreast with the spirit of the age, to the Jewess, too, have come larger duties; she is not only a mother to her children, she must of necessity become **a mother and sister to the unfortunate and poverty-stricken.**"

[In the field of charity] "there, is no one to dispute woman's rights, no male angel Gabriel standing with flaming sword at the gate, saying, 'Thus far and no farther.' Here she can be a priestess to herself and to others."^{lxviii}

In conclusion, the Sisterhoods of Personal Service, along with many women's movements in the 19th-20th C., highlight an essential dimension to the narrative of modern philanthropy, which is often overlooked. **Tzedakah work in the modern world is about self-fulfillment and self-development of the giver who is transformed by servicing the needy.** As the midrash remarks: "Greater than the benefit given by the householder giving tzedakah to the needy, is the benefit derived from the needy" (Midrash Leviticus #34). In the case of Jewish upper middle class women at the turn of the century, the transformations involved building egalitarian bonds among themselves and at least a hope of eliciting such feelings of commonality with the needy that differed radically from them in class and ethnic background. This work enhanced their Jewish identity as well. While such hands-on aid of *gemilut hasadim* to the poor might have been utterly commonplace in the medieval era, it was remarkable in the industrialized age of estrangement between classes, residential segregation and the introduction of money as a buffer between givers and recipients.

For us, living in an age sensitive to the marginalization of women, we may feel that these wealthy and privileged women were themselves discriminated against and that in many ways they were really liberating and empowering themselves by helping others. While they were aware of and celebrated their own empowerment, these women shared a sense of being "discriminated against" only in a very limited sense. As Felicia Herman notes pointedly, their achievement was subsequently lost in American Jewish women's history, since the ideology of the next generation of Jewish women led the retreat from the welfare work in the outside world back into the home and synagogue, in the form of the synagogue sisterhoods of the 1930s up to the end of the 20th C.

The Charity Organization Society⁹ and its Victorian Jewish Disciples

⁹ In 1863 Samuel Gridley Howe, pioneer of aid for the blind and president of the Massachusetts Board of State Charities (the first to be established in the United States), formulated eight principles to guide government welfare policy that encourage privatization of charity, preventive treatment, and mainstreaming of the disabled:

General Principles of Public Charity

In considering what measures ought to be taken for the care and treatment of the dependent and vicious classes, we are to bear in mind several principles.

First. That if, by investing one dollar, we **prevent** an evil the correction of which would cost ten cents a year, we save four per cent.

Second. That it is better to separate and **diffuse the dependent classes** than to congregate them.

Third. That we ought to avail ourselves as much as possible of those **remedial agencies which exist in society** - the family, social influences, industrial occupations, and the like.

Fourth. That we should enlist not only the greatest possible amount of **popular sympathy**, but the greatest number of individuals and of families, in the care and treatment of the dependent.

Fifth. That we should avail ourselves of **responsible societies and organizations** which aim to reform, support or help any class of dependents; **thus lessening the direct agency of the State, and enlarging that of the people themselves.**

Sixth. That we should build up **public institutions only in the last resort.**

The Western Jewish women active in the 19th and early 20th C. in aid to the poor, like their upper class Christian colleagues, were motivated by competing ideologies. In the Victorian age, English Jews followed the lead of English charity that had demanded the reeducation of the poor to meet bourgeois standards as well as scientific principles of charity. They applied this approach to the new Eastern European immigrants.

These activist women were sometimes caught between two Victorian ideals – reason and emotion, discretion and compassion. On one hand, as we discussed above, women took pride in their 19th C. image as naturally compassionate, but on the other, they sought to be scientific and methodical in their generosity according to the standards set by men, such as successful business entrepreneurs Rosenwald and Carnegie, whom we will discuss in the next section. The organization that embodied this "modern" scientific approach to charity was COS, the Charity Organization Society, and its ideology often shaped Jewish women's organizations as well.

"The COS was not itself a charity, but a society for organizing charity; that is, its aim was to understand the size of the problem, to help charities of which there were many dozen in the cities of Britain; to spend their money wisely. **'Method not muddle' was the slogan.**"^{lxix}

"A great deal of the charitable relief given is bestowed without discretion ... too often it is a veritable source of mischief, and has the effect of intensifying and increasing the very evil that should be its aim to alleviate and to cure." (Hannah Hyam, "Organization in Charitable Work," Report on the Conference of Jewish Women, 1902, 31)

"Charity is as much a science to be studied with care as many of the other branches of activity which require of those who would engage in them a course of study." ("Training the Philanthropic Worker," *Jewish Chronicle*, Feb. 24, 1905)^{lxx}

Committed not only to caring for the needy but helping the needy, especially refugees and immigrants, rise out of their poverty, these women were committed to education as the key to reform of character. They aimed to reform charity services, both private and governmental, which did more bad than good by corrupting the poor's character and encouraging dependency and parasitism. Therefore, aid must always be balanced with moral exhortation to self-reliance in order to remove its negative effect. Allan Ryan describes the worldview of COS which also shaped that of British and American Jewish women:

"To a later age, the COS has looked altogether too like an organized procession of Lady Bountiful figures handing out a combination of minimal relief and moral exhortation to the poor of East End London. In fact, this was what it was at pains not to be. ...What they mostly wanted was to do as much good as possible with the resources that could be brought to the **inner city poor of their day**.... Those resources should in the first place be provided by the family or friends of the needy, so that **the recipients of help were motivated to put themselves on their own feet**... The thought was rather that some of the poor were more plausible targets of assistance because they had **more aptitude for self-help** than others (the "deserving poor"). It was a moral view that the English working class itself subscribed to without any embarrassment. A line has always been drawn between the respectable and the unrespectable without any great censoriousness, but with a perfect con-

Seventh. That these should be kept as small as is consistent with wise economy, and arranged so as to turn the strength and the faculties of the inmates to the best account.

Eighth. That we should not retain the inmates any longer than is manifestly for their good, irrespective of their usefulness in the institution. (Alice Felt Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment*, 299)

sciousness that what it entails is that it is **a waste of time and effort to try to help the excessively unrespectable. No matter what their circumstances, they would make a mess of their lives, and would assuredly end up on the dole, in jail, or in the river...** The better-off owed a duty of assistance to the worst-off, but only to those who would thereby be helped **to rejoin the moral community to whose maintenance all ought to contribute.**" ^{lxxi}

Self-help presupposed education to middle class values such as respectability and prudence, and to English or American values for foreigners, and only then to developing skills and finding work. Teaching by example, the upper class women of respectability who did not have to work outside the home nevertheless presented themselves as a model for the poor women to follow, hence the importance of home visits.

"Respectability has overtones of that great English activity, keeping up appearances, but the thought behind even that activity might be less obnoxious than we usually think. **Only someone with the desire to look like a full member of the community would have the energy and foresight to get employed, stay in work, and try to improve himself. People who want to keep up appearances at least have some inkling of what it is they are trying to seem; they are "capable of assistance."**

"The ladies who did good works for the COS were given quite fierce instructions about how to treat the targets of their efforts. They were always to knock on the door before entering a house, they were always to address the women of the house as Mrs., they were to say and do nothing that implied moral, social, or economic superiority on their part. Those who gave them that advice knew why they were giving it; it was not because they would achieve an egalitarian relationship with the working-class families they were visiting. All hands agreed that the working classes yelled a good deal and addressed one another by their Christian names if not by nicknames of any degree of indelicacy. The COS understood that working-class women knew that ladies spoke nicely to each other, and that working-class women would wish real ladies to treat them as ladies too." ^{lxxii}

Victorian assistance came with expectations of morality, cleanliness, decorum, and sobriety as part of their "scientific" – but certainly not value free – approach. Scientific charity set clear standards of behavior for potential recipients of relief.

"By 11:30 the preparations are all complete.... aged men, sad-looking women, and poverty-stricken children stream gladly in; and even whilst receiving the bounty, they learn passing lessons of politeness and cleanliness, for men are required to doff their caps, and if any member of the great unwashed arrives, he or she receives a significant warning that on the next occasion the entire parcel will be soap, and soap only, if it is again so obviously needed." (*Jewish Chronicle*, May 30, 1902)

"It is not a virtue to be poor or to be sick, and this must not be the sole recommendation for relief, for both one and the other may be a man's or a woman's own fault." (Alice Model, "The Care of the Sick and Convalescent Poor," Report on the Conference of Jewish Women, 31, 1902)

In addition, Jewish care for the improved breeding of Eastern European Jewish immigrants was also motivated by English patriotism and by indigenous Jews' embarrassment at their indigent, foreign brethren and their seeming ingratitude. So Claude Montefiore, a founder of Liberal Judaism in England, wrote:

"The Anglo-Jewish community is anxious to turn these foreigners into ... citizens in the best sense of the word, responsive and awake to all the moral responsibilities of citizenship. We want them to repay the unexampled generosity of English feeling and English law by living upright lives and by associating themselves with their Christian fellow-citizens in every kind of social activity" (Claude Montefiore, letter to *The Times*, April 26, 1902 as quoted by *Jewish Chronicle*, May 2, 1902).

D. Julius Rosenwald, John D. Rockefeller,
and Andrew Carnegie: “Scientific Giving”

The End of Charity and the Empowerment of “Self-made Men”

"God helps those who help themselves." (Benjamin Franklin, *Poor Richard's Almanac*)

“**Unenlightened and short-sighted benevolence**, which, taking the care of people's lives out of their own hands, and relieving them from the disagreeable consequences of their own acts, saps the very foundations of the self-respect, self-help, and self-control which are the essential conditions both of individual prosperity and of social virtue.” (John Stuart Mill) ^{lxxiii}

“Charity is injurious unless it helps the recipient to become independent of it.” (John D. Rockefeller)

"Give a man a fish, feed him for a day. Teach him to fish, feed him for a lifetime."
(Anonymous)

“Helping the poor does not mean giving them money. In the majority of cases, that would be the very worst thing to do.” (Olivia Sage, Sage Foundation, 1906)¹⁰

“When contributors to the New York Charity Organization Society asked Mrs. Lowell, its president, how much of their contribution would go to the poor, she responded hopefully: "Not one cent." (New York Charity Organization Society) ^{lxxiv}

“The indigent has no legal claim to the kindness shown to him. He depends on the mercy of benevolent people, on their feelings of tenderness which his distress arouses. What he receives is a voluntary gift for which he must be grateful.

“To be an almsman is shameful and humiliating. It is an unbearable condition for a self-respecting man.” (Ludwig von Mises) ^{lxxv}

“In the Beginning Is the Donor” - The first and fundamental fact about foundations is that they do not start with a concept or an organization chart or a strategic plan. A foundation starts with a person, the donor. That human being, by his or her major charitable act, is the fountainhead from which all else - good, bad, or indifferent – flows.” (Waldemar Nielsen, *Inside American Philanthropy*, 10)

Julius Rosenwald^{lxxvi} (1862 –1932), born to a Jewish immigrant family from Germany, joined the charmed circle of progressive philanthropists, Carnegie and Rockefeller, after succeeding as the business magnate of Sears and Roebuck Mail Order Catalogue Company. Though many of his fellow millionaires like Rockefeller and Carnegie are often condemned as robber barons who treated their workers as cheap labor, Rosenwald actually developed a highly-successful profit-sharing plan with the rank and file

¹⁰ Plutarch tells of a Spartan who refused to give to a beggar and told him that giving his alms would only encourage him to beg all the more and that the first person who gave to him was the one who set him off in a career of disgraceful idleness (Plutarch, “Solon,” 17)

employees of his company (1916). His motivation was not compassion, however, for he did not like "sob story" philanthropy:

"Philanthropy' is a sickening word. It is generally looked upon as helping a man who hasn't a cent in the world. That sort of thing hardly interests me - I do not like the 'sob stuff' philanthropy. What I want to do is to try to cure the things that seem to be wrong. I do not underestimate the value of helping the underdog. That, however, is not my chief concern but rather the operation of cause and effect. I try to do the thing that will aid groups and masses rather than individuals."^{lxxvii}

Rosenwald has a highly-articulate approach to helping the needy, typical of mega-donors at the turn of the 20th century. He helped redefine American philanthropy as promoted by the great industrial and commercial leaders Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller.¹¹ They too rejected the traditional charity system and formulated their own approach aimed at eliminating poverty in society.¹² The historian Robert Gross captures the difference in his essay, "From Charity to Philanthropy":

From Charity to Philanthropy: "How do I define these terms? The first in time is **charity**, a complex of ideas and practices rooted in Christianity, particularly in the reformed Protestantism of the English settlers. **Charity expresses an impulse to personal service; it engages individuals in concrete, direct acts of compassion and connection to other people.** Historically, as Daniel Boorstin has noted, **philanthropy** represents a second mode of social service. Coined as a term in late seventeenth-century England, it became associated with **the Enlightenment**, for it sought **to apply reason to the solution of social ills and needs.** Philanthropy can take secular or religious forms. **Either way, it aspires not so much to aid individuals as to reform society. Its object is the promotion of progress through the advance of knowledge. By eliminating the problems of society that beset particular persons, philanthropy aims to usher in a world where charity is uncommon - and perhaps unnecessary.**"^{lxxviii}

Julius Rosenwald was born during Abraham Lincoln's presidency and the period of his Emancipation Proclamation and he was raised just a few blocks from the Lincoln residence in Springfield, Illinois. Rosenwald became very interested in the education of African Americans especially after reading Booker T. Washington's autobiography, *Up from Slavery*, in 1910.

¹¹ "Instead of giving alms to beggars, if anything can be done to remove the causes which lead to the existence of beggars, then something deeper and broader and more worthwhile will have been accomplished." John D. Rockefeller, Sr. (Ron Chernow, *Titan: The Life of J.D. Rockefeller, Sr.*, 304).

¹² "I believe that success is 95% luck and 5% ability. I never could understand the popular belief that because a man makes a lot of money he has a lot of brains. Some very rich men I know who have made their own fortunes have been among the stupidest men I have ever met in my life."

"The aim of my life is to make \$15,000 a year- \$5000 for expenses, \$5000 to be laid aside, and \$5000 to go to charity."

"It is unselfish effort, helpfulness to others that ennobles life, not because of what it does for others but more what it does for ourselves. In this spirit we should give not grudgingly, not niggardly, but gladly, generously, eagerly, lovingly." – Julius Rosenwald (cited in Nielsen, 40, 42)

"The horrors that are due to race prejudice¹³ come home to the Jew more forcefully than to others of the white race, on account of the centuries of persecution which they have suffered and still suffer." (1911).

Both the American narrative of freedom and equality embodied in Abraham Lincoln's Proclamation of Emancipation and the Biblical narrative – "*you knew the heart of the stranger for you were strangers in the land of Egypt*" (Lev. 19:34) – inspired him to reach out in particular to African Americans.

In his commitment to Negro education, Rosenwald was inspired by Booker T. Washington of the Tuskegee Institute, to whom he had been introduced by his friend, the senior partner of Goldman Sachs. He supported Tuskegee Institute and then, at the urging of B. T. Washington, agreed to address the poor state of African American education in the Southern United States by providing grants for the construction of small public schools in rural Alabama. However, he sought to encourage not dependence on charity but communal self-help, so he provided his funds as **matching grants** paired with funds raised by the local residents for their own schools.^{lxxix}

"Take, for example, a scene in Boligee, Alabama, in the winter of 1916-17. This was one of the so-called 'arousement meetings' to raise money from the local Negro community to meet Julius Rosenwald's offer of a **matching sum** to build a simple schoolhouse. We are fortunate to have an eyewitness account:

"We gathered together in a little old rickety building, without any heat, only from an old rusty stove with the stove pipe protruding out of the window where a pane had been removed for the flue... The Farmers had been hard hit that year ... The patrons and friends were all rural people, and crudely dressed... When the speaking was over we arranged for the silver offering, and to tell the truth I thought we would do well to collect ten dollars from the audience; but when the Master of Ceremonies, Rev. M.D. Wallace, who had ridden a small mule over the county through the cold and through the rain, organizing the people, began to call the collection the people began to respond. You would have been over-awed with emotion if you could have seen those poor people walking up to the table, emptying their pockets for a school... One old man, who had seen slavery days, with all of his life's earnings in an old greasy sack, slowly drew it from his pocket, and emptied it on the table. I have never seen such a pile of nickels, pennies, dimes, and dollars, etc., in my life. He put thirty-eight dollars on the table, which was his entire savings:"

"These were the people who would benefit most from the Rosenwald gift, yet they were the people who in proportion to their means were giving most. Someone with less faith in his fellow men might simply have given the sums outright without asking any matching funds, for the Negroes of Alabama were surely depressed and underprivileged. ...Rosenwald had **faith in the Negroes of Alabama - not only in their potentiality but, still more important, in their present determination and their ability to help themselves.**

"By the time of his death, Rosenwald had contributed to the construction of 5,357 public schools, shops, and teachers' homes in 883 counties of fifteen southern states at a total cost of \$28,408,520. Julius Rosenwald's personal contribution was monumental: \$4,366,519. But a fact of which he would have been still prouder was that his contribution had induced others¹⁴ to contribute still more."^{lxxx}

¹³ Rosenwald sponsored the building of many buildings for of the Y.M.C.A. for African Americans so as to provide alternative for lodging in an era where race segregation made it hard for them to find accommodations and when massive numbers of southern African Americans were migrating north.

In his scientific approach to modern philanthropy, Rosenwald was inspired by the social progressivism of Jane Addams and the Reform Judaism of his rabbi in Chicago, Emil Hirsch. Rosenwald's grandson reported that his grandfather was guided by Rabbi Hirsch to give tzedakah in such a way as to encourage social justice.^{lxxxix} Similarly, Rosenwald's partner in many such efforts, John D. Rockefeller was a devout Baptist, deeply moved by his parents' abolitionism and by the Protestant Social Gospel of his college teachers at Baptist-run Brown University.^{lxxxii} Rockefeller promoted "scientific progress carried out under God's inspiration."

Rosenwald devoted his time, energy, and money towards philanthropy, but he did so innovatively by applying the same rational methodology to tzedakah that he had pioneered in his innovative business operations (the mail order catalogue). He used to say:

"I made my money in retail trade – but when it comes to philanthropy, I'm preferably a wholesaler."¹⁵ Indeed, he argued that the only people who could actually make a success of what he called "freelance charity - direct customer-to-customer giving" - were the poor. "When Mrs. Levy gives Mrs. Lewis a little from her meager family store to help out because Lewis is unemployed, Mrs. Lewis accepts the gift with the knowledge that the tables may be turned at any time."^{lxxxiii}

The Rosenwald Fund was established in 1917 for "the well-being of mankind." Unlike other endowed foundations, which were designed to fund themselves in perpetuity, The Rosenwald Fund was intended to use up all of its funds for philanthropic purposes within 25 years of the death of the founder, because its purpose was not to preserve the memory of the donor, but to confront pressing problems of his own generation and address them scientifically.^{lxxxiv} As a result, the fund was completely spent by 1948. However, over the course of his life, Rosenwald and his fund donated over 70 million dollars to public schools, colleges and universities, museums, Jewish tzedakah especially in the Middle East and Russia, African-American institutions and built more than five thousand schools, shops, and teachers' homes in the South. These schools became informally known as "Rosenwald Schools."

While the Rosenwald schools were designed by Booker T. Washington to offer vocational training, Rosenwald by no means wished to keep these children of former slaves in servile employment. He also provided scholarships during the Depression for promising African Americans in arts, literature, science and history including such black intellectuals and artists as Langston Hughes, Ralph Ellison, James Baldwin, Kenneth Clark, Marion Anderson, and Zora Neal Hurston.

¹⁴ The matching system provided 15% of the budgets of the Rosenwald schools matched 21% donations by local blacks and whites, but also supported by 64% local taxes. Thus his private initiative created public schools and led the southern states that had ignored the needs of their black citizens to take responsibility. The schools were of course segregated, however Rosenwald also funded the Commission on Interracial Cooperation that sought to change Jim Crow social practices in the south. (Nielsen, 44 - 46)

¹⁵ Baptist minister Frederick Gates, J.D. Rockefeller, Sr.'s, principal advisor on philanthropic giving, insisted that to be "scientific," philanthropy had to deal in wholesale, not retail, giving.

Julius Rosenwald's Jewishly-motivated empathy with former slaves in the South was very publically acknowledged in his own lifetime.¹⁶ In a memorial service for the Chicago philanthropist, the rabbi of Rosenwald's congregation, Rabbi Louis Mann, also drew the connection:

“By helping the Negro, Rosenwald was motivated both intellectually and emotionally Rosenwald's devotion to the cause of uplifting the Negro was, in the light of... emotional motivation, one of the most intensely Jewish things that Rosenwald ever did ... His passionate interest in helping the black man was an ethical paraphrasing of "*remember the stranger for you, too, were strangers.*" A white man who accepted the burden of the black man! A Jew who built Young Men's Christian Associations! An American who loved men of all nations.”^{lxxxv}

Rosenwald found enormous personal satisfaction in helping others, Jews and non-Jews: “All the other pleasures in life seem to wear out, but the pleasure of helping others in distress never dies.”

Many 20th C. foundations have created a tradition of innovative scientific giving that seeks to solve basic problems and thus reshape society, especially through science and education. Andrew Carnegie launched the first pension fund for college teachers and built 2500 public libraries¹⁷ in USA.^{lxxxvi} In 1929 Sears Roebuck and Company chairman Julius Rosenwald offered a \$10,000 prize to the writer of the best answer to the question "How can Judaism best adjust itself to and influence modern life?" The competition was won by Rabbi Mordecai Kaplan who published "Judaism as a Civilization," the most influential Jewish book of its time.¹⁸ Scientific education was promoted within previously denominational colleges by offering their faculty a pension fund on condition that the university become trans-denominational. For instance, the Baptist Rockefeller with his minister-cum-director of philanthropy F. Gates reconstituted a defunct Baptist college into the trans-denominational power house for social science, the University of Chicago. With the help of Abraham and Simon Flexner, Carnegie upgraded medical education across the country (1910).^{lxxxvii} The Rockefeller Foundation won a Nobel Prize for eradicating yellow fever, and a Nobel was awarded to their chief scientist Norman Borlaug for creating “The Green Revolution” by developing new food grains like dwarf wheat and rice for India. More recently, Bill and Melinda Gates set a mission to eradicate world diseases such as malaria.

The Ford Foundation lobbied for environmental laws and set up mass membership organizations for conservation. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, concerned with health issues, invented the 911 national emergency number and services (1972) and lobbied for higher taxes on cigarettes.^{lxxxviii} Joel Fleishman, an expert in American philanthropic foundations, captured the ethos of scientific giving by big magnates when titling his book *How Private Wealth Is Changing the World*.

¹⁶ “In Mr. Rosenwald serving the stranger, we see the performance of the highest mission of the Jew. The mission of the Jew is to contribute to mankind of his idealism and enrich the world with his age-old experience as a civilized human being - to serve at the common altar.”

¹⁷ In his speech on the night the Pittsburgh library was opened, Carnegie said that when "this library is supported by the community, as Pittsburgh has wisely committed to do, all taint of charity is dispelled. Every citizen of Pittsburgh, even the very humblest, now walks into this his own Library; for the poorest laborer contributes his mite indirectly to its support." (Cited in Nielsen, 34)

¹⁸ In 2008 Charles Bronfman offered a similar competition for new directions in the American Jewish community.

Scientific Givers and "Self-made Men"

Even though **scientific giving** is purportedly an "objective" rational method of problem-solving, its narrative is also shaped by the autobiography of these magnates. Most of these wealthy givers were not traditional landed elites but self-made men. They were new industrialists in new fields created by modern scientific technology such as steel, railroads and oil. These philanthropists wanted to apply the secrets of their own private success to the potential success of the economically poor and to the improvement of society as whole. They adapted their own scientific attitude to business management and their moral stance to individual initiative in order to promote the idea that the poor could rise from rags to riches, just as they did.

Andrew Carnegie's ideas of scientific giving may be traced back more than a hundred years earlier to Ben Franklin,¹⁹ father of American secular philanthropy who was also a self-made man and a scientist. Franklin was in fact the first self-proclaimed rags to riches story of the successful self-made man as he portrays himself in his didactic, best-selling *Autobiography*. This perfect American Enlightenment thinker he was unlike the French philosophes, a commoner, businessman, self-taught, an inventor of practical gadgets such as the Franklin stove. For him material comforts were legitimate goals, as they were not for his Puritan teachers in New England. Poverty was not given or birth a determinant of one's future like the European aristocrats. Thus Ben Franklin invented a God whose motto was "God helps those who help themselves" as he wrote in his *Poor Richard's Almanac*. Yet self-help and individual happiness were not selfish. One joins with others in cooperative endeavors²⁰ to improve the world for one's own sake and for other's sake. Contributing to the public good always began, not with self-sacrifice or humility or love, but with the development the **individual's personal potential** and a pride in one's own achievements:

“Questioning the wisdom and effectiveness of ‘almsgiving,’ philanthropists like Benjamin Franklin and Andrew Carnegie sought instead **to maximize human potential**. Their distinctive style of giving established a great American tradition of **providing opportunities for individual and civic improvement**. To this day, many of us choose to give by underwriting fellowships for talented individuals, sponsoring cultural and artistic activities, or supporting educational and other "improving" organizations.

¹⁹ Ben Franklin: "I am for doing good to the poor, but I differ in opinion about the means. **I think the best way of doing good to the poor is, not making them easy in poverty, but leading or driving them out of it:**" In practice Franklin relied on leading rather than driving, on persuasion and encouragement rather than coercion. Unlike some later advocates of individualism, however, Franklin was not content merely to exhort the poor to become self-supporting. He was ever mindful of the need for **widening opportunities for self-help**, and throughout life he strove, as he put it, "to promote the happiness of mankind" by working for the establishment of conditions in which **men would be able to take care of themselves.**" (Robert Bremner, "Doing Good in the New World," 43)

²⁰ Ben Franklin founded the fire department, the University of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania militia, and many more organization for a public service that were neither forms of Christian altruism nor aristocratic philanthropy.

"Andrew Carnegie ...believed the traditional forms of charity and almsgiving perpetuated the very ills they sought to alleviate.²¹ "In bestowing charity, the main consideration should be **to help those who will help themselves**; to provide part of the means by which those who desire to improve may do so; to give those who desire to rise the aids by which they may rise; **to assist, but rarely or never to do all**. Neither the individual nor the race is improved by almsgiving."^{lxxxix22}

For Andrew Carnegie, the purpose of philanthropy is "to stimulate the best and most aspiring of the poor ... to further efforts for their own improvement."^{xc}

Being scientific, objective, and rational, meant **refusing to give in to compassion**, which, they believed, leads to indiscriminate, shortsighted, "feminine" charity that causes more damage than profit. But suppressing compassion was not always so easy, and caused its own forms of damage:

"Jane Addams of the Settlement House described her attempts at cooperation with Chicago's newly organized Bureau of Organized Charities in the bitterest terms, telling how, in attempting to conform to its "carefully received instructions," she had refused relief to a shipping clerk who had lost his job.^{xcii} A white-collar worker forced to work outside in the winter as a manual laborer, the man contracted pneumonia and died. "I have never lost trace of the two little children he left behind him, though I cannot see them without a bitter consciousness that it was at their expense I learned that life cannot be administered by definite rules and regulations; that wisdom to deal with a man's difficulties comes only through some knowledge of his life and habits as a whole; and that to treat an isolated episode is almost sure to invite blundering."^{xcii}

"In spite of this experience, Addams could never wholly reject the ideas of the 'scientific' philanthropists, for the sheer magnitude of the problems she faced seemed to require a wholesale rather than a retail approach to charity."^{xciii}

However, scientific giving is not only a rationale for *not* giving charity to the needy. Carnegie and his peers were proactively engaged in helping those who wished to help themselves become "self-made men":

"The best means of benefiting the community is to place within its reach the **ladders** upon which the aspiring can rise such as parks, and means of recreation, by which men are helped in body and mind; works of art, certain to give pleasure and improve the public taste, and public institutions of various kinds, which will improve the general condition of the people." According to Carnegie, proper philanthropy sets out ladders for those who have initiative and climbing skill. Individuals are then responsible for taking advantage of the ladders set before them."^{xcivxcv}

²¹ British economist Walter Bagehot once mordantly observed: "The most melancholy of human reflection, perhaps, is that on the whole, it is a question whether the benevolence of mankind does more harm than good." (cited in Amy Kass, *Giving Well*, xxv)

²² Dr. Walter Channing, a Boston physician from an elite family, with an extensive practice among the poor, was appalled by the way the so-called respectable turned their backs on the indigent. First, they blamed the impoverished individual for his miserable condition: "The pauper is forever looked to as the active, the sole agent in the production of his own misery. He is poor - he is squalid in dress and loathsome in his whole bearing. He is dependent upon others around him for that which he should obtain for himself... He is in a state of willing slavery, and so he must be a degraded being." Pulling back in horror from such creatures, the privileged retreated into the comforts of their own homes. To salve their souls, they contributed to charity, but it was a cold, impersonal act, paying the bills of conscience. Gone was the true spirit of charity - Christian love. "It is not much disposed to go to the lower places in society. If it aims to aid Pauperism, it does so by delegation." (Robert Gross, *Charity*, 46)

The libraries funded by Carnegie are an excellent example of this kind of giving. By helping the talented and motivated to help themselves up the ladder, scientific philanthropists saw themselves as motivated not by compassion but by prudence, not by altruism but rational self-interest. Their concern was for the social good of the whole society, rather than merely the welfare of poor individuals. In that sense their worldview was, as in many areas, continuous with those of Ben Franklin.

“The patron saint of American philanthropy is ... Benjamin Franklin,²³ the man with a business sense and an eye on his community. **For Franklin, doing good was not a private act between bountiful giver and grateful receiver; it was a prudent social act.** A wise act of philanthropy would sooner or later benefit the giver along with all other members of the community.”^{xvii}

What is most innovative in their methodology was its scientific emphasis on **studying the problem** by collecting evidence, developing a cadre of what became professional social workers to handle each individual's case,²⁴ and professionalizing the giving mechanism itself through the establishment

²³ “According to Ben Franklin, three works were particularly influential: *Bonifacius: An Essay upon the Good*, by Cotton Mather; Daniel Defoe's *Essay upon Projects*; and Plutarch's *Parallel Lives of the Noble Greeks and Romans*. *Bonifacius* was a clarion call for social activism. Massachusetts already had a well-defined rationale for philanthropic stewardship in the idea that citizens were duty bound to share their wealth with their communities. In effect, personal wealth and public gain were ideologically linked. Mather extended this notion of civic duty to include voluntarism. Toward this end, he urged his readers to embrace "an unfainting resolution to do good" through the creation of societies of "Young Men Associated." Rather than focusing on elites, he sought to mobilize men of all ranks, both young and old. "A little man may do a great deal ... of good!" Mather exclaimed. **"It is possible the wisdom of a poor man, may start a proposal, that may save a city, serve a nation!"**

Franklin fastened on his ideas, secularized them, and made them his own. To quote one of his many biographers, he transformed the notion of associated public service into "a kind of religion." The *Essay upon the Good* inspired him to "set a greater value on the character of a doer of good, than on any other kind of reputation."

Like Mather, Defoe offered a menu of potential activities, from insurance schemes to schools for women. Unlike Mather, however, he rooted these activities in self-interest. Carefully sidestepping the idea that one could buy one's way into heaven through good works, Mather gloweringly warned: "when you have done all the good that you can, reckon yourself well paid ... if you are not punished for what you do. In short, be insensible to any merits of your performance." Conversely, Defoe emphasized the ties between "Publick Good, and Private Advantage." By **linking public service to self-interest**, Defoe's work underscored the possibilities for doing well by doing good - lessons not lost on the ambitious Franklin. Plutarch cast the theme of service in more **patriotic** terms.” (Kathleen McCarthy, *The American Creed*, 15)

²⁴ In the late 19th century in England and the United States: **“Charity Organization Societies** had come into being for the express purpose of organizing voluntary and public charities to direct toward worthy families the relief-giving services of others. Their particular concern was with the poor, and especially with those individuals whose flawed character permitted them to sup at the public trough while contributing nothing to the public larder. Their **investigations of applicants** for relief-investigations that led eventually to the development of **casework methodology** and to the emergence of a **social work profession** - were meant **to individualize each poor family** so that particular flaws could be detected and overcome and independence could be regained. The Charity Organization Societies did make an effort to separate the "worthy" poor from the "unworthy" poor to help the former adequately, but the fear of encouraging pauperism led for the most part to a basic philosophy that deterred all from asking for help. In essence, the orientation of the Charity Organization toward relief was in line with the Poor Law tradition (16th century)... In many localities, Charity Organization Societies took on the job of investigating relief applicants for public agencies, a job they had assumed very early for private relief societies.”

“The Charity Organization was bent upon preventing pauperism. To aid in this process of reformation, Charity Organization Societies engaged heavily in "Repressive Work," the detection of fraud through the establishment of "Confidential Exchanges," and in "Provident Work," the establishment or promotion of "various well-proved schemes for the encouragement of thrift and self help." (Axinn, *Social Welfare*, 112)

of foundations. Scientific giving has its own self-conscious methodology drawn from the magnates' business world:

“The strategy of the early leaders of the Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Commonwealth foundations regarded themselves as applying the scientific method to grant making. For them, the scientific method involved:

- (1) getting the facts right by research and/or surveys;
- (2) identifying the problem clearly and precisely;
- (3) studying a number of potential options for action;
- (4) identifying those whose help would be needed or whose opposition must be neutralized in order to achieve the objective; and only then
- (5) developing a plan of action that included a clearly defined objective, benchmarks of progress, and methods of gathering data to evaluate accomplishment. This, in a nutshell, is strategic thinking.”^{xcvii xcviii}

Of course, their “scientific” method was no better or worse than the theories of economy and human motivation on which they were based. The ideology of scientific givers was reinforced by theories such as *laissez faire* liberal economic theory that holds that the best government is that which governs least, for the economy is self-regulating. Hence government intervention must be avoided and private initiative should handle poverty in businesslike ways rather than with endless government handouts. Other scientific theories that guided the magnates included Social Darwinism which preached that unbridled economic competition was the best key to progress, so distributions based on charity supported weakness and corrupted the otherwise self-reliant.

Andrew Carnegie's lament was that "It were better for mankind that the millions of the rich were thrown in to the sea than so spent as to encourage the slothful, the drunken, the unworthy." The intellectual roots of this kind of thinking can be traced to 19th century British philosopher Herbert Spencer, father of so-called "Social Darwinism" who coined the term "survival of the fittest." Adherents of Social Darwinism believed that observed inequalities between people represented a natural process by which the "fit" (successful people) rose to the top of social and economic hierarchies, and the "unfit" (the poor and needy) were weeded out. Since political and social institutions (such as welfare and charity) cannot permanently alter this process, the thinking went, these institutions created a disservice to society by delaying the inevitable population decline of the unfit. These institutions created pain by providing artificial incentives for the unfit to reproduce. Margaret Sanger, the pioneer for birth control who founded Planned Parenthood, was a Social Darwinist who promoted contraceptives to discourage the reproduction of "unfit" people. In her 1920 book *Woman and the New Race*, Sanger defined birth control as "nothing more or less than the facilitation of the process of weeding out the unfit, of preventing the birth of defectives or of those who will become defectives."^{xcix}

In the same spirit but with different business techniques and scientific theories, the mega-philanthropists of the early 21st century seek to bring their business expertise to bear on their charitable activities in multiple ways. The 21st century generation of scientific philanthropists still oppose government panaceas. Many today would argue that the economic experience of the last half of the 20th century shows that wars against poverty, whether through World Bank aid to third world lands or welfare supports and job retraining for the socially marginal poor in Western lands, do not help. The culture of poverty^c is thought to prevent development and the character traits of such

impoverished individuals and societies are condemned morally. People are seen as needing more of the protestant ethic of capitalism or the bourgeoisie values of industriousness, rational planning and delayed gratification. But they also need structural changes to their economies and governmental policies so as to encourage individual initiative. Again, the businessman – now called the entrepreneur – is the hero who can redeem humankind applying his economic success to a new kind of philanthropy:

First, by introducing **managerial procedures** that bring high standards, efficiency and accountability to the good works, often led by people moved by humanitarian motives rather than business skills and attitudes.

Second, by **innovative entrepreneurial approaches** such as typical of venture capital. Here hands-on engagement goes with an investment orientation where the donors and the recipient do-gooder organization are in a so called joint venture.

Third, by applying long term **strategic thinking** about the problem and developing alternative solutions.²⁵

Fourth, by brokering the philanthropy, using networking and organizational skills both to raise money and to set the institution on a path of responsible growth.

Fifth, by focusing on **catalytic action to mobilize a large public** to support the endeavor and to lobby with political and economic magnates from one's social elite.

Often this progressive philanthropy is committed to social change and so must be more political in nature than that of Carnegie's generation.^{ci} For example, consider Jeff Skoll, founder of eBay who promotes social entrepreneurship:

“Each year, we find innovative social entrepreneurs from around the world – people like Paul Farmer of Partners in Health or Ann Cotton of Camfed – and we support them over a multi-year period. In the words of one of my heroes, John Gardner, we are ‘betting on good people doing good things.’

In 2004, I resurrected my original vision of telling stories that make a difference in the world by creating Participant Media [that] has released movies, including *The Kite Runner*, *Charlie Wilson's War*, *An Inconvenient Truth* ... [to] impact social issues – human rights, Afghanistan, climate change and so on. I believe that good stories well told can inspire and compel social change.

In 2009, I started the Skoll Global Threats Fund to deal with urgent threats that imperil humanity. The first five issues are climate change, Middle East peace, nuclear weapons, pandemics and water scarcity. In the meantime, I will continue to tell stories that awaken

²⁵ **Scientific Giving: The Difference between the Gifts of Money and Service by John D. Rockefeller**

"Perhaps just here lies the difference between the gifts of money and service. The poor meet promptly the misfortunes which confront the home circle and household of the neighbor: The giver of money, if his contribution is to be valuable, must add service in the way of **study**, and he must help to attack and improve underlying conditions. Not being so pressed by the racking necessities, it is he that should be better able to attack the subject from a more **scientific standpoint**....Great hospitals conducted by noble and unselfish men and women are doing wonderful work; but no less important are the achievements in research that reveal hitherto unknown facts about diseases and provide the **remedies** by which many of them can be relieved or even stamped out. The first appeals to the sentiments overpoweringly, but the second has the head to deal with. All over the world the need of dealing with the questions **philanthropy with something beyond the impulses of emotion is evident**" (John D. Rockefeller, "The Difficult Art of Giving").

enlightened self-interest, activate citizen engagement, and galvanize political will. I will continue to double down on innovative solutions that have enduring social impact. And I will continue to support catalytic mechanisms...that unite the forces of change from all corners and cultures of humanity."^{cii}

The givers as social entrepreneur prefer building a new society to building a building. Their concern is not to leave something permanent behind them after death, but to make changes that will be remembered and emulated in world of business and philanthropy where dynamic change is the only permanent feature of life. Thus many seek not foundations to carry their name in perpetuity but self-liquidating funds that will use all their resources to leverage massive change in short period during and after their death.

Rockefeller's Rationalized Philanthropy and the Puritan Tradition

Soma Hewa shows in her essay on the religious background of J.D. Rockefeller's scientific philanthropy that Puritan self-control and rationality underlie the Baptist education that he received as child and as an adult who consulted with Baptist ministers on all his philanthropic endeavors. Protestantism contributed to the rationalization and organization of charity in several ways. First, Puritanism rejected emotionalism in charity. The 19th C. Puritan divine Richard Baxter warned against "an irrational act of love." **It is "not fit for a rational creature to love any one farther than reason will allow us.... It very often taketh up men's minds so as to hinder their love of God."**^{ciii} The sociologist Talcott Parsons notes:

"Puritanism had no place for the easy Catholic attitude toward charity. It organized what charity it allowed to remain as **a severe discipline on a rational basis.**"^{civ} Max Weber reflects: "What such an impersonality of brotherly love, resulting from the orientation of life solely to God's will, means? **It served the glory of God precisely to the extent that all personal and human feelings were necessarily insulted by it.**"^{cv} Then Weber concludes: "'Humanity in relation to one's neighbor has, so to speak, died out....Charity became a rationalized enterprise.'"^{cvi} So too Rockefeller insisted on being systematic, not emotional in his giving.

The second feature of Puritanism that contributes to Rockefeller's worldview is the positive attitude to the production of material wealth in an efficient way. Unlike the Catholics, Puritans held that material profit was a commandment to maximize God's wealth and then apply it to public service.

"If God show you a way in which you may lawfully get more than in another way, without wrong to your soul or to any other, if you refuse this, and choose the less gainful way, you cross one of the ends of your calling, and then you refused to be God's steward, and to accept His gift and use them for Him when He requireth it."^{cvi}

The Richard Baxter's preaches about being God's trustee both in developing God's wealth and in sharing it carefully and responsibly:

"Though God needs none of our good works, yet that which is good materially- pleaseth Him, as it tendeth His glory, and to our own and other's benefit, which He delighteth in.... Man is only a trustee of the goods which have come to him through God's grace..... **Public service is God's greatest service.**" (*Christian Directory* Vol. I 1825, 456)

Rockefeller said precisely that: "The good Lord gave me my money and how could I withhold it from the University of Chicago?"^{cviii} Rockefeller argued that:

"Every right-minded man has a philosophy of life, whether he knows it or not. Hidden away in his mind are certain governing principles.... Surely, his ideal ought to be to contribute all that he can, however little it may be, whether of money or service, to human progress."^{cix}

Soma Hewa adds that it was this rationalized religious view of brotherly love that gave rise to modern philanthropic foundations and shaped Rockefeller's Baptist education.

This commitment to public service but only after rational scrutiny meant that Rockefeller, overwhelmed with requests for aid from his vast wealth had to develop a professional philanthropic delivery service. The Baptist minister and philanthropic director Frederick Gates wrote in his biography:

"In March of 1891 during an interview with [Rockefeller], he told me that the pressure of appeals for philanthropic causes on his time and strength had become too great to be borne; that he was so constituted as to be unable to give away money with satisfaction without inquiry as to the worthiness of the cause; that these inquiries were now consuming more of his time and energy than his business and indeed injuring his health, and that either he must shift the burden to other shoulders, or he must cease giving entirely."

Therefore Rockefeller was wholly in agreement with Gates in developing scientific philanthropy. Gates defines scientific philanthropy in terms of a "healing mission" devoted to search "urgently needed solutions." Therefore "scientific philanthropy is not attained with superficial remedies, palliatives, artificial reliefs. It seeks, in so far as it is wise, to find out the underlying causes and remove them, and will be content with nothing else." (Letter from Gates to Rockefeller, May 7, 1924). John D. Rockefeller himself believed that "The best philanthropy is constantly in search of the finalities - a search for cause, and attempt to cure evils at their source."^{cx}

Back to Maimonides' Highest Rung

In thinking about Rosenwald and Carnegie in the context of classical tzedakah models, their most novel idea is conducting scientific research on economic and social processes in order to change society and solve poverty. Furthermore, the classical Jewish point of view shows very little animus against giving material aid to the poor for fear it may *make* the recipient slothful. However, there is a strong connection between Maimonides' ideal form of tzedakah and Carnegie's "ladders" for the initiative-taking poor. Maimonides' highest rung of tzedakah is also about using capital to empower those individuals who already have business acumen and initiative.

As we saw above (chapter 10), Maimonides' policy of providing grants or loans as capital, job training, investment or partnership in order for an individual to escape the poverty cycle goes far beyond relief.²⁶ The free loan society whose roots go as far back as Deuteronomy 15 is not primarily

²⁶ In the Maimonidean spirit of helping the needy to pull themselves out of poverty we may cite the philanthropic work of Fred Braun's Creative Enterprises that introduced private industry to prisons in the 1970s. Thus idle prisoners now worked on such businesses as making license plates, earned the minimum wage and learned skills, paid for their room

a form of relief but an investment of assets, such that a broke farmer might use it to plant his land. Similarly, granting money to a freed slave after six years of indentured servitude (Deuteronomy 16) is also a **gift of assets**, a springboard for further independence so that the one who sold himself into slavery will not return to their previous lowly economic status.

Maimonides' most interesting idea that connects with the business model of scientific giving is that of preemptively entering into a partnership with one who may slip into poverty:

"The highest, supreme level is one who supports an Israelite who has come by hard times, by handing him a gift or a loan, or **entering into a partnership** with him, or finding work for him, in order to strengthen his hand, so that he would have no need to beg from other people. Concerning such the Torah says, "*you are to sustain him, like a stranger or a resident, that he may live with you*" (Lev. 25:35) – meaning: sustain him, so that he will not lapse into poverty." (Mishne Torah, Gifts to the Poor 10:7-14)

Partnership is neither charity nor maintenance and it need not be merely a one-time transfer of funds. The philanthropist may add expertise as well as capital, since the ongoing relationship between partners allows the poor to gain by virtue of the vision and business skill of the investor/philanthropist.

Carnegie and Rosenwald suggested an investment plan which goes far beyond such individual entrepreneurship. They drew their models from the Christian notion of the loyal steward, serving as a trustee of the society. Andrew Carnegie writes in his "The Gospel of Wealth":

"Thus is the problem of rich and poor to be solved. The laws of accumulation will be left free, the laws of distribution free. Individualism will continue, but the millionaire will be but a **trustee for the poor**, entrusted for a season with a great part of the increased wealth of the community, but administering it for the community far better than it could or would have done for itself.^{cx1} ...

"Time was when the words concerning the rich man entering the kingdom of heaven were regarded as a hard saying.... **The gospel of wealth but echoes Christ's words. It calls upon the millionaire to sell all that he hath and give it in the highest and best form to the poor by administering his estate himself for the good of his fellows, before he is called upon to lie down and rest upon the bosom of Mother Earth!**"

By investing in educational institutions that maximize the talents of the underprivileged, they provide a new form of capital for society as well as for the individual. Free or subsidized education provided in Carnegie's libraries and universities might be compared to the provision of capital resources in the Biblical *geulah* (redemption) system of Leviticus 25:25-30, 39-55. In the *geulah* model, when one is descending the economic ladder, help is proffered to reverse that process. Like unemployment insurance it provided relief but, more importantly, like in a small business loan, one's brother used to buy the poor out of hock, bankruptcy or slavery, and even reacquire their land, thus redeeming them so they could once again become self-sufficient. If one does not have a redeemer, then one redeems oneself presumably by working and saving. Maintenance aid is offered temporarily, just enough so that one who

and board to the state and saved money to be used to launch their post-prison rehabilitation. Braun said of his projects in Leavenworth: "We believe our recidivism rate is about 50% of the normal rate. When they [the prisoners] get out, they have jobs, confidence, money and contacts – which is a good way to stay out" (Nielsen, 195-199).

Eugene Lang created the "I Have a Dream" program that guarantees a free college education to Hispanic and African American high school students from poor neighborhoods. It began in 1981 when he returned to the public school from which he had graduated as a son of Jewish immigrants. As the graduation speaker he made the pledge to support all the graduates who could get into college. Now over 150 such programs exist countrywide. (Nielsen, 212)

has been helped may return to work and rebuild their solvency and independence, enabling them to help others in the future. Far beyond individual help, the *geulah* system provides legal amnesty for all debts every seven or 50 years. It also redistributes the basic capital – land, not unlike the GI bill of rights or the Israeli government giving all veterans a sum of money to get an education or start a business. Every 50 years the Jubilee also removes all excess land and slaves the rich have managed to accumulate. Today a stiff death tax might serve a similar function in leveling the playing field for the next generation. Interestingly, Carnegie thought the mega-wealthy should not leave too much as an inheritance to their children lest the unearned wealth corrupt their children's industriousness.

"A rich person had three choices: he could give his money to his family, bequeath it in his will to good causes, or use it during his lifetime to improve society. Only the third option was really acceptable. **Each generation should create its own great fortunes from scratch; indeed, inherited wealth was a social and personal curse.**"^{cxii}

Like Carnegie, the Biblical *geulah* (redemption) system provides ladders for individuals, but unlike what he envisioned, it also provides government help in the form of bankruptcy law and a universal grant system. Carnegie's narrative of giving is more about the super wealthy entrepreneur helping out young entrepreneurs to find opportunities so that they too may contribute to commonwealth and progress. Leviticus 25 is more about mutual help that includes relief as well as capital. A whole society becomes a network of givers, offering each other the means to become economically productive. Such means take on different forms – farm land as capital, money as interest-free business loans, freedom from financial debt as well as redemption of one's body from debtor slavery – all so that one can support one's family.

Rosenwald's approach to African American school construction takes another big step beyond Carnegie's ladders and Maimonides' private business partnership. Rosenwald tackled the deeper and wider problem of reconstructing a community. In essence, he offered a whole community a **partnership** which would make them not only self-supporting but raise their social level. In fact, he meant to circumvent unjust political discrimination that denied these African Americans public funding for their schools and opportunities for remunerative employment. As a Jew, Rosenwald was thoroughly aware of this. Through education, acquiring skills of democratic organization, and rational planning the community also gained power economically and politically. Social Darwinism, individual competitiveness and laissez faire government could not be his answer to *this* problem as it might be for the talented white poor helped by Carnegie and Rockefeller as well. Such partnerships with communal associations of self-help will be considered further later in this chapter.

In short, what had led so many successful 19th-20th century capitalist philanthropists, especially Jews, to preach and support the finding of jobs and the extension of business loans to promote entrepreneurs, was their faith, illustrated in their own lives as immigrants who made good in capitalist lands, in the modernization narrative. That narrative sees the ideal society as composed of self-sufficient economic persons engaged in mutually beneficial free trade. The ideal world is similarly composed of self-sufficient nations called "developed" nations, who trade among themselves. Further economic success, achieved with the help of technology and capital, is considered the key to all good things. A single-minded concentration of economic competitiveness and material productivity will automatically produce the fruits of prosperity which are the surest resource and index of happiness in all aspects of life. This is the modern "practice of treating economic growth as a social good of autonomous and ultimate worth. A whole ideology – a framework of justifying beliefs – has risen within society shaped by this practice," for we have "faith in progress."

“We assume that whatever problems arise along the way will be solved by technological advance and economic growth.”^{cxiii}

Those who are “generous” and those who feel a responsibility to help the “underdeveloped” individuals and nations to “develop” want to provide them with technology and capital. They are even willing to violate the basic principle of capitalism that “surplus is employed to create the means to gather additional surplus.”^{cxiv} These philanthropic capitalists devote their surplus wealth to help others generate their own private wealth. In an interesting way they have connected themselves to the traditional language of voluntary *tzedakah*, charity and Muslim *sadaqa*, according to which, the “surplus” is a gift of God meant to be passed on and shared. Yet here, in the most untraditional way, the surplus is “invested” under a regime of business discipline, so as to make the needy productive. To build up the minds of the undeveloped nations and the not yet successful businesspeople, requires reeducation to a work and business ethic of hard work and strict bottom line capitalism. It demands a restructuring of traditional societies, such as that required by economists of the IMF and World Bank regarding debt-burdened underdeveloped countries. These societies are “muscled” into trying to function more efficiently in modern economic terms and to encourage a regime of disciplined rational self-interest where property is reinvested for greater and greater productivity.

The Critique of the “Robber Baron” Scientific Philanthropists

"The philanthropic streak in Americans is merely a euphemism for selfishness." "Perhaps the most over-rated virtue in our list of shoddy virtues is that of giving.... Nearly always giving is a selfish pleasure, and in many cases is a downright destructive and evil thing. One has only to remember some of the wolfish financiers who spend two-thirds of their lives clawing a fortune out of the guts of society and the latter third pushing it back.... Such a nature never has enough and natures do not change that readily." (John Steinbeck)^{cxv}

Many criticisms can be leveled against the scientific philanthropists. In their exclusive focus on rugged individualism they grossly underestimated the systemic and structural economic barriers that limit the poor's mobility as a class. One cogent criticism of this vast philanthropic work is aimed at the naiveté of believing that all the working classes needed was some education and some business opportunities to climb out of poverty. Certainly a few talented individuals and perhaps some communities were thus enabled to become successful entrepreneurs. But the overwhelming majority could not emerge from poverty precisely because robber barons like Carnegie were "skin flints" in terms of the low wages and exploitive hours under which they employed their workers and by which they accumulated their own vast wealth. In the long-run it is not the personality or even the idealism of the donors that is to be judged. It is the very structure of the world capitalist economy that grows by redistributing the wealth of labor and raw materials of poor countries, classes and regions into their own pockets. At time, this critique is harsh, sarcastic and seemingly unbalanced, but it needs to be voiced so as to dampen the enthusiastic adoption of the Maimonidean principle of *tzedakah* to become financially independent, which lacks any prophetic critique of the deeper structural and spiritual dynamics of poverty and exploitation.

The science of business management that the Carnegies and Rockefellers wished to apply to the poor was itself ruthless in its treatment of the working poor in the industries of these “robber barons.”²⁷ They scientifically calculated the lowest possible salary scales²⁸ and the harshest work conditions necessary to maximize the profits in their own industrial empires with which they could then be charitable towards the public as whole. Their opposition to government welfare for the poor was not consistent with the benefits and favors they themselves obtained from the government in securing their monopolies and other preferential treatment.

In his thought provoking book, *Until Justice and Peace Embrace*, the Calvinist theologian Nicholas Wolterstorff adopts much of the critique against the capitalist and imperialist world economy articulated by the Marxist Catholic Liberation theology of South America. In doing so he implicitly launches a critique of Maimonides’ highest level of tzedakah and all those 19th-20th philanthropists who adopted it as their banner in the name of individual and national economic development and self-sufficiency. In particular, he rejects the 16th C. Protestant emphasis on the poor person’s own character flaws as the chief cause of their continued poverty. In rejecting the simplistic faith in science and rationality, Wolterstorff, in the Calvinist tradition, calls the “faith in progress” idolatry.

A new religious anti-capitalist narrative with Biblical roots has developed since the 1960s. It is associated with **liberation theology** that sees the world economy as a single system in which the developed make their wealth *at the expense* of those on the periphery. Allegedly monopolistic international capitalism, which insists on cheap labor, intensive raw material crops, and a mono-crop economy for export, prevents the poor nations or classes from competing and developing. In the name of "development," a false cover for selfish avarice, the capitalist economy undermines the social systems without bringing the third world companies or individuals within reach of economic success. Colonialism reduced many lands to poverty and reoriented their economies to one crop cash crops that served Western markets, but did not move the nations toward economic development. The economic problem is more about lack of opportunity than lack of character, or rather, it is more about power relations of exploitation and unfair competition between rich and poor, Western and otherwise. The amount of actual aid provided is infinitesimal compared to the deep and growing need and the Western surpluses. The national economies are in fact prevented from real growth by the capitalist system itself.

Even without a Marxist economic ideology, there are many pragmatic criticisms to be made both of the robber-baron philanthropists in particular and more importantly of the American government policy that encourages the donation of private philanthropic funds by wealthy private through foundations that receive a tax-deduction. While the researcher Waldemar Nielsen praises the far-sightedness of Carnegie, Rockefeller and Rosenwald and the invention of the American

²⁷ **Robber baron** is a pejorative term used for a powerful 19th century United States businessman and banker. The term may now relate to any businessman or banker who used questionable business practices to become powerful or wealthy. The term derives from the medieval German lords who illegally charged exorbitant tolls on ships traversing the Rhine. It was popularized by Matthew Josephson during the Great Depression (1934) and expressed public scorn for big business. After the Depression, business historians, led by Allan Nevins, began advocating the positive image of the "Industrial Statesman" thesis (*John D. Rockefeller: The Heroic Age of American Enterprise*. 1940).

²⁸ “The British economist Arthur Young wrote: “Everyone but an idiot knows that the lower classes must be kept poor or they will never be industrious.” (William Cohen, *Charity*, 401)

philanthropic foundation, he sounds a dire warning about the irrationality of the American foundations and the waste of their philanthropic potential:

“A full-length portrait of donorship and foundation formation also helps us understand the odd inconsistencies and contradictions: That some of the toughest old brutes in business were openly sentimental when it came to philanthropy; or that some donors who were the most cynical in money matters were remarkably naive in their charities.”^{cxvi}

Most big gifts are allocated and private foundations are created at the moments that their otherwise effective donors are least able to think clearly – as they retire or upon their death beds:

“To be an aging or elderly apprentice in philanthropy presents heavy, even fearsome, intellectual, physical, and emotional demands. It is a simple enough matter to decide whether or not to make a gift to United Way, and if so how much to give; or even to decide whether one's alma mater needs a new dormitory. But if one seriously undertakes an effort to help cut the crime rate, raise educational achievement, improve health care, or improve protection of the environment, then the conceptual and the operational problems can be enormous. If a good many new donors, under most circumstances, turn out to be less than spectacularly effective, we should not be surprised.

"An even more difficult and almost equally frequent situation is that of the deathbed donor, Most donors go about setting up their foundations, given all the very emotional aspects of the matter, is predictably mostly amateurish, if not irrational.”^{cxvii}

While Carnegie, Rockefeller and Rosenwald set their goal to be scientific philanthropy, in fact the overwhelming number of big donors are as unscientific and as unbusiness-like as possible:

“Since the great majority of donors in the past, most all of them men, have almost by definition been individuals with long experience in establishing major enterprises, it might logically be assumed that in launching what is often the last great enterprise of their life they would seek sound advice from individuals is familiar with the field, review the experience of other institutions, assemble a board and staff of proven competence in philanthropy, and define the program of the new foundation on the basis of some study of social or scientific needs and opportunities.

"But in most cases, if they turn to anyone other than a family member or old friend it is usually to their lawyer, accountant, or financial advisor. Tax, legal, and financial considerations take priority. Typically, donors make no study of the work of other successful and unsuccessful foundations. Quite often they will not define any clear philanthropic objectives of their own and will include in the foundation's charter simply the boilerplate language ordained by the tax code. They choose their trustees not for their competence in and commitment to philanthropy but for their familiarity. Thus the process is more often a deeply personal and emotional one than an exercise in rationality and objectivity.

"It makes understandable why nearly one-third of new large foundations-created by deathbed donors or indifferent donors without any real interest or experience in the nonprofit world - fall into serious and sometimes disastrous difficulties after their creation. It helps us understand why so many foundations, given money and little else by their founder, muddle along in mediocrity. And it helps explain why so many foundations fall under the control of staff professionals after the donor is gone: they were abandoned orphans from the start.”^{cxviii}

Thus while governments may be inefficient and haphazard charity motivated by sentimentality may backfire and certainly fails to solve the root problems of poverty, the aura of the greatest scientific philanthropists has become a figleaf to hide the massive waste and irrationality of most private philanthropy which are subject almost no checks and balances, though they earn large tax deductions that decrease tax dollars that could be allocated by the government. .

American Philanthropy and the Reconstruction of Nations

The American scientific philanthropists of the 20th C. have at times set their sights on reconstructing whole societies or major sectors within them, at times at the behest of the American government and in pursuance of its global policies and at times by developing their own “foreign policy” through massive NGOs under the banner of international humanitarianism. As Oliver Zunz notes in his enlightening book, *Philanthropy in America*, the reconstruction of the society of African-American former slaves in the South was the first test-case for long-term, broad-based societal reform by private philanthropists after the failure of the federal government’s Reconstruction.

Without directly attacking the racial disenfranchisement of the African-Americans, these philanthropists believed that improved education and economic opportunities might lead eventually to the political rights they deserved. For example, George Peabody (1867), the Slater Fund (1882), John D. Rockefeller (1902) and Julius Rosenwald (1917), discussed above, sought to improve the educational, agricultural and health situation of the whole African-American community in the South by building schools, by eradicating hookworm and by providing agricultural training.^{cxix} More radically, many of these philanthropists supported the founding of the NAACP. In the 1960s the heirs to these earlier foundations became much more political in their funding.²⁹ For example, Julius Rosenwald’s daughter, Edith Stern helped support voter registration among African Americans^{cxx} and the Ford Foundation paid for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund to prosecute civil rights violations in that era.^{cxxi} These same foundations were the primary partners in the Great Society of President L. B. Johnson in the mid-1960s.

Even beyond domestic policy, the magnate philanthropists and their foundations contributed to implementing their own foreign policy. In 1903 Andrew Carnegie helped build the Hague Peace Palace as the permanent seat of the international court of arbitration. In 1907 he promoted international peace efforts, such as those in Central America and established an international court for Central American disputes. In 1909 Rockefeller established a worldwide foundation to promote world health.

²⁹ The use of tax-exempt charitable contribution to advance political goals remains a controversial issue and it has been the subject of Congressional and judicial debate. “Lawmakers, regulators, and philanthropists alike have invested much effort throughout the twentieth century to maintain a solid distinction between philanthropy and politics. Yet promoting the common good often leads to political advocacy. The prevailing view (from Justice Learned Hand, 1930) was that philanthropy could educate but it could not advocate, a distinction that depended on an artificial boundary between communication and lobbying. In this dichotomy, policymaking is eligible for a tax exemption but political strategizing is not.” (O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 77, 95)

These visionary mega-donors were also involved in reconstructing new and renewed nations as well as trying to rescue the Jewish people. After WW I the US government encouraged aid to the newly independent Soviet Russia and later to resettlement of Jews in farming:

“After the Russian famine of 1921, Herbert Hoover, with President Harding's official endorsement, had worked with many American relief organizations to feed starving Russians. The Joint Distribution Committee, which had worked efficiently during the First World War, operated in areas where Jews were numerous, and Felix Warburg, chairman of the Committee, began raising money for permanent settlements for Russian Jews in the rural Ukraine and along the Crimean Sea in support of a Russian government plan to move Jews to the countryside. Rosenwald, who believed relocation³⁰ would help persecuted Jews, joined in this effort to turn Russian Jews into farmers. By 1928, after a series of initial gifts, Rosenwald had pledged over eight million dollars. John D. Rockefeller Jr. contributed \$500,000 ‘out of respect for Rosenwald's and Felix Warburg's interest in the work.’”^{cxxii}

After WW II the Marshall Plan involved many private foundations though the bulk of funds came from the US government. On a more personal level CARE package was invented:

“To foster the new charitable internationalism, a plan was devised to encourage all Americans to send packages abroad. By 1946, with pledges the Cooperative for American Remittances in Europe or CARE made it possible for every donor to make his personal mark by identifying package recipients. By personalizing contributions to such a large-scale organization, CARE became associated in everybody's mind with enlarging the meaning of the ‘old American custom of neighbor helping neighbor. At the end of its first five years, CARE packages had reached one out of every five families in Germany and one out of every five Austrian families.’”^{cxxiii}

During the Cold War American governments invited philanthropists to support the free flow information behind the Iron Curtain like radio Free Europe. In the 1970s many American Jewish organizations pressured the US government to liberalize the regime in the USSR and to let persecuted Russian Jews emigrate to Israel.

“In the 1970s, George Soros joined the Ford Foundation in backing Helsinki Watch. In the 1980s, he established Popper Fellowships at Columbia and New York University, and helped dissidents travel out of Eastern Europe and develop contacts in the West. In 1985, he opened a Soros Foundation in his native Hungary, which had retained the least repressive regime in the Soviet bloc.”^{cxxiv}

A prime example of aggressive democratic nation-reconstruction is modeled by the Jewish émigré from Communist Hungary, George Soros. With or without the approval of the American government, George Soros has invested enormous sums in the democratization of newly-liberated Eastern European lands, as well as a failed attempt to open China to free information by offering to create twenty readings rooms on scientific knowledge.

“George Soros, the most emblematic, and most committed of the foundation leaders. Soros, the richest of Diaspora philanthropists, took an approach towards his native Hungary that was much like Andrew

³⁰ Rosenwald did not sponsor Zionist resettlement organizations because he did not think *Eretz Yisrael* could provide the economic infrastructure needed for massive settlement of Russian Jews. But he did seek to address worldwide anti-Semitism which was at the root of Jewish suffering by conducting a long and eventually successful campaign to stop the “scientific philanthropic” efforts of Henry Ford who paid for the massive distribution of the forged anti-Semitic tract, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. (Nielsen, 45-46)

Carnegie's towards his native Scotland a century before. But the stakes were so much higher in Hungary, where Soros had learned firsthand the damage that totalitarian regimes could do. As a young Jewish boy, he had survived the Nazis, and as a man he had fled the communists.

"In America, Soros had made the lion's share of his fortune as an unblinking currency speculator. In 1979, he created The Open Society Fund, partly to leave his children some good work to do and partly to enjoy a tax break. But behind what might have been at the time a routine investment in philanthropy on the part of a wealthy American was a larger idea. Ever since Soros had fled totalitarianism, he had reflected on the need for liberty and openness. As a student at the London School of Economics, he had deepened these thoughts in reading Friedrich Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom* and [the Jewish émigré] Karl Popper's *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Both men were his teachers. They had fled Nazi Austria and loomed large in defending the values of freedom against totalitarian regimes. In their fight against economic controls and for an open society, they were an inspiration to Soros much as, a century earlier, Herbert Spencer had been in justifying the gospel of wealth to Carnegie."²⁹ cxxv

Thus the magnate philanthropists have developed in some cases their own foreign policy to accompany their economic resources that outshine many small nation's full budgets and often the United States' foreign aid budget. These efforts at reconstructing regions and nations provide a background for our next theme the American Jewish community's engagement in nation-building of the Jewish people in Israel as the project of both philanthropists and rank-and-file Jews as well.

E. Philanthropy as Nation-Building: Zionism and the American Jewish Civil Religion

“We don't call it philanthropy, we call it nation building. The Hadassah organization is the owner of its properties in Israel. We feel that we have a role, that we have a partnership with the nation in Israel.” - Nancy Falchuk (International president of Hadassah Women's organization that built Hadassah hospital in Jerusalem)^{cxxvi}

The next section examines the Zionist vision of a social welfare state as part of a utopian plan of social engineering. It also explores how the philanthropy of Western Jews in the Diaspora, chiefly capitalist magnates and bourgeoisie Jewish national associations such as the JDC (Jewish Distribution Committee), has shared deeply in the international nation-building narrative of Zionism. It is important to note that through the appeal of this imaginative and powerful narrative, the tasks of tzedakah have transformed private individuals in Western lands into self-appointed leaders taking responsibility for a whole people and their political-social-cultural growth toward self-sufficiency.

One person who models the gradual transformation from scientific philanthropy to the idea of redeeming a whole people is the son of Julius Rosenwald. **William Rosenwald** (1903- 1996) was an American business executive, director of his father's Sears Roebuck Company who later invested in Western Union International. He followed in his father's footsteps on the board of Tuskegee Institute for 40 years. In the mid-1930s he organized a family effort to provide assistance to relatives in Nazi Europe eventually rescuing almost 600 family members whom he provided with work and places to live. In 1939, in response to the Nazi threat to the Jewish people, he worked both on the national and international level to establish the nationwide United Jewish Appeal (UJA) and Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS). Rosenwald stated that:

"There is the thought in my mind -- and that I would like to get across to the Jews of America -- that to the extent that the Jews as a whole help their suffering brethren, we will fortify the Jews of all countries against anti-Semitic onslaughts (1935)."^{cxxvii}

While the American Jewish community was not effective in saving many of the Jews threatened by Hitler, it did emerge with new resolve and organizational drive and mass appeal when the threat to the new State of Israel and potential genocide of its citizens by Arab assault loomed. Rising very small amounts in 1940 the UJA contributions in 1948 equaled 4 times the American Red Cross and 13 times the American Cancer Society's campaigns.^{cxxviii}

Herzl and Mass Philanthropy

“No one has ever thought of looking for the Promised Land in the place where it really is – and yet it lies so near. It is here, within ourselves! For everyone will carry over there, in himself, a piece of the Promised Land. This one, in his head, that one, in his hands, the third in his savings. The Promised Land is where we carry it.

I know where the country lies - in ourselves! In our capital and our labor.” (Theodore Herzl, June 18, 1895)

"You have hitherto been only a philanthropist, I want to show you the way to become something more." (Theodore Herzl to Baron de Hirsch (1895))

Pre-State Zionism continues both bottom-up self-help traditions (such as self-help associations) and the top-down philanthropic humanitarian scientific giving model (such as Montefiore's international campaigns for defending Jewish rights, providing planned migration and settlement and education for productivization). Yet it utterly transforms them, applying both to the building of a national political movement. Three aspects of this process are relevant to our discussion.

First, Zionist ideology rejected dependence on great Jewish philanthropists and sought to be a self-help movement. Initially, in the foundational era of Zionism, in 1895 when Theodore Herzl first envisioned a renewed state of Israel but had not yet founded the Zionist Congress (1897), he appealed to the great philanthropists Edmond de Rothschild and Baron de Hirsch who, like Carnegie, were helping individuals become independent and productive. They helped resettle migrants and build businesses such as those of Jewish cowboy *gauchos* in Argentina and wineries in Eretz Yisrael with French technocratic overseers. But these philanthropists were not interested in a self-governing Jewish state.

So Herzl declared that “we” would create a grass roots national movement that would organize and fund itself. Many Zionist fundraising efforts sought to embody that ethos. For example, the Jewish National Fund,^{cxxix} *Keren Kayemet L'Yisrael* (better translated as the Perpetual National Trust) sought to buy lands for the building of Israel as nation. Following Herzl’s vision, they emphasized small contributions by the rank and file so that the “redemption of the people would be by the people themselves.” The J.N.F. blue box was placed in many homes and passed around in many Jewish schools, becoming a national symbol of pride and an educational tool, not just a collection box.

Such Zionist economic organizations revived and reshaped traditional Jewish ideas and forms of *tzedakah* such as the Biblical redemption of the land, a membership tax for public use, and loans for economic rehabilitation. In the work of the JNF, many aspects of the *Geulah* model of Leviticus 25 were embodied anew: the contribution was not called *tzedakah* but *geulah* – redemption; every Jew was considered a fellow brother helping in the auto-emancipation of the land of Israel; the land was viewed as a national trust, never to be sold; the permanent land trust was the basis of economic self-sufficiency for individuals and for the nation; as in Leviticus 25, the benefits were for Jews only, and Arabs were excluded from use of the national land trust.

Another Zionist fund created in 1921, *Keren HaYesod*, the Foundational Fund,^{cxxx} collected an annual obligatory tax on all members supporting the Jewish National Home, as defined by the British Mandate. Thus contributions were viewed as a membership fee in the Jewish people like the half shekel paid annually to the Tabernacle which went towards paying for public sacrifices for the common good. The Israel Bonds organization launched by David Ben Gurion in 1951 revived the use of loans to support economic rehabilitation, though unlike the *Gemach* funds, these loans did bear a small rate of interest. These loans rehabilitated the whole nation and an entire economy, not just individuals as their Biblical and rabbinic precursors did.

Herzl agreed with the international Jewish humanitarian philanthropists in defining the issue of Jewish poverty as an international one to be solved by rational policies of emigration and resettlement, whose application required acquiring the essential tool of political influence. He also agreed that the Jewish character must be reeducated towards manual labor and that the masses must be retrained for productive labor using new skills and technologies. But on the national scale he insisted on self-help, which meant democracy, and on the importance of a historic myth to lead people to the Promised Land thereby restoring their dignity and activism. In other words, it is not just a job one needs, but a calling. Not just remunerative employment and a better quality of life, but an opportunity to make a meaningful and inspiring contribution to human progress and to fulfilling Jewish national destiny. These were big dreams that appealed not only to the indigent Eastern Europeans but also to the marginalized Western Jews, who were rejected by their non-Jewish nationalist "compatriots." The rehabilitation of those who lost their honor, self-respect, as well as their resources, housing and employment, requires instilling a will, an imagination and a faith in themselves.

To place Herzl's innovation in national fundraising and consciousness-raising into an American context of philanthropy let us digress to give some 20th C. examples of what might be called "amass philanthropy as self-help." The Progressive Movement at the turn of the 20th C. led by Theodore Roosevelt sought to broaden philanthropic campaigns to the masses rather than just the big magnates. Teddy Roosevelt called that "collective responsibility." One of the first American examples of this ideology and its new fundraising technology began with the public health effort to wipe out tuberculosis and it reached out for small contributions by workers and the lower middle classes and collected by rank-and-file volunteers involving up to 500,000 (1915).^{cxxxix} Like the Zionist blue box of collecting pennies for the Jewish National Fund and the sale of JNF stamps, the campaign to cure TB used its own gimmick which was imported by Jacob Riis from Denmark - Christmas seals purchased and affixed to a letter or card (1908).

"Jacob Riis told the story of this highly successful 'penny subscription' urging the duplication of this type of fundraising in the US. He pointed to the fact that 'no millionaire' had come forth 'to endow' the fight against tuberculosis and went on to say that '**no millionaire' was 'wanted;'** that **the job would be 'far better done by the people themselves!'** Riis added: 'Five years of that sort of campaigning, and we ought to be on the home-stretch.'"^{cxxxix}

What was unique in the rationale for this new mass philanthropy was the theme of "thrift" and collective self-help through directed philanthropy.

"Earlier appeals for **humanitarian** causes at home or abroad had called on Americans' Christian sense of charitable duty, while appeals for national emergencies invoked **patriotism**. Increasingly campaigners added to their pitch the donors' contribution to their own well-being. In appealing to ordinary Americans, fundraisers expanded on the earlier notion of a public thrift. They emphasized that it was in the givers' self-interest to contribute to the **common cause**, because they would ultimately benefit from the expected results.

"To the extent that the money raised would help eradicate diseases, create a healthier environment, lengthen life, and other such collective enterprises in which all Americans stood to gain, a personal contribution was an investment in a safety net for all that was well worth the momentary sacrifice. Giving for all competed with saving for oneself and one's immediate family. But with greater disposable income and clear collective goals, the two behaviors became increasingly intertwined and non-exclusionary. This self-taxing for the common good is what Tocqueville labeled '**self-interest properly**

understood' when he observed and codified Americans' involvement in voluntary associations in Jacksonian America."^{cxxxiii} 31

Laboring classes by the end of the 19th C. placed their savings in cooperative savings, building and loan associations, and people's banks, and paid for insurance for life, death, and sickness through fraternal associations and insurance companies. But what could be done with the great predator: 11% of deaths in the USA were then the result of TB.

“Now a tuberculosis association was proposing an entirely new formula to donor and beneficiary alike: Make giving a form of safety net against broader threats. Invest some money for the common good as well as your own in a philanthropy devoted to eradicating a major cause of impairment and death.”^{cxxxiv}

At the local level that same ethos of mutual self-help by fellow citizens generated community chests like the United Way and community foundations like the first one in Cleveland. At the national level mass philanthropy was launched to buy US Liberty and Victory Bonds to support the war effort (1917-1918). Each cause had its gimmick but they ultimately appealed to implicit sense of collective responsibility among neighbors who did not actually know each other who lived across the land, but felt a solidarity of fate.³²

“In 1928 H. L. Mencken, focused attention on the changing locus and operation of organized giving by highlighting the rise of new professional fundraising techniques and new forms of philanthropic management. Referring to a ‘Big Wind’ sweeping across American philanthropy, the magazine observed: ‘Where money-getters on the prowl once devoted themselves almost solely to the Big Money Boys, they now seek to be democrats, giving everybody, high or low, a fair chance to do his bit for the Worthy Cause. Instead of chasing after fat checks of six figures, they snatch up whatever is offered-dimes and nickels, and even pennies. And what was once a simple art, practiced exclusively by amateurs, is now in the hand of Science and Organization. It has become, indeed, a Great Profession, with trained specialists who, for a fee and expenses, stand ready day or night to raise funds for any Great Cause.’”^{cxxxv}

Turned down by the great Jewish magnate philanthropists, Herzl had to turn to the nation of impoverished Jews and lower middle class to finance their own auto-emancipation and it the process not only was the money helpful to the cause but the process of self-help and self-organization created a national consciousness and a Zionist movement.

³¹ “Thrift was an important part of ordinary Americans' lives. The Charity Organization Society volunteers, as well as the new crop of professionally trained social workers encouraged all people of modest means to save money as much as they could. They valued thrift as both a means of personal improvement and a minimum safety net.” (O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 46)

³² “In January 1938, FDR established the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. Former vaudeville star comedian and Democratic fundraiser Eddie Cantor coined the phrase ‘March of Dimes;’ a play on the name of the popular newsreel feature ‘The March of Time;’ and he appealed to radio listeners all over the country to send their dimes directly to the White House. The campaign proved hugely successful. In 1939 the national office initiated a ‘Mile O’ Dimes’ campaign, with towns competing to produce the ‘longest line’ of coins. In 1940, O’Connor organized the viewing of short polio movies at theatres around the country where a “March of Dimes mother” would pass through the audience collecting donations. The most famous of these short clips was “The Crippler.” Soon after began the so-called ‘porchlight’ campaigns. People turned on their lights to announce that they would welcome a campaign volunteer to their door. Thus the March of Dimes reinvigorated the techniques of neighborhood canvassing initiated in the fight against tuberculosis before World War I and used extensively thereafter by the Red Cross, the United War Work, and the war chests. With the March of Dimes, grassroots campaigning again connected all (willing) citizens in a great philanthropic chain that linked the White House to modest houses in remote communities and indeed to just about every dwelling and workplace in America.” (O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*,71)

The Ultimate Self-Help Association: Zionist Nation-Building

A second aspect of the Zionist transformation from philanthropy to nation-building is modeled by the generation after Herzl, the socialist Zionists of the Second and Third Aliyah (1904- 1929). They explicitly rejected the *haluka* system where Diaspora Jews of each European land sent contributions to support their own indigent religious immigrants in *Eretz Yisrael*, who for the most part "merely" studied and prayed in the Holy Land and its sacred cities. The Labor Zionists' goals were to be economically self-supporting by hiring themselves out as farm hands and ultimately setting up kibbutzim and cooperatives. For them, the point was not just economic or political self-sufficiency, but the power of labor which connected them to the land as a native natural people, to one another in a common effort and shared wealth, and to a renewed sense of self (for we have come to *livnot u'lehibanot* – "to build and for ourselves to be built up" as their pioneer songs proclaimed).

Third, Zionism sought not just to serve the needs of the weaker members of the community such as the holy societies for visiting the sick and burying the dead did, but **to solve Jewish problems** by building a state, an economy, and an international movement. In that sense Zionism took up the banner of the 19th C. philanthropists who used international alliances to effect political goals (securing rights for the Jews) and economic solutions (job training, migration and resettlement), and who used scientific analysis of the situation to seek solutions to poverty and distress, not just relief work. Like the Western philanthropists, the Zionists too aimed at a **transformation of character into that of a self-reliant worker**. However, the philanthropists, even while preaching self-reliance, often created dependence on their own bureaucrats who distributed the funds to Zionists settlers. By rejecting this dependence on the mighty Jewish rich, Zionism was basing itself ideologically on the national principle of **auto-emancipation** already announced in the 1880s by the proto-Zionist thinker Leo Pinsker. Zionist self-reliance was of course also translated into military and political terms. For example, early Zionists emerged from the Jewish self-defense groups (1904) who fought back against the Russian pogroms and later established the HaShomer guards in *Eretz Yisrael* (1909-1920), as well as the Hagana in the 1930s and 40s.

For these reasons, the narrative of giving to the Jewish state differs radically from earlier narratives and it can barely be called "tzedakah" at all, unless we return to the grand narratives of tzedakah in the Biblical Jubilee. In some ways it is a return to Maimonides' model of tzedakah as a business partnership and business loans that may best apply to national projects to develop the land and its industry. The Zionist model views helping individual immigrants as part of building up capital for a national "company". Equally important is the rabbinic concern for the lost dignity of the formerly rich. It is not the case that Zionism provides status symbols for recently impoverished immigrants nor that it props up illusions of past grandeur using a horse and slave. However, Herzl was very much aware of the painful nostalgia felt by immigrants, even those who were fleeing anti-Semitism. He imagines providing Viennese cakes on the boats to *Eretz Yisrael* and bringing boatloads of exhumed dead relatives so that immigrants will be able to visit their deceased kin in local cemeteries. To be practical, Zionism must offer national myths, songs, flags, ceremonies and awards, all rooted in the national past in order to create new modern nation. Herzl recasts the modern Jewish people as the ancient Hebrew heroes of the Bible and the Maccabees who simply lost their grandeur and hence their will along the way. Nation building is in no sense seen as a uniquely Jewish method of economic and political revival, and Herzl explicitly credits Otto von Bismarck as responsible for the great resurrection of the German nation.

Herzl is himself inspired by the Biblical Exodus and by Moses, as he wrote to chief rabbi of Vienna:

"I have the solution to the Jewish question. I know it sounds mad .. This simple old idea is the Exodus from Egypt. I can see your troubled face, as you stroke your beard and murmur, 'completely out of his head.. the poor family.'" The rabbi replied: "I could think you were Moses!" (*Herzl's Diary*, 1895).

Just as the Bible's central tale presents a solution to poverty, homelessness, and the exploitation of a whole people, Zionism also offers solutions to these issues which promote society-wide redemption. The Jewish narrative of Exodus emphasizes that just as God was our redeemer when we were slaves, so Leviticus 25 demands that each Jew become the personal **redeemer** of poor brothers in our midst. We owe them not just maintenance but **liberation** to help all maximize their capabilities and exercise their freedom to develop. God gave us as a people not just political and legal manumission but a land, **resources to live independently, productively and creatively**. These permanent assets, this trust, provide an opportunity **to found a multi-generational community – fruitful and multiplying – and to achieve greatness, even becoming a blessing for the whole world** (Abraham's narrative). The early Zionist thinker Leo Pinsker wrote about *Auto-Emancipation* rather than dependence on the nations of the world. What Herzl and Zionism add is that the role of God the redeemer will be played by the collective people who organize for self-help deriving their resources from within, while also admittedly soliciting capital investment from their brothers abroad.

For Zionism, the Jubilee model of Leviticus 25 was also relevant in terms of the capital which would redeem the land and the people economically. As mentioned above, Ze'ev Jabotinsky, founder of revisionist Zionism (predecessor of the leading Israeli political party now called the Likud), used Jubilee and *Peah* as blueprints for his vision of a progressive non-socialist national economy. The old blue and white JNF (Jewish National Fund) tzedakah box – used to collect coins for purchasing, salvaging and re-foresting the land of Israel – carried the ancient Hebrew phrase from Leviticus 25:24: "*You shall give redemption to the land*" (*geulah titnu la'aretz*). Thus the Zionist narrative means the people must pull themselves up by the bootstraps. The people play the Divine role of redeeming the land, repatriating the exiled and then distributing the national heritage to the citizens – not qua private property, but as a temporary lease on the common patrimony.

Changing Idealizations of Zion and New Forms of American Jewish Giving: Nineteenth Century

In Moses Montefiore we saw the meeting of several strains of giving from (1) support for traditional Orthodox scholars in Israel who would pray for his soul; through (2) retraining and "productivizing" Jewish immigrants in agricultural settlements in Eretz Yisrael; to (3) humanitarian political reform to abolish slavery and to guarantee Jewish and Christian civil rights in the Ottoman Empire. So too, 19th C. North American Jewish giving related to Israel took multiple forms.^{cxxxvi} Jonathan Sarna has summarized these stages beautifully while showing how giving served American Jewry by projecting their self-image needs unto the life of Jews in Eretz Yisrael.

(1) Traditional gifts were given to the poor scholars in Zion to make up for the lack of spiritual achievement in America. Mordecai Noah, founder of a failed Jewish colony in NY, for example,

argued for support to unproductive traditional scholars. In 1825, at the laying of the cornerstone of Ararat, his abortive Jewish colony near Grand Island, New York, he argued for sending money to Zion for these scholars because:

“They are the great sentinels and guardians of the law and religion and amidst the severest privations and the most intense sufferings, they have for centuries kept their eye upon the ruined site of the temple and said, "the time will come - the day will be accomplished.”^{cxxxvii}

Jonathan Sarna explains how giving to one’s value-opposite complements your weaknesses:

“America and Israel, according to these exaggerated conceptions, were polar opposites. Where American Jews cultivated commerce, neglected Jewish learning, evinced considerable laxity in their religious behavior, and enjoyed liberty and freedom, the Jews of Eretz Israel wallowed in poverty, suffered brutal oppression, devoted themselves to Jewish learning, and remained completely scrupulous in their religious observances. America, in this binary scheme, represented modernity's lures and perils, while Israel symbolized tradition and suffering with the promise of redemption. Each nevertheless needed the other, and as a result the two communities (like the Diaspora and Israel generally) developed a genuine sense of **interdependence: material sustenance flowed in one direction, spiritual sustenance in the other.**”^{cxxxviii}

Again, in his address at Shearith Israel on Thanksgiving Day, 1848, on behalf of Rabbi Jechiel Ha-Cohen’s project to build synagogue, Mordecai Noah articulated this symbiotic relationship:

“It has been said that the Jews at Jerusalem are indolent, are disinclined to labor, are only employed in studying the law, and devoting all their hours to prayer, and prefer leading a life of dependence and want to one of prosperous active industry. I thank them that they do so. Amid our worldly cares, [our] pursuits of gain, our limited knowledge of our holy faith, our surrender of many cardinal points - probably of necessity - I am thankful that there is a holy hand of brotherhood at Zion, whose nights and days are devoted to our sublime laws, our venerable institutions. I wish them to remain so; I think it our duty and our interest to share our means with them - **to repay them with the bread of life, for aiding us with the bread of salvation.**”^{cxxxix}

(2) Yet American Jews, shaped by the Enlightenment and American pioneer values, also supported vocational training including agricultural settlements for the poor Jewish refugees, as Moses Montefiore did earlier. They too wanted the Jews of Palestine to become self-sufficient and replace study with "prosperous active industry". So Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise, leader of the American Reform movement, supported the Jewish farmers in Palestine as a transformation of the old Jews into the modern Hebrew.

However, their motives were not merely to find a pragmatic economic solution to the issue of Jewish refugees. They were concerned for their own self-image as Jews in an anti-Semitic world which often used parasitic motifs to stigmatize the Jews. Robert Alan Goldberg explains in *Back to the Soil* that contributions to Jewish vocational training meant a defense of the Jewish giver against anti-Semitic slurs:

“Agriculture offered to ‘**productivize**’ the Jew by removing him from the artificial and less worthy sectors of urban commerce and industry while providing him with a measure of dignity and self-worth. The Jew would claim the power of decision making and initiative along with the sense of

fulfillment generated by hard work and land ownership while contributing in a real sense to the wellbeing of his fellow countrymen. Further, a return to the land promised an end to dependence ...and the creation of a balanced economic structure, the absence of which had plagued the Jewish world in the Diaspora. No longer would anti-Semites be able to smear **Jews as commercial parasites** who fed upon the sweat of producing members of society. Jews, in turn, would be cleansed of the debilitating self-hatred produced when such slurs were internalized.” (38)

(3) Further, 19th C.-20th C. American Zionists sought to use their funds to construct a progressive social utopia in Eretz Yisrael that would represent their highest American and Jewish ideals. Sarna reports on the American Zionist leader Bernard Rosenblatt (1886-1969), who called Palestine "a laboratory for momentous experiments". He simultaneously promoted a social commonwealth for America^{cxl} and for Israel. Unlike Mordecai Noah, others like Louis Brandeis, Horace Kallen and Bernard Rosenblatt, saw in their philanthropic work for Israel not a compensation for their spiritual deficiencies as Americans but an extension of their progressive politics and a way to achieve “social justice.”

Rosenblatt incorporated the Zion Commonwealth for Land Purchase and Development in order to help Jewish colonists create a "just land system". As spelled out in *The Social Commonwealth*, it was to be based on "collective ownership of city land, industrial plants and sub-soil deposits." The very first article of the corporation's lofty constitution promised to make "**social justice, in harmony with the ideals of the prophets of Israel ...the cornerstone of the Jewish Commonwealth in Zion.**" In his book *Social Zionism*, he advocated the creation of "a model state in the Holy Land – **freed from the economic wrongs, the social injustices and the greed of modern-day industrialism.**" Economic cooperation formed the cornerstone of this plan and of the charter of Zionist Organization of America (1918), which envisaged the creation in Palestine of a "social-moral community of Jews – a true commonwealth". Horace Kallen wrote: “The fiscal policy shall be framed so as to protect the people from the evils of land speculation and from every other form of financial oppression.” Appropriately, Louis Brandeis sounded a call that sounds like *tikkun olam*: “our aim is the Kingdom of heaven”,^{cxli} which for him meant a political-economic-legal heaven on earth.

American Jewish Civil Religion: Post World War Two

In *Sacred Survival: The Civil Religion of American Jews* Jonathan Woocher describes a comprehensive narrative of giving developed by the philanthropic leadership of the American Jewish Federation-United Jewish Appeal especially after World War Two. He conceptualizes this broadly as a central feature of a new Jewish civil religion. Borrowing from the sociologists Emile Durkheim and Robert Bellah, Woocher defines the social function of a community's religion as follows:

“Religion – belief and ceremony – serves both to represent [communal] unity and to reinforce it by linking the group to **a transcendent order of reality**. The group comes to envision itself not merely as a conglomeration of individuals, but as a **moral community**, a **purposive entity** with shared values and conceptions, with **a life and destiny of its own beyond that of the individuals who comprise it**. ... Religion is thus, in effect, the cement which bonds a group together. Where unity exists, religion arises; and where religion takes hold, unity is reaffirmed.”^{cxlii}

A “civil” religion focuses its search for transcendent meaning on the political-social order as did the gods of the ancient Greek polis and as do many contemporary nationalisms. In modern Western

democracies the national loyalties are not based on a particular religion or denomination since citizens have many private religious sub-communities. However the state develops its own transcendent myths, a sacred paradigmatic history of founding fathers, symbols, struggle, pilgrimages, holy sites, holidays, calling to a greater mission, holy land, and heroes/martyrs. With these quasi-religious means, the civil religion can mobilize individual citizens to sacrifice even their lives for the survival and success of their sacred nation. Individuals of disparate ideologies, classes, ethnicities, languages and denominations are forged into a new nation, a band of brothers. Thus an individual's life gains transcendent meaning rooted in an eternal nation. An individual takes part in a historic task as bearer of the sacred memory of past heroics and sacrifices.

Woocher assembles a catechism of beliefs held by the American Jewish civil religion:

- The unity of the Jewish people ("We are one!" says the UJA slogan);
- Mutual responsibility as "my brother's keeper" and as "guarantors of every other Jew" (*arevim zeh lazeh*);
- Jewish physical survival in a threatening world (*pikuakh nefesh*); Jewish spiritual-cultural survival and a sense of continuity and rootedness in a transcendent source of meaning;
- The centrality of Israel both as a sacred national homeland with a right of return for every Jew worldwide and as a platform for fulfilling the mitzvah of pilgrimage. This is implemented through UJA missions, family bar mitzvah trips to Masada and Birthright trips for college students. Israel is also a politically sovereign nation where American political activism such as through AIPAC makes one, at least vicariously, a maker of history;
- The confluence of American and Jewish identities and values; and
- The commitment to tzedakah and Tikkun Olam, social justice.

Historically and institutionally, Woocher traces how the American Jewish community managed to create a civil religion with a broad and deep appeal based mainly on philanthropic institutions, even though American Jews lack a national language, a recognized sovereignty, an army, a geographic area and are divided by different religious orientations, different countries of origin – especially German versus Eastern Europe, and political ideologies. Its development began with the model of 19th century humanist philanthropists like Montefiore, Rothschild and Jacob Schiff seeking to protect the lives and rights of persecuted Jews worldwide, to provide relief for refugees, to help them resettle and promote their Westernization/Americanization and productivization. The American German Jewish elite took responsibility for developing a strategy of coping with an international Jewish problem based on the political-economic crises of Russian pogroms and then World War One. They founded the American Jewish Committee in 1906 and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) in 1914. These not only showed the philanthropists' political prowess as individuals, but also their ability to build a common platform that transcends differences, thus beginning to forge a real alliance with American Eastern European Jews.

Over time, the significance of this philanthropic collaboration for the identity and communal cohesion of the American Jewish community became clear. It satisfied not only the material needs of its direct beneficiaries, but also enabled the benefactors to redefine and establish a coherent and compelling Jewish entity. After World War One, Henry Rosenfelt described the impact of the successful collaborative endeavors on the nascent Jewish community:

“The touch of common danger made all kin. In the pools of war-blood all Jewish hyphens have been washed away. Jews today are closer together than ever before.... We are no longer orthodox and reform, conservative and radical – all are becoming united, bound together by that ancient formula, "I am a Jew!" And for this we owe our brethren across the sea an eternal obligation which outweighs our help to them, as **fidelity to faith casts the scales of Israel against even the gold of unselfish charity.**”^{cxliii}

For Henry Rosenfelt, the Jewish rationale of brotherly solidarity in tzedakah takes precedence over the Christian idealization of altruistic giving.

Similarly, the New York City leadership came together for the first time to establish a federation of Jewish charities in 1917 appreciating that “**philanthropy promised New York City Jews an unexpected bonus for their charity: a sense of identity and basis for community.**”^{cxliv}

Woocher summarizes this process succinctly:

“As the historian Oscar Handlin has noted, ‘from the point of view of the people who lived through that period, philanthropy was important not only for what it actually accomplished, but because it was the means by which they engaged in **communal endeavors**. Philanthropy supplied them with the signs by which they recognized one another.’

"Philanthropy drew upon and reinforced a feeling of Jewish solidarity at a primal level, one which transcended differences of ideology, nationality, and religious practice. It was **identity-constructing both for the individual who engaged in it, and for the community which was created by it**. It provided a vocabulary and a setting in which those who differed profoundly on ‘ultimate’ issues could nevertheless reach common cause. Thus, philanthropy gradually came to express the meaning of ‘Jewishness.’ What is more, it defined a mode of Jewish identity and behavior which was thoroughly compatible with American values, in which group solidarity became the basis for the exercise of moral responsibility. Out of these building blocks, the American Jewish civil religion was being constructed.”^{cxlv}

This was a paradigm shift in the narrative of giving not only in its content and modes of operation but in its felt significance: giving is community building. In this sense the giver receives much more than the recipient. In fact this transforms the whole asymmetry between powerful donor and needy beneficiary because they become one people involved in taking care of one another.

“Federations and their agencies were becoming less vehicles for **noblesse oblige philanthropy** than instruments of **Jewish self-expression** and development for the community as a whole. Instead of one-half of us financing and administering programs for the other half, Jewish agencies more and more represent the community serving itself, with the beneficiaries and contributors constituting the same group.”^{33 cxlvi}

The payback for engaging in the mechanism of Jewish philanthropy was enormous in terms of an individual’s search for meaning. In an era of affluence, secularization, Jewish assimilation and social

³³ Philadelphia Federation of Jewish Agencies said of itself: “The Federation of 1964-65 ... is drastically different from the Federation of twenty years ago. This is dramatically illustrated by the shift in meaning of the word ‘welfare.’ Until about a generation ago, welfare service was something the well-to-do provided for the poor. Nowadays, welfare services are something that all of us provide for ourselves.” (Woocher, *Sacred Survival*, 53)

atomization typical of American middle class life, people sought more profound social connections and deeper significance to their lives.

“The symbolic significance ... for the board member, the volunteer and the professional [is that] the agency serves as **a medium for attaching themselves to the Jewish tradition and Jewish community; as a means of giving expression to their religious sentiment and Jewish creativity; as a practical method of functioning as a Jew on behalf of other Jews and keeping related in an active way to the mainstream of Jewish life.**”^{cxlvii}

After the Holocaust, Israel's wars of survival in 1948, 1967 and 1973, as well as the Soviet Jewry movement and the rescue of Ethiopian Jews, North American Jewry felt they had made an unprecedented difference in world history and in Jewish national history, not only by their contributions but also through their political lobbying and demonstrations. What mega-philanthropists felt in the 19th C. in shaping events during the Damascus Blood Libel of 1840, was now democratized and extended to a broad spectrum of American Jews. Their identity was now Zionist in the sense of their belief in national auto-emancipation, though this rarely included making aliyah themselves. They reinforced America's crucial support for Israel in times of war and America's confrontation with the Soviet Union – until the USSR backed down and admitted the Jewish right to emigrate. These were heady power trips but also expressed the merged idealism and activism of American *and* Jewish values of social justice, political freedom, religious freedom and faith that human beings can remake history.

"For us," asserts a UJA fundraising brochure, "there can be no rest ... We hear the cries and see the need. We must respond quickly. For in our hands we hold the tools **to mold this moment in history.** As Jews we recognize no boundaries on the map of human need ... we are responsible, one for another."^{cxlviii}

However, Wocher shows that the civil religion of American Jews came to mean more to them than political power, liberal values and making their mark on history. It came to represent what they considered a profound tie to ancient Jewish religious values embodied in Jewish national survival. This is what Wocher calls the “**Judaization of the Federation/UJA.**” Speaking a new language of mitzvot and Torah combined with the sacred mysteries of Jewish survival, the spokespersons of this elite preached messages that inspired the participants and gave legitimacy to their organizational fundraising activities and financial commitments. Even more so, it served to anchor and uplift their individual lives into something transcendent – a trans-generational community, a 4,000 year old history, an ancient religious-ethical tradition that lies at the foundation of the western world. Their involvement was a Divine mitzvah and mystery, though no explicit theology was offered. Here are a few excerpts from such speeches as preached by the high priests of the American Jewish civil religion.

“Neither our efforts as a defense organization against the forces of anti-Semitism, nor our efforts as a human rights organization in support of a liberal society, or even our labors on behalf of the safety and wellbeing of Israel, none of these, important and critical as they may be, is sufficient to secure the future of Judaism. Rather, it is **the cultivation and transmission of our cultural, moral, and spiritual heritage that gives purpose,** that gives direction and passion to all of the other activities in which institutionalized Jewry engages in the United States.”^{cxlix}

[Tzedakah] - "It goes directly to the heart of Judaism.... It is to give another Jew a chance-a chance to be independent, a chance to live a fuller and more beautiful Jewish life. This, ladies and gentlemen, is the highest tenet of **our belief**.... It affords me the opportunity to be a good Jew. It gives me a chance to perform the **Mitzvah** that each of us is charged to perform." (1970s).^{ci}

"At the very heart of the **mystery of Jewish survival** throughout the ages, in magnificent denial of the normal laws of history that decree the death sentence on peoples that lose their homeland, is the idea of community ... **the sense of a profoundly shared destiny, a shared purpose, a shared history and customs, a shared responsibility.**"^{cli}

Even the quasi-monastic traditional rabbinic ideal of contemplative Torah study, which had always been seen both by Zionism and Western secular philanthropy as utterly opposed to modern activism, became absorbed at a rhetorical level in the attempt to link federation work to transcendent Jewish values. In 1984 the General Assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations adopted the theme: "The Jewish Leader as a Learning Person". Herschel Blumberg, outgoing chairman of the United Jewish Appeal's Board of Trustees, urged the leadership, known for its secular and practical orientation to business and Jewish organizational lives, to study:

"Together we may become scrolls of psalms, volumes of verse, tomes of Talmudic lore. We may become a veritable library of Jewish praise, prayer and perception. We need to study more and be inspired to live more with our holy texts. They are ours to possess. If we let them possess us, we will become finer human beings, more knowledgeable Jews and more secure in the great work we do."^{clii}

Surprisingly, Woocher ends his illuminating book on civil religion in search of a theology for the work of Federation/UJA. On one hand, an inclusive Jewish civil religion consciously focuses on political action and avoids denominational and theological faith statements that might undermine the solidarity of all Jews united around the practical issues of survival. Nevertheless, to mobilize the necessary sacrifices and to provide the kind of individual and communal existential meaning the participants seek, a civil religion must venture into becoming a religion with an implicit but transcendent faith foundation.

The leader who articulated the spiritual meaning of the federation world's work was Rabbi Irving Greenberg of CLAL, providing a religious depth to this American Jewish civil religion. Not only does he rephrase the ongoing tzedakah work in traditional terms, but he sees the unprecedented historical events of emancipation, Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel as a new revelation of mitzvot, a new Torah for a new era, that invites us to renew the Sinai covenant voluntarily. The content of the 20th C. American Jewish civil religion includes the ultimate moral value of survival after Hitler and therefore the ethical imperative to have power. This formulation gives a deeper significance to the physical basis of life that tzedakah supports, so that philanthropic activism can compete with the spiritual crown usually reserved in rabbinic Judaism for contemplative Torah scholars. In light of the universal significance of Auschwitz and the blessings of Western democracy for all, one must give priority to the "mitzvah of our era" and expand tzedakah to include its Biblical prophetic content of *tikkun olam* or social justice, worldwide. Thus, the messianic context fills tzedakah with broader humanist and deeper spiritual significance.^{cliii}

Classical Roots of the New American Jewish Civil Religion

The narrative of the American Jewish Civil Religion during the second half of the 20th C. builds on all the classical Jewish narratives of giving, yet it raises them to a national historical level. If Maimonides' highest tzedakah focused on helping the poor become financially independent, then American Jewish Zionism contributes to economic, political and military independence of a whole nation. Sometimes donors even donate tanks or visit army bases and weapons' development plants as part of the UJA "mission" to enhance their identification with the military struggle for survival and self-sufficiency. If Maimonides recommended investing and partnering in business with the needy, then American Jews bankroll the Zionist project and take pride in being "partners" as reflected in a UJA project for American and Israeli sister cities, aptly named *Shutfut 2000*, Co-Partnership 2000. If orphans are to be rehabilitated by being provided a home and a spouse, as God took care of a lonely Adam in the garden and as in Talmudic times, then many UJA projects resettle immigrants who left lands of persecution and integrate them into Israeli life as full members. If the shame of an individual from a good family who has fallen and become economically dislocated deserves special tzedakah sensitivity, then the shame of a fallen and reviled nation ashamed of being taken "like sheep to slaughter" in the Holocaust was to be removed by becoming a great and powerful nation whose power and creativity would be a source of pride. Gaining recognition among the nations is considered the antidote to being a pariah among nations. Here the shame also belonged to the American Jewish community that felt they had not done enough to rescue Jews from the Holocaust and who saw Israel and Soviet Jewry as the venues to make up for that failure.

Further classical models were also invoked and upgraded. If tzedakah is motivated in the Torah by a narrative of empathy between the Jewish people who recall being persecuted strangers in Egypt as well as strangers and immigrants in the present, then the resettlement of Russian Jews in the US and Israel recapitulated for American Jews their ancestors' history as immigrants and refugees from that same Russia struggling to settle in America after the 1880s. If Jewish solidarity was forged in the experiences of Egyptian slavery and the exodus, then the 20th C. was interpreted and relived as a new Exodus though its miracles resulted from human activism. In this 20th C. messianic reliving of the Exodus myth, God helps those who help themselves. If tzedakah prioritizes one's brothers over more distant needy, then American Jews prioritized Jewish causes in their philanthropic expenditures – during the crisis years of 1948, 1967, and 1973 at least – without feeling that they had betrayed the universalism of American liberalism. For them too "charity begins at home", with your brother. If the Biblical Jubilee (Leviticus 25) uses the term *Geulah* (redemption) for the reformation and renewal of a whole society by liberating slaves and returning them to their land and to their families, then the American Jews were the *goel*, the family redeemers and the imitators of God the redeemer, who helped reclaim the land, gather in the dispossessed exiles and "*proclaim liberty to all the inhabitants thereof*" (Lev. 25:10) – a motto which has American as well as Biblical overtones. That seemingly particularistic national redemption is always presented as part of the worldwide messianic vision of justice, peace and economic renewal. In this way, the unprecedented philanthropic work of the federations and the achievement of making "the desert bloom" serve as models for all, as Israel truly fulfills its Biblical destiny as "a light unto the nations."

Relief of poverty was not the primary purpose or focus of this kind of tzedakah. However, if the laws of tzedakah are called by the Jerusalem Talmud Peah "a matter of life and death," then helping Israel at a time of anti-Semitic military threats from the Moslem world to "push the Jews into the sea" as

they had the Crusaders, is also an act of *pikuakh nefesh*, rescuing human life on the national and the individual level. After the Holocaust, this money enabled a miraculous resurrection and revival of a near dead nation who had lost one third of its people. Every new project in Israel becomes the concrete fulfillment of a prophetic vision for the first time in 2,000 years. Most significant in this narrative is that, for the most part, the giver-recipient relationship was viewed in Maimonidean terms as a partnership of American and world Jewry.

"A partnership of equals, who seek practical ways to work with, relate to and understand, each other. A partnership that pools its talent, and strives to improve the quality of life of both partners, with a full and total commitment to the viability of Jewish life in Israel and of Jewish life in North America."^{cliv}

Empowering tzedakah is about self-investment, auto-emancipation, self-help, and self-redemption. It is not perceived by either side as an act of mercy by wealthy Western donors for the desperate and helpless third world needy. Therefore both givers and recipients draw pride from their spiritual, national, political and economic partnership. Of course the gap between ideology and reality is always great, but the narrative is inspiring and meaning-granting both as a continuation of the classical tzedakah narrative and in its unique national significance. As we discussed in book one of the trilogy in the opening chapter, Maimonides identifies individual acts of tzedakah (*righteousness*) as the social marker, the Jewish gene that makes the individual a descendant of the seed of Abraham a righteous person. In this American Jewish civil religion, tzedakah is not only about helping Jews in need but about redeeming and constituting the community. It thereby epitomizes Judaism itself: "The history of tzedakah turns out to be a history of the Jewish people."^{clv}

One of the most important lessons that can be gleaned from Woocher's notion of a civil religion is the way that a powerful narrative of giving must be rooted in a larger and deeper theological-ideological matrix that gives individual and communal life metaphysical meaning. Ethics and theology are not fully separable.

F. Partnerships for Civic Engagement and Community Building: The JDC (Jewish Joint Distribution Committee), *Shatil* (The New Israel Fund), and Post Modern Foundation Philanthropy

“Only Connect.” (E. M. Forster, British novelist)

“**SHATIL**, the New Israel Fund's empowerment and training center, was established in 1982 to promote democracy, tolerance, and social justice in Israel. Recognizing the need for building a strong **civil society** in Israel, SHATIL, Israel's leading **capacity building center for social change organizations**, provides over 1000 non-profit organizations with consulting and training in organizational development, advocacy, media and PR, coalition building, resource development and volunteer management each year. It is building whole new sectors of non-profit organizations committed to addressing neglected issues, like environmental justice, vast socioeconomic needs in the Negev and the rights of new immigrants, the Israeli Arab community and other disadvantaged communities.” (SHATIL website)

Shatil, which means sapling in Hebrew, is a prime example of the new kind of philanthropy sponsored by progressive foundations interested in promoting Israel's civil society. Shatil seeks to strengthen marginal groups or inactive citizens to promote their own issues of social change. For example, they support self-help organizations such as Israeli Arabs pushing for better education for their sector or associations of the disabled organizing for wheelchair access. They also underwrite volunteer organizations seeking to protect civil rights, even when the activists are themselves from the more advantaged sectors of society. While the government may or may not be responsive to these citizens' demands, the very mobilization of voluntary associations consisting of democratically active citizens is in many ways more important than the actual benefits won. Thus Shatil builds the "capacity" of people not only to be autonomous economically but to be autonomous politically.

Shatil is a program of the New Israel Fund whose founders and donors were nurtured on 1960s social activism based on communal empowerment as well as on the American rejection of the melting pot in favor of a multi-cultural mosaic of identities. As Kerri Steinberg^{clvi} points out, the NIF must be distinguished in multiple ways from the United Jewish Appeal analyzed above by Jonathan Woocher:

"In order to contextualize the differences between the New Israel Fund and the UJA, we must recall that each came of age at a different historical moment. In response to Kristallnacht of November 1938, the JDC merged with the United Palestine Committee and the National Committee for Refugees to establish the United Jewish Appeal in January 1939 ...Built into the UJA philanthropic machine was an impulse toward crisis resolution."^{clvii}

The UJA's birth in opposition to a global Nazi threat toward all Jews everywhere regardless of religious orientation also predetermined the emphasis on "unity". Its slogan was: "We are One." By contrast, NIF was a break away from the UJA in the late 1970s and stood for respect for diversity:

"With thirteen million Jews in the world, including over four million in Israel, there is much diversity among us. So when we talk about 'unity,' we do not mean uniformity. Our diversity keeps us healthy,

vibrant, and responsive. It must be accommodated and respected.” (New Israel Fund advertisement on November 14, 1997 in Los Angeles Jewish Journal)³⁴

Since the UJA was founded during the Holocaust and reached its heights in defending Israel from attack, identifying with its victories, and supporting the absorption of immigrants, it was not constructed to offer internal criticism to Israeli policy. By contrast the NIF was designed to be anti-establishment, constructively critical of the UJA and of Israeli government.

“Founded in 1979 by Jonathan Cohen and Eleanor Friedman (one of the heiresses to the Levi-Strauss fortune), the New Israel Fund represents a smaller philanthropy with a vastly different agenda from that of more centralized organizations like the UJA. Its establishment was in part a response to the social, cultural, and intellectual revolutions that swept across Europe and North America during the sixties and seventies. In addition, the New Israel Fund was a response to the desire for more direct involvement in social justice and peace in the Middle East. The New Israel Fund presented an alternative venue for a **more progressive donor** who felt that his or her interests in Israel were not addressed and who wished to circumvent the bureaucracy of mainstream philanthropic involvement.

"The New Israel Fund's establishment anticipated the proliferation of Jewish social action groups that would emerge in the next decade. By the early 1980s, particularly in the aftermath of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, some American Jews began to express publicly alternative political viewpoints. Those who were staunch supporters of Israel began examining just what kind of Jewish state they were supporting, while those who had earlier felt marginalized by the organized community began to explore alternative ways to forge a relationship with Israel. It is within this context of increased concern on the part of the public regarding the limited interests supported by the philanthropic mainstream that the New Israel Fund was able to organize.

"In its emphasis on tolerance, pluralism, and equality, the New Israel Fund claims to challenge Israel, as a democratic nation, to recognize the human rights of all its inhabitants as a precondition to the peaceful coexistence of peoples. This means that Israel must honor the competing values of its citizens, rather than require certain groups to bury their differences and acquiesce to a hegemonic majority. The New Israel Fund also supports programs to help eliminate gender-based discrimination and bridge social and economic gaps. Such programs have traditionally been excluded from the UJA budget."^{clviii}

The New Israel Fund (NIF) promotes a more democratic model of donor-recipient relationships, defined as “participatory funding for participatory democracy.”³⁵ Its “two key perceptions about the

³⁴ “And yet, the second part of this ad reads, ‘It’s hard work reconciling religious difference. But after surviving thousands of years, this family can handle it.’ Although masked by an emphasis on discord and diversity, also built into the New Israel Fund’s campaign is an underlying assumption of ties that bind Jews as a “family.” Despite opposing motifs, the metaphor of family unity rather than discord ultimately unites the two philanthropies on the level of Jewish continuity and survival into the future.” (Kerri Steinberg, “Contesting Identities in Jewish Philanthropy” in H. Wettstein, 256-8)

³⁵ "From our inception we have insisted that the Fund be managed... as a genuine partnership. Our North Americans bring a set of particular insights and experiences to our work, but it is not their intention to impose their understandings on the Israelis. Instead we work as a joint enterprise, with responsibility fully shared by both parties. Each grantee is ensured not only funds, but also priority for assistance from SHATIL [the Support Group for Voluntary Organizations, an NIF technical assistance arm].. The same commitment to accountability... informs [NIF's] relationship to its donors. NIF enables donors to choose to give general support, core funding for a particular program area... or, if desired, donor-advised funding to a specific organization.... NIF is committed to providing full and accurate reports to its donors about

nature of tzedakah are: first, that it is a reciprocal relationship of involvement and accountability, and second, that successful tzedakah should create more tzedakah.”^{clix}

“The commitment to tzedakah that creates more tzedakah is reflected in the roster of NIF grantees, which includes scores of Israeli grassroots groups that are themselves performing tzedakah deeds of the highest order, giving time, skills and heart to projects of empowerment in any of five fields: civil and human rights, Jewish-Arab coexistence, the status of Israeli women, bridging economic and social gaps, and the encouragement of pluralism and tolerance.”^{clx}

This Jewish model of communal empowerment in civil society can be connected to Maimonides' highest model for tzedakah which seeks empowerment of the poor individual through partnership with the economically strong private entrepreneur willing to invest in a common business. Generally a partnership involves both parties having input and common interest, and yet they do not become a corporation, one new body, but maintain their separate identities. The Rabbis imagined God and human beings as ongoing partners in the creation of the world (*shutaf bmasei breshit*), even though there was an enormous power differential between God and humans. God did not want to control everything but intentionally withdrew (*tzimzum*) to allow space for human autonomy and a human contribution to a Divine-human dialogue. That same watchword – “partnership” – signals the newest frontier of philanthropic work by **private foundations seeking to partner with local communities to provide their own solutions through collective action**. Here, unlike Maimonides, the active recipient is not the individual but the community. Foundations help communities organize for democratic action in the style of **voluntary associations** for self-improvement and for social service typical of America since Ben Franklin pioneered them in Philadelphia and since the 1840s when Alexis de Tocqueville described them. American middle class self-help associations are identified with a healthy democratic civil society since de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*. Foundation that encourage such grass-roots organization are seeking to teach middle class social patterns, values and skills to lower classes, ethnic immigrants and third world countries in order to strengthen democracy as well as to improve the bottom line of social welfare outcomes.

Reactions against State Welfarism

The new trend to establish partnerships between civil society and modern philanthropy must be understood against the massive critique of the narrative of state welfarism since the 1970s in all Western societies since the demise of the socialist republics of Eastern Europe. Post World War Two was the heyday of the welfare society.³⁶ In Europe and Israel there were many massive state-sponsored plans for the reconstruction of the economy and society, rehabilitation of millions of refugees and the reintegration of demobilized soldiers. These projects were sometimes justified by social democratic and socialist ideologies of the political elites. Not only did States promise their citizens social benefits but also full-employment supported by monetary policies and by state ownership of basic industries. State-ism (called “*mamlachtiut*” in Israel by David Ben-Gurion) envisioned the state as solving all the citizens' basic problems, not just the needy on the margins of society. The state was the lone and centralized player economically and socially. Only the state had

the use of their contributions.... In short, our grantees are not fleshless file folders, nor are our donors disembodied check-signers. We seek intimate and ongoing contact with both. . .” (NIF Handbook, Strengthening Democracy, 1991).

³⁶ See a review of the development and ideology of the post WWII welfare state in book one of the trilogy, chapter #11.

the financial resources and legal authority to stimulate a whole economy to provide employment. Only the state could make social and health insurance compulsory. Only the state could rewrite legislation to prevent discrimination and exploitation of workers. Only the state could raise funds with progressive taxation and thus redistribute wealth. Only the state had the ability to gather statistics, develop and coordinate a centralized government-planned economy and society. Only the democratic state could claim the mandate for public interest as opposed to the private sector, where each is ruled by particular self-interest. Often labor unions were the one element in the private sector which partnered with the government, since they saw themselves as representing the working class. Later, and in its own way, the United States experimented with a welfare society orchestrated from Washington under the Kennedy-Johnson administrations in the 1960s.

However, since the 1970s, the backlash in Western democracies has humbled this grand ideology as it learned the limits of its power and wisdom. Governments, especially those with socialist ownership of industries, are not very good at running a planned economy. Even the state does not have enough money to provide for all social benefits, as exemplified by the fear of bankruptcy of the Social Security pension funds in the US. State social engineering of the poor, such as in Johnson's "War on Poverty" or in Israeli peripheral settlement towns for new North African immigrants, have often failed to improve the lot of the beneficiaries. Rather, they have fostered a culture of multi-generational poverty and dependence. Bureaucracies, including public schools, often lack the ability to help local populations develop their own ways of doing things. The reconstructed liberal society is often less satisfying and less effective than the traditional one. Governments sensitive to election politics and short term political concerns may not be the best sites for long term planning of social and economic reform. For all these reasons and many more, an unusual alliance has emerged between right and left, such that both the economic and social conservatives such as Reagan, Bush and Netanyahu *and* the left-wing communitarians opposed to globalized, modern "one fits all" top-down solutions, have both preferred to mobilize initiatives of civil society and of private sector through individuals, churches and political associations.

Private Foundations in America: Promoting Public Social Welfare with Private Wealth

The general purpose foundation is an American invention that required changes in the law in the late 19th C. to allow bequests that were not designated for a narrow purpose as was typical in English law, but open to adjustment in ends and means by a board of trustees interested in the changing needs of their society.

"The advent of open-ended philanthropy at the turn of the twentieth century produced a new kind of institution designed to administer large philanthropic resources. The **general-purpose foundation** was a genuine American invention, a direct outcome of the greater range of options the new rich and associated reformers could rely on for adapting philanthropy to society's changing needs and contributing to public policy. (27 foundations were in operation by 1915; over 200 by 1930)." ^{clxi}

However these American foundations which won government recognition for their magnates' contributions as the tax-deductible – have been subject to democratic critiques. Waldemar Nielsen writes:

“In the great jungle of American democracy and capitalism, there is no more strange and improbable creature than the private foundation. Private foundations are virtually a denial of basic premises: an aristocratic institution living on the privileges and indulgences of an egalitarian society; aggregations of private wealth, which contrary to the proclaimed instincts of Economic Man, have been conveyed to public purposes. Like the giraffe, they could not possibly exist, but they do.”^{cxii}

Critics have argued, for example, that J.D. Rockefeller raised his foundation’s money by exploiting his workers by keeping their wages very low, according to the same ideology of scientific and therefore cost-effective management that he applied to his philanthropy. Furthermore, wealthy donors giving to private foundations receive tax write-offs at the expense of government revenue that could be applied to social problems, while generally dispersing only 5% per year of their capital on whatever they cavalierly consider to be the public good. Public accountability is minimal, while public acclaim of their generosity is overgenerous. Foundations, claim the critics, remain an aristocratic island in an American democracy. They are created and nurtured by the same democracy that is unduly influenced by political contributions to elected officials. These tax-shelters serve to enhance the donors' good names and their public as much as, or even more than, promoting the public good.

The defenders of foundations, however, maintain what their founders have always claimed which is that governments serve the people badly where innovative and efficient problem-solving approaches to socio-economic issues are most needed. They claim to apply efficient scientific analysis while bumbling and traditional government bureaucracies cannot initiate change. Social entrepreneurial skills and strategic thinking tempered by competitive success in the world of business are the special resource that foundations supposedly have to offer.

In the 1960s, liberal governments were appreciative of this private input. The US and Israeli governments, somewhat humbled by their gargantuan social tasks, began to seek partnerships with private foundations such as Ford, Carnegie and, in the Jewish world, the JDC and UJA. In the 1970s, America developed a mixed private-public division of labor aimed at providing for the needs of all citizens, including the poor. As the government took over more basic relief work such as old fashioned charity, progressive private foundations like Ford and Carnegie developed a new calling. They would identify public problems, experiment with innovative solutions and then advocate legal, social and economic laws by which the government would make its own welfare policies more effective. Private foundations became think tanks and political lobbyists for government policy changes and they leveraged their power in alliance with the much vaster government resources.

The Jewish Distribution Committee (JDC) exemplifies a private agency’s contribution to solving problems in what are usually seen as governmental or international areas of responsibilities. The JDC began as a short-term emergency relief organization for Jewish refugees in Europe and in Turkish Palestine. The German Jewish US ambassador to Turkey Henry Morgenthau, seeing the desperate plight of Jews in Jerusalem during the war, asked for a private donation of \$50,000 from the German Jewish philanthropist Jacob Schiff and thus JDC was born to execute that request for relief. They continued direct maintenance aid under difficult war conditions in World War Two in places such as the Warsaw Ghetto and concentration camps. During the mass exodus of Soviet Jewry in 1980s and 1990s the JDC supported refugees wherever they wished to settle.

The JDC, however, began to pursue pro-active solutions to problems that far exceeded emergency humanitarian relief for Jews in wartime. In the 1920s they sought to rebuild shattered European Jewish communities by helping reestablish yeshivot and schools. They invested in vocational training and extensive loans to small businesses. Together with the Soviet government they helped retrain and settle Jews as farmers in accordance with Soviet policies (Agro-Joint), though the Zionists criticized them for reinforcing the illusion that Jewish life in Eastern Europe was still viable.

Uniquely the JDC entered into political minefields usually avoided by charities. They engaged in politically-sensitive rescue operations often involving clandestine activities such as support for Raoul Wallenberg in Budapest in helping smuggle out Hungarian Jews in 1944 – 1945. The JDC in concert with the State of Israel helped in smuggling persecuted Jews out of Europe after the Holocaust by purchasing the S.S. Exodus, by rescuing the remnants of Jews from Yugoslavia and Muslim lands – Yemen, Syria, and Iran – and in paying a \$35,000,000 bribe to the totalitarian Communist government of Ethiopia to facilitate the Israeli airlift called Operation Solomon. As a result 14, 310 Jews were flown to Israel on May 24, 1991. Besides saving lives with material aid and escape routes when necessary, the JDC in the 1990s took it upon itself along with other organizations to rebuild the Jewish cultural life in the FSU.

Also unusual was the political role of the JDC in pursuing and obtaining restitution of funds left in Swiss and other bank accounts by Holocaust victims and survivors. The 1995 Claims Conference provided vast sums and the JDC applied much of that money to social services for the aging Jewish populations in the FSU who had suffered during the war. In all these ways the JDC has combined political leverage with traditional relief work in ways that are unprecedented in the collaboration of governments and private agencies.

Michael Schneider, the executive vice-president of JDC (1988 – 2002) describes the unique skill set of JDC employees who must combine innovation and *hutzpah* with good organizational work to provide aid to the needy in murky political situations:

“A ‘Jointnik’ is a little bit of a maverick, a generalist, can turn his hand to everything from rescue to conflict resolution to negotiation to speech writing, public speaking, administration, is not afraid to get caught in slightly dangerous situations, turns on a dime, is courageous enough to buck headquarters when necessary, and is just a good overall general manager with a lot of *sechel* [wisdom] and savvy, street smart as well as sophisticated, capable of moving in diplomatic circles, speaking to a cabinet minister or a rough people smuggler from dangerous countries, a wheeler-dealer.”^{clxiii}

The JDC has also blazed a path of collaboration between government and private initiative more similar to many innovative American foundations who act from outside the government to develop expertise and, then take on the roles of prophets and social scientists, to diagnosis social ills, formulate new priorities and then advocate for governmental reform and societal renewal through in-depth analysis of the challenges and threats to society.

“**Philanthropy as social reform** is dedicated to encouraging social change. Its practitioners believe that societal circumstances are often more powerful in shaping human destiny than the actions of individuals themselves; hence, they argue, philanthropy must strive to change the circumstances. Indeed, its motto might well be the MacArthur Foundation’s own: ‘**A Catalyst for Change**’ “

"As this motto suggests, the philanthropic tradition of social reform takes a **proactive**, even directive role in public life. Rather than responding to the requests of others, it actively attempts **to define and solve public problems**, often through experimentation and the innovative use of venture capital. A foundation has the resources, freedom and expertise necessary to experiment on social problems. It should therefore seek innovative solutions that can in time be adopted by others.

"Our society ... is in obvious need of philanthropic institutions standing **outside the frame of government** but in support of the public interest...Just as **scouts** move in advance of a body of troops to probe what lies ahead," so too philanthropic institutions "can spot emergent problems, **diagnose** them, and test alternative ways to deal with them." (Peterson Commission in 1970)^{clxiv}

In the Jewish context, along with private foundations based on individual donors, there are quasi-public organizations sponsored by private contributions. These are run by professionals such as the Joint Distribution Committee which has become partners in developing government social policy in Israel. Initially, Israeli governmental social administrators looked askance at these private sector outsiders and entered into alliances mainly to obtain matching funds. However, over time, the JDC came to play a vital role in developing policy and experimenting with solutions later adopted by the government. JDC Israel today works in partnership with the Israeli government and other local organizations to develop social policies and institutions to improve the lives of the most vulnerable members of society, including the elderly, immigrants, children at risk, the disabled (MALBEN), and those who are chronically outside the workforce. In 2007, the JDC was awarded the prestigious Israel Prize for its lifetime achievements and special contribution to society and the State of Israel.³⁷

Initially engaged by the government to provide emergency aid to a traumatized and impoverished population of former refugees, JDC has redirected its efforts toward advising and subsidizing a broad spectrum of community based public and volunteer service providers. The evolution was a reflection of a new reality: Israel had come into its own as a nation and had successfully achieved building an infrastructure with the capacity to address the needs of its most vulnerable citizens. By the end of 1975, JDC had divested itself of all direct services in Israel, but through its JDC-Brookdale Institute it has expanded its role in pilot projects to help Israel and many other lands to rethink their governmental strategies for solving deep social problems.^{clxv}

³⁷ For example, in the 1950s, institutional care for the aged was replaced whenever possible with JDC initiatives that enabled older people to live at home in their communities. For the mentally ill, JDC trained staff and developed a service plan with the Ministry of Health. The Paul Baerwald School of Social Work, first created by JDC in France to train professionals working with refugees from many diverse cultures, was reestablished at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem to professionalize social services. In the 1960s the JDC helped found Israel's first Child Development and Assessment Center, which put into practice the then-emerging idea that early detection and treatment optimize outcomes for children with disabilities. Once proven as a successful model, Child Development Centers soon spread across the country. In 1969, JDC and the government of Israel inaugurated ESHEL—the Association for the Planning and Development of Services for the Aged—to extend a network of coordinated local, regional, and national services to underserved elderly.³⁷

Post-Modern Philanthropy: Humility and Civil Society

Following the decline in enthusiasm for state welfarism, foundations have led the way back to establishing civil society as a partner in societal renewal and providing solutions to the problems of the disadvantaged and disempowered. In their seminal essay "Toward a Fourth Philanthropic Response: American Philanthropy and Its Public", Elizabeth M. Lynn and D. Susan Wisely sketch this new direction of the last 30 years:

"We hear calls for different voices in public life - not just the voice of the successful, not just the voice of the expert, but the voice of the citizen.

In response, foundations and other philanthropic organizations have begun to turn toward **..civic engagement**. They are investing resources in **strengthening relationships and nurturing conversations among citizens**, in order to build, 'more reflective and resourceful local communities.' ... Ultimately, the goal of these **investments** may be to relieve, improve, or reform the communities they serve. Yet the focus of the work and the standard of its success, is building up **connections** among ordinary citizens." (Lynn and Wisely, 108) ^{clxvi}

This kind of philanthropy might be called **postmodern** because it is wary of top down experts who think they know best what to do to reform others' lives. It is post-liberal and beyond 1960s liberalism in its turn away from centralized government initiatives powered by new legislation for a whole nation, a Great Society, run by technocratic philosopher kings of social justice who redistribute wealth and social solutions. The 1960s work of American liberal foundations followed the social reform tradition led by intellectual and economic elites using government power to enforce systematic and totalistic change also has its weaknesses.

Liberal and left-wing political leaders, government technocrats, university savants, think tank experts, and private foundation executives can often be legitimately criticized for **"arrogance in advocating for social change on behalf of the public, and a failure to listen carefully to that public."**

"The tradition of social reform has obvious strengths... But modern foundations have naturally been tempted to see themselves as a kind of 'shadow government,' not just as supporters of experiments that might inspire further thinking, but as the very makers of future social policy. ...The result can be a kind of **arrogance in advocating for social change "on behalf of" the public, and a failure to listen carefully to that public.**" (Wisely and Lynn, 108)

In post-modern philanthropy, unlike the "scientific giving" of individual philanthropists such as Carnegie and Rockefeller, foundations do not generate new knowledge and then apply it to social engineering aimed at remodeling the recipients into the givers' own success paradigm of the self-made businessperson. Rather, there is a nostalgic return to Alexis de Tocqueville's vision of America as revived by Robert Bellah in *Habits of the Heart*. There is a new commitment to revitalize democracy, especially local communal initiatives:

"Americans of all ages, all conditions, all minds constantly unite. ... Thus the most democratic country on earth is found to be, above all, the one where men in our day have most perfected the art of pursuing the object of their common desires in common and have applied this new science to the most objects. ..

"There is a necessary relation between associations and equality. Aristocratic societies always include within them ... a few very powerful and very wealthy citizens; each of these can execute great

undertakings by himself.... In democratic peoples, on the contrary, all citizens are independent and weak; they can do almost nothing by themselves, and none of them can oblige those like themselves to lend them their cooperation. They therefore all fall into impotence if they do not learn to aid each other freely.What political power would ever be in a state to suffice for the innumerable multitude of small undertakings that American citizens execute every day with the aid of an association?"^{clxvii}

The method of citizens' initiative is what many foundations since the late 1990s have been advancing. No longer certain they have all the scientific and moral answers and no longer sure that wealthy businessmen or liberal government bureaucrats have all the techniques, the new approach of philanthropic foundations is to encourage **civic engagement by small scale, local, grassroots organizations.**

Since the 1980s (in America) and the 1990s (in Israel), the rapid retreat of governments from many social welfare policies and functions, has created a vital need to reinforce and extend civil society. In America this means revisiting narratives of individual and communal self-help that go back to Ben Franklin, while adjusting them to an age of atomistic individualism and weakening of communal and familial ties. In Israel and within the American Jewish community, that means revisiting the tradition of communal organization in the Diaspora Kehilla, the European immigrant Landsmanschaften and the Yishuv (the pre-state Zionist society of the 1930-40s). In order to benefit marginalized subgroups and increasingly passive rank and file citizens, it is essential to invite them to take advantage of the democratic process. Therefore many philanthropic foundations, like NIF's Shatil in Israel now pursue policies of **empowerment of local groups to solve their own problems.**^{clxviii}

As we said, Maimonides had preached on the individual level: offer the needy not just a job or a loan but a partnership in which the donors invest in a common pot to build a business together because they believe the poor can be successful. Applied at the communal level, a similar vision is echoed eloquently in the words of the director of the Boston Foundation:

"It seems to me that the primary mission of philanthropy in America is .. **to make it possible for individuals to emerge from the constraints of history, from lives defined by poverty, by age gender, by physical disability, by racial or ethnic discrimination, or by any other condition limiting the development of their innate potential.**"

"What we tried to do at the Boston Foundation was to effect .. **freedom for individuals by leveraging the power of the community.** We realized that **no amount of "giving" could do for the community what the community could do for itself.** We came to reject the notion that solutions could be superimposed on communities by outsiders. ... We then did something so obvious, so straightforward, and so self-evident that we wondered afterward why it had not occurred to us earlier. We reached out directly to the poor and asked them what they needed, what they wanted.

"In practical terms, it meant .. redirecting our resources toward organizations more organically connected with the communities they serve, organizations with more community people on boards and staff, directly shaping and implementing policy. It meant drawing into the decision-making arena teenagers, elderly people, single mothers, the disabled, the jobless, the poor. Even if these people are struggling on the margins of society, even if their very problem seems to be their powerlessness, these are the people whose engagement and participation are most critical to successful social change. Such change cannot be imposed by politicians, or experts, or academics, or even well-intentioned persons such as those who run important philanthropic institutions. .. **The best work we as**

community foundations can do is to give the gift of respecting, believing in,³⁸ and working with people, where they are, to help strengthen their capacity to change and improve their own lives.^{>>clxix}

Wisely and Lynn sum up this approach of partnering with civil society optimistically yet realistically:

“Civic engagement suffers from the perennial frustrations of democracy. It can be slow, contentious, prone to more talk than action, and difficult to render into measurable outcomes. But it can also **empower** those who might not otherwise participate in public life. It encourages attention to local needs and, in the language of our own time, recognizes **local assets**. And it builds community by engaging its citizens with one another and enabling them to work together on their shared concerns.”^{>>clxx}

“In this time between times, when new wisdom is needed, civic engagement may be an especially important philanthropic response. Citizens have untapped wisdom and resources for public service in their own practical experience which, for a variety of reasons, they have not been able to discover or recover. To put it simply, **people need opportunities to learn from themselves and about themselves, from others and about others.** ... Foundations can ... promote civic engagement and encourage public moral discourse, by cultivating hospitable spaces for reflection and by bringing diverse people and perspectives into conversation in the hope that new vision and fresh action will eventually emerge.”^{>>clxxi}

Post Modern Jewish Philanthropists: The Age of the Social Entrepreneur

Today in 2012 the innovative young founders of nontraditional private businesses often in the hi-tech area have generated a new model of philanthropist called often the social entrepreneur. They belong to a special niche in the Non-Profit Sector.³⁹

³⁸ “One evening a few years ago I spoke at the opening of an art exhibit at the Boston Public Library. Sponsored by Dorchester Community Center for the Visual Arts...Much of it was by children and teens completely new to art. These young people from a part of Boston that includes some of the city's poorest and most troubled neighborhoods, had worked over a period of several months with trained artists to create life-size portraits of themselves that they had painted on hollow-core doors a local lumber company had contributed to the program. The results were striking. I could see, I could feel, what it is that art does for individuals and for a community.

There, in those paintings, were the young people of Dorchester, presenting themselves to the world as they saw themselves. Simultaneously bold and innocent, the self-portraits conveyed a very different view of this community's young than the one we see in headlines and on the evening news, where Dorchester represents the "inner city" a place of drugs and gangs and violence. These youngsters had freed themselves from other people's definitions to stand on own, in their uniqueness and particularity, as large as life and as vibrant. They had discovered how to use art - not as experts, but as serious practitioners, to explore and celebrate their own identities, to create something that would tell rest of us who they really were.” (Anna Faith Jones, former executive director of the Boston Foundation in the 1980s, "Doors and Mirrors: Reflections on the Art of Philanthropy," in Amy Kass, *Giving Well*, 46ff)

³⁹ “Paul Vanderventer, the President and CEO of LA Community Partners that nurtures and trains the city’s social entrepreneur sector commented that the nonprofit sector is distinct from the business world in many ways and needs to operate on its own set of principles and methodologies. This flies in the face of what we often hear from board members today, who are known to demand that “nonprofits operate like businesses.” It certainly is not what I encountered several weeks ago at Google. Silicon Valley’s hi-tech social activists, who are invested in data as the driving force of business, believe that the same methodologies must also be applied to how nonprofits judge their efficacy and impact.” (Gary Wexler, “In a New Era where Everything is Changing, Should the Non-Profit Sector Still Call Itself the Non-Profit Sector?” on website Nonprofit Revolution Now (2012).

"The invention of the new philanthropy is credited to the successful young entrepreneurs of the dot-com world of 1990s. Thus they are called social entrepreneurs or strategic donors who have a founder's attitude to their projects, a sense that this is mine and I will succeed. Therefore they give their 'energy, enthusiasm, creativity, passion, and connections.'^{clxxii}

Perhaps a more revealing name for their giving than Non-Profit Sector would be the "For Social Profit Sector." That title seeks to capture both the drive for profits and the chief beneficiary. The methods used are aggressive and imaginative business methods with much leveraging to address complex goals of transformation of their field of philanthropic endeavor. The beneficiary, however, is society through the introduction of structural changes that will be self-sustaining, not merely providing charity money to relieve immediate suffering. "Social Profit" as a term reflects an antidote to the notion of capitalist competition that often seeks individual profits at the expense competitors and even of consumers whose sense of "need" may be artificially manipulated by advertising. For Adam Smith by pursuing wholly selfish business objectives, one indirectly and unintentionally help the workers and a whole society to rise to higher levels of living. That is his notion of the Invisible Hand of market providence. For the social entrepreneur, however, social benefit, sharing material success with the larger society is a self-conscious goal. This approach may be called "**the triple-bottom-line**" which means to bring profit to the investor, to enable individual self-improvement and to benefit society, as for example with micro-finance programs that make a profit when loans are returned but also make it possible for small businesses to profit and thereby invigorate a whole society from the bottom-up. Thus the social entrepreneur's donation serves as venture capital "to create a profitable solution for a social problem" that leveraged much bigger problems and attracts more investment than any charity could.^{clxxiii}

Social entrepreneurs like the scientific philanthropists of the early 20th century are wary both of non-profit traditional charities and of government welfare programs because charity relief lacks imaginative goals of solving problems and governments lack imaginative and effective methods.

This generation of new philanthropists is also highly individualistic. While deeply moved by a social conscience, they are often wary of becoming part of a collective communal effort to take responsibility for society. Let us return to Charles Bronfman and Jeffrey Solomon's insightful presentation of this new generation of 21st century Jewish givers. His characterization begins by placing the self in the center of philanthropy in the most unapologetic fashion. Giving is self-expression and often self-invention of a *persona*:

"Few donors are selfless. That is fine. The question is what self governs these philanthropic choices? Therefore we must know the narrative of *who we are* to be able to identify **the self that governs our choices. The motives may be past, present or future oriented – social obligation growing out of our communal and historical identity including guilt; ephemeral and idiosyncratic whims like hobbies; the needs and crises encroaching on our society now; or the visions of what we can do to change the world. Since giving is highly individual without a sense of social obligation deriving from membership, it must fit one's self. It requires much sorting of one's preferences and values which means **self-reflection**. Therefore choosing one's philanthropic thrust is 'doing what's right for you.'^{clxxiv}**

Therefore one must market to the new donor as one does in high-end boutique advertising. Howard Rieger, executive of the Pittsburgh Jewish Federation, reports how fundraising successfully shifted from an appeal to social obligation to philanthropic consumerism as he engaged donors in JDC projects:

“Shopping around for places that I could fund projects that would be of interest to our donors, led me to the Joint ...and it's resulted in tremendous support for the Joint, tremendous support and identity with the federation on the part of [one] donor... somebody who essentially was on the sidelines of the federation became just galvanized by this effort, stepped right into the middle of the action. And that was a model that we built upon ...people who were pretty much on the fringe of federation activity stepping up to be some of our largest contributors on an ongoing basis through these kinds of ventures.”^{clxxv}

Rieger's use of shopping metaphors captures the change of paradigm in a highly individualist market culture, as does Michael Hoffman's donor strategy: “We like to steward our donors, .. We like to cultivate relationships... It is exceptional customer service... The donor is a customer.”^{clxxvi}

That individualistic self-centeredness attaches not so much to emblazoning one's name on the gift which is an ancient tradition, but to the choice of beneficiary as an act of self-definition and hands-on control of the method of problem-solving chosen:.

"In the new philanthropy donors have sought to make a difference... And they are ready to make use of sophisticated management instruments they have developed in their business life to achieve greater performance in this new, more challenging arena, and with potentially more impact. They give purposefully, think strategically, rely on measurements and regular monitoring. In short, they are relying on the focus and rigor of for-profits to enhance the effectiveness of their philanthropy... Business' best attributes of purposeful, honed intelligence and strategic-mindedness have a place in philanthropy.”^{clxxvii}

As compared to the UJA and American Jewish Federations, the social entrepreneur has often abandoned the old sense of community membership and therefore of tzedakah as a social obligation:

"Old philanthropy is being replaced by new philanthropy... Charles Bronfman's father, head of Seagrams, used to donate to the major umbrella organizations of the Jewish and general community out of a sense of social obligation as one gives taxes regularly and annually with fluctuations by the economic success of one's own business.... The old philanthropy was about fulfilling a social obligation, while the new is about fulfilling my life by making a difference in the world.”^{clxxviii}

“In the old philanthropy, donors gave largely out of **obligation**, routine, and guilt .. In the new philanthropy, the donor's giving is like their doing: it is **individual**, forward looking, leveraged for effect, and bent on changing the world...It signifies the transformation of society from **noblesse oblige** to one of **entrepreneurial problem solving**. The new philanthropist looks at her activities with a refreshing frankness and realism. She is less saint than engineer.”^{clxxix}

John Ruskay, executive director of the UJA-Federation of New York, echoes the tie between new trends in Jewish giving and an American cultural paradigm shift:

“We the federations are now against the grain. Said differently, we are a Jewish philanthropic mutual fund at a time when increasingly people want to select their own philanthropic stock. This is a result of what I refer to as ‘rampant individualism’ which impacts all of American culture, including philanthropy. Increasingly, people want to do their own philanthropic thing.” ^{clxxx}

Thus the Jewish social obligation typical of the great American Jewish organization of 20th century and typically a direct continuation of the Rabbinic sense of tzedakah as a social and legal duty is no longer self-evident in Western society. The fabulous structures of American Jewish giving built over the last half century are in danger of collapsing at a time of generational change. One veteran fundraiser told me the number of givers to the United Jewish Appeal nationally is down from 1990 to 2010, from 1,000,000 to 500,000 and most of those and most of the big donors are over 60 or 70 years old. Individual donors within the Federation world and individual federation now prefer to allocate their gifts directly to organizations of social change and relief. The advantage is that the donor feels much more engagement and perhaps gives more money and certainly more time and thought to the use of the gift.

However the downside from a purely pragmatic angle is that individual donor choices are made without coordination with other donors without regard for how the community as a whole sets priorities for what is needed more and deliberates about what strategies to pursue them. The distribution of support for projects is then haphazard and often not sustained over decades.

The American Jewish philanthropic base of potential donors has changed both because there are many less committed to a social obligation to the reconstruction and maintenance the Jewish communal identity and because many younger but strongly-identifying Jews now care more about universal causes as part of their Jewish commitment to justice. To meet this challenge and this opportunity some traditional communal fundraising organizations have changed in style, in designated beneficiaries and in Jewish rhetoric. One of the most creative adjustments of traditional Jewish communal organizations has been the new focus on “nonsectarian” recipients - that is, non-Jews, on humanitarian emergencies in which saving any life takes precedence over long term community building and tikkun olam that identifies global structures that must be repaired for the common good of Jews and non-Jew alike.

An excellent example is provided by Mark Rosen in his book on changing fundraising pattern in the JDC. Historically the JDC handled issue of the support and resettlement of Jewish refugees worldwide especially since 1914. Later JDC helped the Jews of USSR to become self-supporting farmers in 1930s and helps the State of Israel to develop new social welfare policies and pilot projects. But what about non-Jews? Mark Rosen reports that the JDC first used aid to non-Jews to bolster the standing of Jews in the same community:

“JDC began its non-sectarian work during World War I, almost from the agency's founding. At the time, by helping non-Jews in the name of American Jewry, JDC was able to dampen European anti-Semitism, an approach that ultimately helped local Jews. JDC has continued this work throughout its history.” ^{clxxxi}

This pragmatic approach to relationships between Jewish minorities and often hostile non-Jewish majorities with political power is already explicit in Talmudic policies of non-sectarian tzedakah allocations even when the non-Jews are polytheists:

"We support the foreign [i.e. non-Jewish] poor together with the poor of the people Israel, visit foreign sick together with the ill of the people Israel, and bury foreign dead together with the dead of the people Israel **on account of peace.**" (TB Gittin 61a)

But a wholly new direction for the JDC was emergency relief work beginning with the Rwanda genocide in 1994. Gideon Taylor at the JDC felt that:

"The non-sectarian programs speak to a segment of our Jewish world that tends to have limited affiliation with - let's call it the system. They are not part of - they are not interested in the system. By the system I mean the organized system, the federations and so on.... I think in some ways the system has missed out on that segment of the population. And I felt JDC had a unique opportunity to try to bring some of those people closer to the system in a broader sense I think the disaster relief was a particularly important way to focus public attention on the Jewish world's commitment to the wider world."^{clxxxii}

Rosen explains how Taylor made this shift for the JDC:

"In a move that was unprecedented at the time, Taylor ranged for JDC to place a full-page advertisement for \$60,000 in the New York Times to solicit aid for Rwandan refugees. He brought together a coalition of twenty or so Jewish organizations ... to co-sponsor the ad. The result was astonishing - over \$2 million in checks arrived at JDC's offices in New York. Currently, what is now known as the International Development Program (IDP) provides services in almost 30 countries."^{clxxxiii}

Here disaster relief as well as support in developing progressive welfare policies in many poor lands is wholly disconnected from helping the local Jewish community. To some this change appears to be a move away from Jewish causes, but it is not a step away from classic Rabbinic Jewish motivations for *tzedakah* which often included aid to all human beings in a life-threatening emergency. ("One who saves the life of one human being is valued as if one had saved the whole world"- Mishna Sanhedrim 4).

What has changed is the reemphasis on selected old Jewish values interpreted in a new social and ethical context. That is why so many Western Jews speak of *tikkun olam* as the core of their Jewish identity. Thus supporting the JDC's non-sectarian projects and the American Jewish World Service's volunteer programs helps repair worldwide structures. At least one Talmudic source makes the obligation to support Jews and non-Jews alike a halakhic demand without regard to Jewish communal self-interest at all:

"The Rabbis taught: In a city with gentiles [idolaters] and Israel [Jews] one appoints gentile collectors of welfare (*tzedakah*) and Jewish collectors, they exact contributions from gentiles and they exact contributions from Israel, and [together] they give maintenance to the poor gentiles and to the poor Jews." (JT Gittin 5:7)

In the Talmudic age one's city and one's solidarity with all its citizens was territorially restricted but today a sense of global community of mutual interdependence expands the *polis* to the cosmo-polis.

In Summary: Jewish Civil Society and Tzedakah

How new is the narrative of promoting civil society through tzedakah activities? In some ways the post-Biblical Jews – at least since Rabbinic times under Greco-Roman rule – have always demonstrated the communal ability to create associations for self-government whose primary field of service was tzedakah. In line with the democratic structure of Hellenist cities and the corporate autonomy of subgroups like guilds in medieval society, Jews also developed voluntary organizations. In each city, the Jewish subgroup established mini-governments with coercive powers for collecting tzedakah as a tax and delivering services. They enforced these by the power of oaths, bans and collective “excommunication” from Jewish society. As Maimonides declared in the 12th C.: “Never have we seen or heard of a Jewish community without a tzedakah fund” – with appointed *gabbaim*, officials empowered to collect and distribute tzedakah.^{clxxxiv}

At the same time, groups of individuals created **self-help societies** for particular purposes called holy societies (*hevras*)^{clxxxv}. For example, a *hakhnasat kallah* wedding society, a *hervra kaddisha* burial society,^{clxxxvi} a *bikur holim* visiting the sick society or the *somekh noflim* free loan society. These were often called *gemachs* (*gemilut hasadim*, acts of loving kindness) and they often involved fundraising activities as well as volunteer work. Such associations continue to flourish in the Ultra Orthodox world alongside government relief agencies. For example, the Haredim, ultra orthodox religious Jews in Jerusalem, founded the Yad Sarah association for lending medical equipment at no charge to anyone who is sick and it has now grown to serve the full range of Israeli society in all major cities.

In the late 19th C. and early 20th C., when mass immigration brought 2,000,000 Eastern European Jews to America, they often formed a **Landsmanschaft** based on common origin in a city or geographical area. They shared funds without charging interest, helped each other bring over relatives from the Old Country, and shared in the work and cost of putting together a wedding. This is the modern descendant of the idea of the *goel* redeemer system of the Leviticus 25 where family members would redeem their economically “falling” brothers. However, now geographic origins define these mutual obligations to provide a safety net for the new immigrants and a surrogate familial clan.^{clxxxvii} It is this nostalgia for small face-to-face self-help groups combined with the internet media abilities to mobilize millions for worldwide campaigns of empowerment that makes this new-old model of philanthropy so exciting.

In the 1930s and 1940s, the Zionist immigrants to Israel interested in eventually creating a democratic state already developed extensive self-help associations collecting voluntary taxes, building schools, establishing labor unions, self-governing economic communities – *moshavim* and *kibbutzim*, self-defense groups, job training programs for agriculture, and health funds. However, the rise of a highly centralized socialist state committed to homogenizing society tended to take over social services and denigrate independent citizens’ initiatives. Now the need for a renewal of socio-economic associations became great, and was realized in partnerships with American Jewish philanthropic funds. So, for example, in the interaction between Israel and the American Jewish world, the United Jewish Appeal and its member federations created Project Renewal to develop

the housing infrastructure of the working poor who still suffered from poverty due to their immigrant status in Israel. This developed into Partnership 2000 which brought Jewish and American Jewish communities to work together to solve problems on a local level. When Partnership 2000 was established in 1994 it represented a major transition from the Project Renewal-twinning model. Rather than focusing on transforming disadvantaged Israeli communities through building physical and social infrastructure, it developed a process of building a shared committee of the partnered communities, bringing more than 10,000 volunteers every year to work together to examine issues and possible responses, determine projects and set budgets.

However, what is more typically modern and hardly found in traditional pre-modern Jewish giving is the donors' desire to affect public policy and change society, not just to maintain worthy causes. Modern models of helping the poor – whether as government social welfare taxes and entitlements, nation building, or reformist philanthropy à la Sir Moses Montefiore – are also **political acts driven by a vision of the public good**. These forms of tzedakah are not conceived of as acts of kindness between neighbors or as acts of mercy for the helpless and starving. The donors step out of their private role and become citizens active in the democratic society for the public interest. Peter Frumkin, a scholar in this field, described the public-private aspect of philanthropy incisively:

“In thinking about the relationship between government and philanthropy, philanthropy shares some of the features of political speech. Giving is in many ways a statement, about what is important and what matters. It is translated into grants and gifts, but at its heart there is a **declaration about the significance of certain public purposes and a set of assertions about how best to pursue these purposes**. Giving can be controversial or it can be absolutely safe and innocuous. In all cases, however, **philanthropy pushes the private values of individuals into the public and connects them to causes that create some benefit for others**. Just as a central part of politics is the formulation of claims about what is in the public interest and how best to strive toward common goals, so too in philanthropy is declaring one vision for a better society part of the process.”^{clxxxviii}

Modern philanthropy at its best is, for Frumkin, both expressive of individual interests and serving the instrumental concerns of the public. In this way it is not answerable to anyone in terms of justifying the kind of cause chosen and yet still subject to public debate and rational oversight.

“Philanthropy is both about the rational^{clxxxix} and effective application of resources to address human needs and the passionate enactment of the values, commitments, and beliefs of individuals who have defined a public problem as worthy of private attention.”^{cxc}

A Postscript on *Tikkun Olam*, Repairing the World

As we look back at the transformation of modern philanthropy in the 19th C. and 20th C., we can see its greatest innovation. Never in the classical era of Rabbinic tzedakah or of Christian charity was social and political change an explicit goal of private donors. Nor was accountability for the scientific effectiveness of the mode of giving placed at the center of the project of the giving. Maimonides suggested a way to help individuals become self-supporting and dignified, but no one took the messianic hopes for better society and translated them into a pragmatic program for individuals and voluntary associations to realize in the present by moderately reforming society piecemeal from within.

In the American Jewish civil religion described by Jonathan Woocher, Jews discovered a worldwide mission to solve international Jewish problems – Soviet, Ethiopian and Syrian Jews, reparations from international banks for Holocaust survivors, and the isolation of Israel – that required thinking and acting in macro terms – political, economic, and social. It required building alliances with governments (AIPAC, Jackson-Vanick Amendment to force liberalization in USSR and release of Soviet Jews), just as Herzl had done. This prepared the Jews as Jews for broadening their focus to world problems such as ecology or providing rapid responses to natural emergencies such as the catastrophe in Haiti or Holocaust-reminiscent genocides in Darfur. It recapitulated the efforts in the 1950s-60s by Ben Gurion to make Israel an ambassador for social-economic-health transformations in the Third World when many Israeli experts aided Africans and Asians as part of his notion of "a light unto the nations."

Conceptually, the American Jewish civil religion generated and absorbed a new-old metaphor – *tikkun olam* – as its theological slogan, and then they reoriented it toward political and philanthropic activism. They transformed tzedakah not only into the historic political task of nation-building but into a universal alliance of Jew and non-Jew, of American, European and Israeli, to repair the whole world as well as to reform our own inner character through social action. Drawing the term *tikkun olam* from Jewish mysticism reflects its cosmic and spiritually redemptive implications and connects it to the religious aspects of the Protestant millenarian reformers even more than to secular philanthropists like Carnegie and Rosenwald.

Jill Jacobs, a rabbi who has led a Jewish organization for social justice, explains the change of emphasis that occurs when tzedakah becomes *tikkun olam*:

“The popularity of the term *tikkun olam*, and the general emphasis on its mystical (Lurianic), rather than rabbinic, roots may indicate a desire to place one’s own work in a larger context of influencing the greater world. In an individual’s search for the meaning of his or her own life, it may be more compelling to think of one’s every action as contributing to the repair of the cosmos, than to think of the same actions as simply accomplishing a small fix to a much larger problem.”^{xc1}

Solving poverty, itself an enormous leap in the range of the goals of tzedakah and charity in the 19th C., is now swallowed up by a much more audacious aim: redeeming the world and ourselves (*tikkun olam*) by spiritual and practical reforms. In the next part of this book we examine another religiously-inspired worldwide reform movement centered on the right to human dignity for all those created in the image of God. It is not only material or even social needs that are primary but existential ones. The UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights is the starting point for an audacious goal, yet in my judgment this objective is in principle far less far reaching than the millenarian notions of *tikkun olam*. It establishes a minimum standard – human dignity, human decency, respecting human honor, *kevod habriot* – which requires many reforms but is still far from a messianic transformation that resolves all problems.

Appendices

The Holy Society of Those who Visit the Sick

Tevel B'Tzedek, A World of Justice:

An Israeli NGO's Outreach Program to Nepal and Haiti (2011)

by Rabbi Micha Odenheimer, founder

Theodore Herzl's Pitch to Baron de Hirsch (1895)

Reflections on the Decline of Jewish Philanthropy and Associational Membership

by Derek Penslar

Appendix: The Holy Society of Those who Visit the Sick

Medieval and early modern Jewish society was replete with voluntary associations – hevrahs – that banded together to help those in need. Here is a covenant created by such a holy society in 1767:

When the princes of the people of the God of Abraham, the chiefs and heads and leaders of the Holy Society of Those who Visit the Sick, gathered together in this place, Breslau, they carefully took thought of the poor sick here, to provide for their care, and to concern themselves with their cure. At their head stood the leader and chief in all things religious, that lion of our society, that guide under all circumstances, our master and teacher, the great and distinguished scholar, our judge and the academy head of our community and province, the honorable Joseph Teomim (May God preserve him and deliver him).

And they found it advisable to invite a sage from among our own people, one who is distinguished in righteousness, who is upright in heart, fears God, and is an expert in medicine. The purpose of this is that he may take care of the poor sick in the spirit of his knowledge, and that he may comfort them upon the bed of sickness, as is customary in the other holy communities of Israel.

And behold God has brought to them the distinguished scholar and the competent graduate doctor of medicine, who also happens to be a Jewish doctor, Abraham Kisch, a man in whom there reposes the spirit of wisdom and understanding and all the above-mentioned virtues. Then the two sides spoke to one another, in the presence of the rabbi, and they agreed to the following:

1. The fortunate society has accepted the learned Dr. Kisch for the above-mentioned office for three successive years, beginning in the month of Tevet coming, 5528 (December 22, 1767). And he has cheerfully agreed to accept this holy task for the period agreed upon with all the binding power as hereinafter stipulated, and now this is the nature of his ministry, this is what has been agreed upon between the two parties:

2. He is to visit the poor sick in the local Jewish hospital twice daily, as well as the other poor sick found among those who live in our community. Moreover, he shall treat anyone who presents an authentic statement to him signed by the Officer-of-the-Month of our society certifying that he belongs to our community, that he is poor, and that he requires help.

3. All payments for medicaments required for the cure of the poor are to be taken care of by the doctor out of his own pocket and to be given for nothing. The society assumes no responsibility with respect to this for the entire period indicated.

4. As payment for all this, the Brotherhood gives him from their treasury, as compensation for this holy work and for the medicaments, all told, annually, 399Rt.

May He who is "*the physician of those who are broken hearted and who binds up their suffering*" (Ps. 147:3) remove all sickness from the midst of His people and help them to escape from their perils. May God "*send His word and heal them, and bring them out of all trouble*" (Ps.107:20). Thus say the two honorable contracting parties who sign today, the 12th of Elul 527 (1767), here in Breslau. (Contract of Dr. Abraham Kisch with the Holy Brotherhood for the Care of the Sick, Breslau, 1767)^{cxcii}

Appendix: *Tevel B'Tzedek*, A World of Justice: An Israeli NGO's Outreach Program to Nepal and Haiti (2011)

By Rabbi Micha Odenheimer, founder

On a sunny Tuesday afternoon in Haiti, a week before the first night of Hanukah, villagers in the small rural hamlet of La Kolin, accessible only by rough earthen road and located near the epicenter of the earthquake of January 2010, heard a sound that had never before been heard so close to home: the whirring of helicopters approaching. The helicopters were carrying the President of Haiti, Michel Martelly, flying in for a special occasion: The official inauguration of Tevel b'Tzedek/IsraAid's *Haiti Grows* agriculture project. Aimed at transforming subsistence farmers into profitable agricultural entrepreneurs, *Haiti Grows* teaches farmers to triple their crop production and to sell to high-value markets. 200 farmers are enrolled and 60 are already implementing Israeli best practices in their fields. TbT/IsraAid will be helping the villagers to create rain water storage reservoirs to insure that they can plant all year round; Fonkoze, Haiti's premier micro-credit NGO is waiting to give out loans to those farmers who feel ready to invest in themselves after completing the course.

"Israel," the President said, "is the perfect partner for Haiti in accomplishing this, because it made the desert bloom." The President bent over to plant the first tomato shoots in a demonstration field watered by drip irrigation—an Israeli invention that allows farmers to nourish their crops using 1/3 the water of ordinary irrigation.

Invited to speak after the President, I mentioned our upcoming Jewish holiday. "On Hanukah we light candles," I said. "If you give someone an apple, you don't have the apple anymore. When you light a candle though, your own flame still burns just as bright. Haitians and Jews have a book in common. It is called the Bible, and much of it is the story of a people seeking to reach the Promised Land, and to stay on that land once they have arrived. We are committed to helping you prosper, here on your promised land."

Our work in Haiti is unusual. While there are many international organizations working in Haiti, the emphasis of the vast majority is on the material and the concrete: building schools, clearing rubble, digging wells—all important things. "Tevel b'Tzedek is not like that. It is about giving the villagers the knowledge and the capacity to help themselves, so that they no longer have to be dependent on others." Hundreds of adults in the three villages in which we are working are studying literacy, numeracy, French, English and computers in the community learning centers we have created—the teachers are Haitian volunteers. At first, adult Haitians, most of them women, were embarrassed to come to literacy classes, ashamed that they did not know how to read and write, but now literacy courses continue to grow.

Appendix: Theodore Herzl's Pitch to Baron de Hirsch (1895)⁴⁰

Baron Maurice de Hirsch was, along with the Rothschilds, one of the great multi-millionaires of the 19th century. He had shown deep philanthropic interest in the misery prevalent among East European Jews, and founded the Jewish Colonization Association or ICA (in 1891), endowing it ultimately with some \$40,000,000, for the settlement of Jewish immigrants in agricultural colonies mainly in Argentina.

⁴⁰ *The Diaries of Theodore Herzl*, edited and translated by Marvin Lowenthal, 13ff

Herzl's letter to Hirsch was a bald request from the blue "to have Jewish-political conversation" which perhaps "will have its effect when you and I are no longer here." He told him, "**You have hitherto been only a philanthropist**, I want to show you the way to become something more."

"You will find in what I have to say," I continued, "some things too simple and others too visionary. But **men are ruled by the simple and the visionary**."

"I had never thought that I would busy myself with the Jewish question. You too never imagined that you would one day become a patron of the Jews. You were a banker and engaged in big business, and yet in the end you are devoting your time and fortune to the Jewish problem. I have been since youth a writer and journalist, with no thought of the Jews. But my experiences and observations and the growing pressure of anti-Semitism have forced me to the problem.?"...

"We need to educate our people... If we decide to emigrate, it will take a long while before we can reach the Promised Land. Moses needed forty years. We require perhaps twenty or thirty. In any case, new generations will arise whom we must educate."

"Now, with regard to education, I propose to lay down from the outset quite different methods from those which you employ. First of all, there is **the principle of philanthropy; which I hold to be altogether mistaken. You breed beggars. It is characteristic of the situation that no other people has so much philanthropy and so much beggary as the Jews. Plainly there must be a close connection between these two phenomena. Philanthropy, it is apparent, debases the character of our people.**"

"He interrupted me: "You are quite right...The race must first of all be uplifted - on the spot. They must be made strong, as for war, taught the joy of work, and the exercise of virtue. Instead of buying up Jews one by one, you might offer huge prizes in the chief anti-Semitic countries for deeds of great moral beauty, for courage, self-sacrifice, virtuous conduct, notable achievements in art and science, for the doctor during an epidemic, for the soldier, the discoverer of a remedy, of some public boon, no matter what - in short, for everything great. The prize will achieve two things: first, a general improvement; next, publicity. Because the feat which wins a prize will be unusual and dazzling, everyone will talk about it. Thus people will learn that there are also good Jews, and many of them."

"The first objective is more important: **a general uplift**. I am not at all interested in the annual individual prize-winners. I am more concerned with the contestants as a body, who will strain themselves to obtain a prize. In this way the general moral level will be raised."

"At this point he intervened with impatience. "No, no, no!" he cried, "I do not want to raise the general level. All of our misfortunes come from the fact that the Jews want to climb too high. We have too much brains. My intention is to restrain the Jews from pushing ahead. They shouldn't make such great progress. All of the hatred against us stems from this."

Hirsch enlarged on his praise: "But you have such visionary notions."

Herzl responded: "I will say to the Kaiser: let our people go. We are strangers here. We are neither permitted nor are we able to assimilate with the people. Let us go! I will procure for you the ways and the means-which I will use for the exodus - whereby no economic catastrophe will follow our departure."

Hirsch said: "Where will you get the money?"

"The money?" I said with a defiant laugh. "I will raise a Jewish national loan of ten million marks."

"Fantasy!" smiled the Baron. "The rich Jews will give nothing. Rich people are worthless: they care nothing for the sufferings of the poor." ...[Nevertheless,] Hirsch concluded: "This is not our last conversation. As soon as I return from London I shall give you a sign of life." [June 2, 1895]

Dear Baron de Hirsch:

I look for no immediate conversion. My plan by no means depends upon your good graces. True, for the sake of speed I wanted to win you as a ready-to-hand and well-known power. But there is another power. There is ultimately and above all the **Jewish masses** - to whom I will learn to find the way. This pen is power.**You are the great money-Jew; I am the Jew of the spirit.** Hence the difference in our means and approach.

I would have had to tell you what **flag** would unfurl and how. And then you would have asked in mockery, A flag, what is that? A stick with a cloth rag? No, a flag, sir, is more than that. **With a flag you can lead men where you will - even into the Promised Land.** Men live and die for a flag; it is indeed the only thing for which they are willing to die in masses, provided one educates them to it. **Believe me, the policy of an entire people - especially one that is scattered all over the world - can only be made out of imponderables that float high in the thin air.** Do you know out of what the German Empire sprang? Out of reveries, songs, fantasies, and black-red-and-gold ribbons - and in short order. Bismarck merely had to shake the tree which the visionaries had planted.

What, you do not understand an imponderable? What then is religion? Consider, if you will, what the **Jews have withstood throughout two thousand years for the sake of a vision.** Visions alone grip the souls of men. And whoever does not know how to deal in visions may be an excellent, worthy, practical-minded person, and even a benefactor in a big way; but he will never be a **leader of men** and no trace of him will remain.

Nevertheless, a people's vision must be rooted in solid ground. How do you know that I do not have sound practical ideas for the details? Details, it is true, that are of gigantic dimensions. The exodus to the Promised Land presents itself practically as an enormous job of transportation, unparalleled in the modern world.” [Diary Entry, June 3, 1895].

Hirsch never agreed to support Herzl's plan. So Herzl abandons his attempts to seek support from philanthropists and instead inspires the common people to support the project with funds – the shekel – and with will power and with symbols. The key manner of uplift is not financial, but building self-esteem.

“I know where the country lies - in ourselves! In our capital and our labor.” [June 18, 1895]

After the First Zionist Congress in Basel, in 1897, Herzl wrote in his diary:

“If I were to sum up the Congress in a word - which I shall take care not to publish - it would be this: **At Basel I founded the Jewish State.** If I said this out loud today I would be greeted by universal laughter. In five years perhaps, and certainly in fifty years, everyone will perceive it. **The essence of a State lies in the will of the people for a State,** yes, even in the will of one powerful enough individual. A territory is merely the concrete basis.”

At Basel, accordingly I have created the abstraction, which, as such, is imperceptible to the great majority. I gradually worked the .people up to the atmosphere of a State and made them feel that they were its National Assembly. One of my first ideas, months ago, on how the Congress should be conducted was to have swallow-tails and white tie obligatory at the opening session. It worked out admirably. Full dress has a way of making most men feel rather stiff. The stiffness induces a measured, deliberate tone - one not so readily come by in light summer suits or travel wear - and I spared nothing to heighten this tone to the pitch of solemnity. Nordau turned up that first day in a frock coat and flatly refused to go home and put on his full-dress. I drew him aside and begged him to do it for my sake. As of today, I told him, the Zionist Congress still amounts to

nothing: we still have everything to create. People must be brought to expect only the finest things from the Congress and the utmost solemnity. He allowed himself to be persuaded, and I hugged him in gratitude. After a quarter of an hour he returned in formal attire.” [September 3, 1897]

Appendix: Reflections on the Decline of Jewish Philanthropy and Associational Membership

By Derek Penslar, *Shylock's Children: Economics and Jewish identity in Modern Europe*, 260-1

“Jewish activists in the postwar period (post 1945) have operated in a **mental universe of constant crisis**. Of late, however, the nature of that crisis has changed considerably. Although Israel's security remains a constant concern, threats to Jewish survival are seen to emanate as least as much from domestic, demographic sources, namely, assimilation and intermarriage, as from economic want or physical danger. Over the past decade Jewish philanthropies have increasingly targeted **domestic rather than overseas** projects, and among domestic issues **education has assumed priority over social welfare**. In addition to these changes in the allocation of resources, **the quantity of funds available and the willingness of Jews to invest time and effort on behalf of Jewish philanthropic causes appear to be in decline**. Between 1971 and 1991 total giving to Jewish causes in the United States - what we could call the Jewish gross national product - declined in real terms by 28 percent. Similarly, since 1989 total donations to the Council of Jewish Federations-United Jewish Appeal have, when adjusted for inflation, generally decreased. Given the vast increase in personal wealth during this period, the downward curve suggests not that Jews have less to give but rather that they are giving elsewhere, or not at all. Universities, museums, and other institutions that previously did not welcome Jewish gifts now aggressively solicit them.

At the same time, **associational Judaism is at risk of breaking apart as younger Jews turn away from service organizations** such as the B'nai B'rith and Hadassah. The ascent of associational Judaism in the nineteenth century and its decline in our time are part of a broader social phenomenon: **the rise and fall of the bourgeois public sphere**, that zone between the intimate realm of the family and the administrative realm of the state. Modern associations were voluntary and free; their membership cut across old estate lines, and, unlike all-encompassing guilds, they had specific purposes. The association thus embodied the spirit of modern individualism, in which the free man or woman chooses to associate for purposes of his or her own design. At the same time, **the activities of associations favored public service over private cultivation**. The philanthropic institutions of modern Jewry embodied a sphere of empowerment in which freely acting individuals, operating beyond both traditional communal structures and the purview of the state, devoted themselves to the simultaneous realization of **a social vision shared by middle-class society as a whole and an assertion of Jewish ethnic identity**. The specificity of the Jewish philanthropic project, like the defined purviews of Catholic or women's philanthropy in early-twentieth-century Europe, does not contradict its universalist qualities.

All forms of collective identity have been affected by the decline of the public sphere and the **enlargement of the intimate realm** (now devoted at least as much to **consumption** as to its traditional function of social reproduction).... In the industrialized West **ethno-religious identities have become increasingly privatized, eclectic, and syncretic, realized through a personal search for spiritual fulfillment** or grounding in one's ethnic roots. This process is **quietist** and accommodating of society... The blurring of contemporary North American Jewry's economic distinctiveness, the diminution of its philanthropic involvement, and the privatization of Jewish identity may be causally linked.”

-
- ⁱ *Cultural Values* Vol 2 Number 1 1998, 117- 139
- ⁱⁱ Robert Gross, *Charity*, 31
- ⁱⁱⁱ Samuel Fleischacker *On Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations*, 206-236
- ^{iv} Adam Smith, *WN* I.ii.4 - 75
- ^v Adam Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, 29
- ^{vi} A. Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, 100
- ^{vii} Adam Smith, *Lectures on Jurisprudence*, 497
- ^{viii} Adam Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, 346
- ^{ix} Adam Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, 341-342
- ^x Micah Goodman, *The Secrets of the Guide to the Perplexed*
- ^{xi} M. Goodman, *The Secrets*, 161-162
- ^{xii} M. Goodman, *The Secrets*, 93-103.
- ^{xiii} M. Goodman, *The Secrets*, 97, 178, 180, 148.
- ^{xiv} Loewe, *Diaries of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore*, 1: 32
- ^{xv} Abigail Green, "Rethinking Sir Moses Montefiore"
- ^{xvi} Abigail Green, "Rethinking Sir Moses Montefiore"
- ^{xvii} Jerry Muller, *Capitalism and the Jews*, especially 115-121
- ^{xviii} Leon Shapiro, *The History of ORT*, 3,11-13, 31.
- ^{xix} "It is hard to deny the 'missionary' quality of Jewish educational outreach conducted by the AIU, the AJA, and the Hilfsverein deutscher Juden among the "backward" Jews of the Middle East, even if the mission in question was the secularizing mission civilisatrice." (Abigail Green, "Nationalism and the 'Jewish International'" 535 –558).
- ^{xx} Abigail Green, "Rethinking Sir Moses Montefiore"
- ^{xxi} Abigail Green, "The British Empire and the Jews"
- ^{xxii} Abigail Green, "Rethinking Sir Moses Montefiore"
- ^{xxiii} Abigail Green, "The British Empire and the Jews"
- ^{xxiv} D. Penslar, *Shylock's Children*, 157-158
- ^{xxv} Jonathan Sarna, "The Economic Downturn and the Future of Jewish Communities" in *Jewish Policy Debate*, Sept. 2009
- ^{xxvi} Jonathan Sarna, "The Economic Downturn"
- ^{xxvii} D. Penslar, *Shylock's Children*, 104-105
- ^{xxviii} Derek Penslar, *Shylock's Children*, 99, 101
- ^{xxix} D. Penslar, *Shylock's Children*, 111-112
- ^{xxx} D. Penslar, *Shylock's Children*, 105
- ^{xxxi} D. Penslar, *Shylock's Children*, 108
- ^{xxxii} D. Penslar, *Shylock's Children*, 112-121
- ^{xxxiii} More ominously Jewish giving is also informed by a fear that Jews will be helped by missionary Christian welfare organizations or hospitals that will also convert them (Penslar, *Shylock's Children*, 103). The first Jewish hospitals like Rothschild's were built in the 19th C. Jerusalem because otherwise Jews had to go to missionizing Christian ones in an era when many Arabs were converting to Christianity when attending Christian mission schools and being attended to in Christian hospitals.
- ^{xxxiv} D. Penslar, *Shylock's Children*, 222
- ^{xxxv} D. Penslar, *Shylock's Children*, 231
- ^{xxxvi} D. Penslar, *Shylock's Children*, 240
- ^{xxxvii} D. Penslar, *Shylock's Children*, 241
- ^{xxxviii} Social engineering includes an emphasis on the themes of "scientific giving" discussed above. That desire to be scientific was a direct carry over from new business practices that require profitability. For example, French Baron Maurice de Rothschild required that his Jewish Colonial Association that functioned in Palestine and Argentina and Justice Louis Brandeis in the American Zionist organization insisted on businesslike oversight of their philanthropic projects of colonization. See D. Penslar, *Shylock's Children*, 241.
- ^{xxxix} Ironically today the Damascus Blood Libel with its uniquely Christian understanding of the Jew and of blood now enriches Arab Anti-Semitism.
- ^{xl} Cited in *Beginnings: Early American Judaica*, 46
- ^{xli} Cited in Jonathan Sarna, *Jacksonian Jew*
- ^{xlii} Aron Rodrigue, *French Jews, Turkish Jews*, 22
- ^{xliiii} A. Rodrigue, xi

-
- ^{xliv} A. Rodrique, 71-72
- ^{xlv} Abigail Green, “Nationalism and the ‘Jewish International,’” 535 –558
- ^{xlvi} Jewish Women's Archive and Wikipedia
- ^{xlvii} K. McCarthy, *The American Creed*, 2, 62
- ^{xlviii} Wendy Gamber, “Antebellum Reform: Salvation, Self-Control, and Social Transformation, in *Charity*, 129- 132
- ^{xlix} W. Gamber, “Antebellum Reform, 129- 132
- ^l W. Gamber, “Antebellum Reform,” 129- 132
- ^{li} W. Gamber, “Antebellum Reform,” 129- 132
- ^{lii} W. Gamber, “Antebellum Reform,” 129- 132
- ^{liii} Gunther Plaut, *The Rise of Reform Judaism*, 138
- ^{liv} S.R. Hirsch, “Die religion im Bund emit dem Fortschritt” in his collection of essays, *Judaism Eternal*, 224ff
- ^{lv} Dorothea Dix promised the legislators supporting her endeavors to subsidize mental institutions that “Under well-trained hospital care, recovery is the rule, incurable permanent insanity – the exception” (Dorothea Dix, *Praying for a Grant of Land for the Relief and Support of the Indigent Curable and Incurable Insane in USA – 1848*)
- ^{lvi} Kathleen McCarthy, *The American Creed*, 3
- ^{lvii} Lawrence Freidman, *Charity, Philanthropy and Civility in American History*, 43, 53, 81, and especially, Kathleen McCarthy, “Women and Political Culture,” 185-196
- ^{lviii} “Participation in voluntary associations ultimately gave women a voice in local, state, and national legislative debates, as well as the distribution of charitable resources. ...Female auxiliaries and groups such as the American Antislavery Society, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and the National American Women's Suffrage Association spearheaded the passage of constitutional amendments to extend the rights of citizenship to formerly enslaved black males, outlaw liquor sales, and win the vote for themselves - and they did so without direct access to the polls. (K. McCarthy, 190)
- ^{lix} Cited by G.J. Barker-Benfield in L. Friedman, *Charity*, 88
- ^{lx} In the early twentieth century women’s “philanthropic organizations also enjoyed a special status - that they operate outside the spheres of both the for-profit economy and of patronage politics reinforce their moral authority engaging them to lobby for and implement public programs. “Women's rhetoric appeared to rise above narrowly partisan considerations” by invoking symbols of motherhood and “notions of selfless morality.”
- Recent research suggests that women rather than men were the primary architects of the American welfare state, successfully promoting the introduction of “maternalist’ legislation for mothers and children in the 1910s and 1920s ...The women's groups were able to do so because they relied so heavily on voluntarism and, therefore, could develop even national public programs at minimal cost through what economists would term a commodity of time rather than money. (K. McCarthy, 182-194)
- ^{lxi} Felicia Herman, “From Priestess to Hostess: Sisterhood of Personal Service in New York City” in J. Sarna, *Women* 158- 159
- ^{lxii} Mrs. Benjamin Leerburger, the president of the Ahawath Chesed Shaar Hashomayim Sisterhood and Belle Kayton, the head of the Industrial School Section of the Emanu-El Sisterhood, cited in Herman, 154
- ^{lxiii} Hannah Einstein cited in Herman, 154, 159.
- ^{lxiv} F. Herman, 158
- ^{lxv} F. Herman, 158
- ^{lxvi} F. Herman, 155
- ^{lxvii} F. Herman, 150
- ^{lxviii} F. Herman, 150
- ^{lxix} Alan Ryan, “The Philanthropic Perspective after a Hundred Years,” 92-93
- ^{lxx} Citations from Susan Tananbaum in her enlightening article “Philanthropy and Identity”
- ^{lxxi} Alan Ryan, “The Philanthropic Perspective after a Hundred Years,” 92-93
- ^{lxxii} Alan Ryan, “The Philanthropic Perspective after a Hundred Years,” 92-93
- ^{lxxiii} John Stuart Mill, *The Subjection of Women*, 1869, chap. 4
- ^{lxxiv} June Axinn,, 101
- ^{lxxv} Avishai Margalit, “The Welfare Society,” in *The Decent Society*, 236
- ^{lxxvi} See also Ascoli, Peter M. *Julius Rosenwald* (2006), Edwin R. *Investment in People? The Story of the Julius Rosenwald Fund*. 1949; Werner, M. R. *Julius Rosenwald: The Life of a Practical Humanitarian*; *Julius Rosenwald*, 1976; Jarrette, Alfred Q., *Julius Rosenwald*, , 1975
- ^{lxxvii} Cited in Daniel Boorstin, “From Charity to Philanthropy” in *The Decline of Radicalism* (1963) reprinted in Bremner, *America's Voluntary Spirit*, 136
- ^{lxxviii} Robert Gross, *Charity*, 31
- ^{lxxix} Ben Franklin invented the matching grant by convincing the Pennsylvania legislature to compete funding from tax money wheat donors had given as private donations. (See A. Brooks, *Who Really Cares*,53)

^{lxxx} Cited in Daniel Boorstin, 137

^{lxxx} Peter Ascole, Rosenwald's grandson, interviewed in a short documentary on Rosenwald schools.

^{lxxxii} O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 28-29

^{lxxxiii} Judith Sealander, "Curing Evils at their Source," in *Charity*, 221

^{lxxxiv} As a promoter of scientific education, he was also the principal founder and backer for the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago.

^{lxxxv} Hasia Diner, *In the Almost Promised Land: American Jews and Blacks, 1915-1935*, 191

^{lxxxvi} Carnegie gave away \$350,000,000 (equivalent to \$4 billion dollars) in his own lifetime to create 2500 public libraries

^{lxxxvii} O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 24

^{lxxxviii} Cited in *The Foundation: A Great American Secret – How Private Wealth Is Changing the World* by Joel Fleishman

^{lxxxix} Lynn and Wisely, 105-106

^{xc} Carnegie, "Wealth," 148

^{xc} Jane Addams [1910] 1961, 122-123

^{xcii} Jane Addams [1910] 1961, 122-123

^{xciii} Robert Wuthnow, *Faith and Philanthropy in America*, 53

^{xciv} Lynn and Wisely, 105

^{xcv} Wisely and Lynn critique this tradition as follows:

"Yet the tradition of improvement, like the tradition of relief, has weaknesses. In the latter half of the twentieth century, American philanthropy increasingly confronted a society in which its improving efforts seemed chiefly to benefit the well-situated and highly motivated members of the community. (Ladders, after all, are useful only to those with climbing skills, and fishing lessons only help those with access to the pond!) The concept of "individual opportunities" is of diminished value if entire groups are effectively blocked-for social, legal, and economic reasons-from taking advantage of such opportunities." (Lynn and Wisely, 102 ff)

^{xcvi} Cited in Daniel Boorstin, *ibid.*, 136

^{xcvii} Joel Fleishman, *The Foundation*, 59

^{xcviii} "The older generation of foundation donors and leaders, many of whom came from the business world, had been trained in the philosophy of scientific management. But they were gradually replaced by nonbusiness generalists, usually from liberal arts backgrounds, who lacked the scientific management mind-set and strategic skills of their predecessors." (Joel Fleishman, *The Foundation*, 59)

^{xcix} A. Brooks, *Who Really Cares*, 68-69

^c See Gunnar Myrdal and much later Michael Novack.

^{ci} Paul Schervish, "Empowerment and Beneficence," 95- 109

^{cii} Jeff Skoll's pledge on givingpledge.org

^{ciii} Soma Hewa, "The Protestant Ethic and Rockefeller Benevolence: The Religious Impulse in American Philanthropy," 424-425

^{civ} Talcott Parsons, *The Structure of Social Action*, 528

^{cv} Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 226

^{cvi} Max Weber, *The Sociology of Religion*, 220

^{cvi} Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 162

^{cvi} Soma Hewa, "The Protestant Ethic and Rockefeller Benevolence: The Religious Impulse in American Philanthropy," 450 fn. 44

^{cix} J.D. Rockefeller, *Random Reminiscences of Men and Events* 104.

^{cx} J.D. Rockefeller, *Random Reminiscences of Men and Events* 112

^{cx} "Best uses to which a millionaire can devote the surplus of which he should **regard himself as only the trustee**" are:

1. The-founding of a university; 2. Free libraries; 3. Founding or extension of hospitals, medical colleges, laboratories and other institutions connected with the alleviation of human suffering, and especially with the prevention rather than the cure of human suffering; 4. Public parks; 5. Providing halls suitable for meetings of all kinds, and for concerts of elevating music; 6. Public swimming baths; and 7. One's own church and churches in poor neighborhoods. ... What commends itself most highly to the judgment of the administrator is the best use for him, for his heart should be in the work. It is as important in administering wealth as

it is in any other branch of a man's work that he should be enthusiastically devoted to it and feel that in the field selected his work lies." (Andrew Carnegie, "The Gospel of Wealth")

^{cxii} Cited in Judith Sealander, "Curing Evils at their Source," in *Charity* etc. 224

^{cxiii} Nicholas Wolterstorff, *Until Justice and Peace Embrace*, 64

^{cxiv} N. Wolterstorff, *Until Justice*, 30

^{cxv} cited in Waldemar Nielsen, *Inside American Philanthropy*. 13

^{cxvi} Waldemar Nielsen, *Inside American Philanthropy*, 14-16

^{cxvii} Waldemar Nielsen, *Inside American Philanthropy*, 14-16

^{cxviii} Waldemar Nielsen, *Inside American Philanthropy*, 14-16

^{cxix} After his death the Rosenwald Foundation also sought to reform rural tenancy typical of southern poverty and to force down the cost of medical care for poor whites and blacks (Nielsen, 47)

^{cxx} Oliver Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 10, 41,

^{cxxi} O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 209

^{cxxii} O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 115

^{cxxiii} O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 143

^{cxxiv} O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 275

^{cxxv} O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 275

^{cxxvi} I. Bahur, *Hapa'amon Hasaduk*, 2008

^{cxxvii} Rosenwald was one of the UJA's three national chairmen, leading the first campaign to raise more than \$100 million (1942 - 1946, and again 1955- 1957). In 1974, Rosenwald oversaw the merger of the UJA with the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies and was named as the first president of the combined organization.

^{cxxviii} O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 163

^{cxxix} Paula Kabalo, "A Historical Overview of Monetary Philanthropy in and for Israel in the 20th Century," 29. Since 1924 Edmond de Rothschild's PICA also bought agricultural land later handed over to the K.K.L.

^{xxx} Paula Kabalo, 31

^{xxxi} O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 45,

^{xxxii} O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 48

^{xxxiii} O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 72

^{xxxiv} O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 46

^{xxxv} O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 71

^{xxxvi} Jonathan Sarna, "A Projection of America as It Ought to Be: Zion in the Mind's Eye of American Jews," in Allon Gal, editor, *Envisioning Israel: The Changing Ideals and Images of North American Jews* (1991)

^{xxxvii} "Address of Mordecai M. Noah... Delivered at the Laying of the Corner Stone of the City of Ararat [2i September, 1825]," reprinted in *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society* 21 (1913), 236, 244. On Noah, see Jonathan D. Sarna, *Jacksonlan Jew: The Two Worlds of Mordecai Noah* 1981.

^{xxxviii} Jonathan Sarna, "A Projection of America," 45

^{xxxix} Mordecai M. Noah, *Address Delivered at the Hebrew Synagogue in Crosby-Street, New York, on Thanksgiving Day to Aid in the Erection of the Temple at Jerusalem* (Kingston, Jamaica, 1849),8.

^{cxl} Bernard Rosenblatt, *The Social Commonwealth (A Plan for Achieving Industrial Democracy)* (1914)

^{cxli} Jonathan Sarna, "A Projection of America," 58

^{cxlii} Woocher, *Sacred*, 13

^{cxliii} *This Thing of Giving*, 1924, cited in Woocher, *Sacred*, 32)

^{cxliv} cited in Woocher, *Sacred*, p. 31

^{cxlv} Woocher, *Sacred*, 32

^{cxlvi} Woocher, *Sacred*, 52

^{cxlvii} Cited in Woocher, *Sacred*, 53

^{cxlviii} Cited in Woocher, *Sacred*, 71

^{cxlix} Cited in Woocher, *Sacred*, 74

^{cl} cited in Woocher, *Sacred*, 81

^{cli} Cited in Woocher, *Sacred*, 70

^{clii} Cited in Woocher, *Sacred*, 82

^{cliii} See Woocher, *Sacred Survival*, 193-198

-
- cliv Cited in Woocher, *Sacred*, 78
- clv Cited in Woocher, *Sacred*, 84
- clvi Kerri Steinberg, 256- 258
- clvii Kerri Steinberg, 256- 258
- clviii Kerri Steinberg, 256- 258
- clix Jeffrey Dekro, *Jews, Money and Responsibility*, 128
- clx Jeffrey Dekro, 128
- clxi O. Zunz, *Philanthropy in America*, 22
- clxii Waldemar A Nielsen, *The Big Foundations* (1972, 3)
- clxiii Michael Schneider, interview, February 2, 2007, reported in Mark I. Rosen, *Mission, Meaning and Money*, xix.
- clxiv What is striking here is that the founders and executives of the foundations were private individuals from the establishment who sought to reform the establishment in its relationship to the poor and marginalized exploited by the upper strata. The foundation leaders saw themselves as acting on behalf of the public with a sense of calling not derived from the government authority. "Therein lies the social justice challenge for philanthropy - how privileged, wealthy donors, trustees, and foundation staff can translate their largesse earned from a less than just social and economic system to spur and support a grassroots social justice dynamic." (Richard Cohen, "Philanthropy and the Role of Social Justice," 29, 33)
- clxiv Robert Bremner, "Doing Good in the New World," 42
- clxv Mark I. Rosen in his history of the JDC, *Mission, Meaning and Money*, has provided most of the substance of this summary of JDC's philanthropic mission.
- clxvi "The help Hull House offered its neighbors took many forms - sometimes relief from pain, sometimes improved individual opportunity, sometimes advocacy for social change. But its first and final value, for Jane Addams, lay in building relationships among citizens so that they could better understand and assist one another. Addams did not call this work philanthropy, much less civic engagement." (ibid, 109)
- clxvii Alexis de Tocqueville, "On the Use that the Americans Make of Association in Civil Life" (1830s)
- clxviii Interestingly, the roots of community partnerships with outside finances is already in the Great Society in its ideal of community involvement. Civic engagement goals were evident in Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Office of E.O.) whose title II encouraged Urban and Rural Community Action Programs (C.A.P.) to reach "maximal feasible participation" of recipients of aid in their own self-help.
- clxix Anna Faith Jones, "Doors and Mirrors: Reflections on the Art of Philanthropy," cited in Amy Kass, *Giving Well*, 46ff
- clxx Wisely and Lynn, 109-110
- clxxi Wisely and Lynn, 109-110
- clxxii Bronfman, 25,35
- clxxiii Peter Diamandis and Steven Kotler, *Abundance*, 136
- clxxiv Charles Bronfman and Jeffrey Solomon, *The Art of Giving*, 1, 40
- clxxv Howard Rieger Interview, August 1, 2007, reported in Mark I. Rosen, *Mission, Meaning and Money*, 109
- clxxvi Michael Hoffman, interview, July 27, 2007, reported in Mark I. Rosen, *Mission, Meaning and Money*, 110
- clxxvii Bronfman, 23-24
- clxxviii Bronfman, 25
- clxxix Bronfman, 25, 35
- clxxx John Ruskay, interview, March 30, 2007, reported in Mark I. Rosen, *Mission, Meaning and Money*, 38
- clxxxi Mark I. Rosen, *Mission, Meaning and Money*, 93
- clxxxii Gideon Taylor, interview, July 31, 2007, reported in Mark I. Rosen, *Mission, Meaning and Money*, 93
- clxxxiii Mark I. Rosen, *Mission, Meaning and Money*, 94
- clxxxiv Maimonides, Mishne Torah, Gifts to the Poor 9:3
- clxxxv Jewish confraternities began to become common in Christian Spain from the thirteenth century, and thereafter in other European communities, notably Italy, and derivatively, beginning in the sixteenth century in the Ottoman Empire.³² They served multiple functions, including charitable purposes such as the dowering of orphan girls, teaching poor children and orphans, clothing the needy, visiting the sick, providing medical care, and burying the dead. Similar to their counterparts in Catholic society, they were corporations in the same sense that the Jewish community as a whole formed a corporation within Christian society, and they in some ways constituted an alternative or even counterforce to the officialdom of the organized community. (Mark R. Cohen, *Poverty*, 197)

^{clxxxvi} *Hevruta Kadisha* (the holy study partners) was originally the term for associations of scholars in Babylonia, but in Germany it was modified to *Hevra Kadisha* (the holy society) to apply to volunteer associations that buried the dead, especially the destitute (Yehuda Bergman, *Hatzedakah B'Yisrael*, 57). The seventh of month of Adar was often the day of the members banquet for it marks the traditional date when Moses died and God personally buried him.

^{clxxxvii} For example, in New York City the Chevrah “Poel Zedek Anschei Illia” (the Forsyth Street shul) was founded in the 1880s by a small group of immigrants from the shtetl of Illia, in the province of Vilna, Lithuania. These *landsleit*, immigrants from the same “land,” longed for a taste of home in the midst of a foreign land. They decided to form a chevrah in order to have a place to pray together and meet with their fellow countrymen, to help each other, and to hear news from the old home. The Chevrah was at the peak of its existence at its fortieth anniversary in 1924. At that time it sponsored a variety of activities and services including the Illiar Relief Fund, a Chevrah Kadisha burial society, Chevrah Mishnayos (Mishna study circle), Gemilus Chesed (free loan) fund, and sick benefits. The Chevrah also contributed financially to many Jewish causes.

^{clxxxviii} Peter Frumkin, “Private Wealth and Public Purposes,” 9

^{clxxxix} In his book, *Strategic Giving: The Art and Science of Philanthropy*, Peter Frumkin advises scientific and “political” philanthropists to consider six parameters in choosing a project: (1) the definition of the problem to be solved; (2) the vision of the public good to be achieved (values); (3) the theory of change assumed and precise change desired and at what level; (4) the style of donor involvement on a continuum between low profile and high, hands off to hands on; (5) the vehicle of distribution (personal, foundational etc); (6) time and capital commitment so that progress toward problem solving can be accomplished.

^{cxc} Peter Frumkin, “Private Wealth and Public Purposes,” 4

^{cxc} Jill Jacobs, “The History of Tikkun Olam” in *Zeek*, July 2007, see also her *There Shall be No Needy: Pursuing Social*

Justice through Jewish Law and Tradition

^{cxcii} Cited in Jacob R. Marcus, *Communal Sick-Care in the German Ghetto*, 242-244