



Volume 46
Issue 2 *June*

Article 1

2019

Back to Addams and Richmond: Was Social Work Really a Divided House in the Beginning?

John B. Thompson

St. Ambrose University, Department of Social Work, Davenport, Iowa, thompsonjohnb@sau.edu

Richard Spano

University of Kansas, School of Social Welfare, ricks@ku.edu

Terry L. Koenig

University of Kansas, School of Social Welfare, tkoenig@ku.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>

Recommended Citation

Thompson, John B.; Spano, Richard; and Koenig, Terry L. (2019) "Back to Addams and Richmond: Was Social Work Really a Divided House in the Beginning?," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 46 : Iss. 2 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol46/iss2/1>

This Article is brought to you by the Western Michigan University School of Social Work. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



Back to Addams and Richmond: Was Social Work Really a Divided House in the Beginning?

Cover Page Footnote

Mark Leveling, MSW student at St. Ambrose University, assisted with summarizing and editing this manuscript.

Back to Addams and Richmond: Was Social Work Really A Divided House in the Beginning?

John B. Thompson
St. Ambrose University
Department of Social Work

Richard Spano
Terry L. Koenig
University of Kansas
School of Social Welfare

Social work has experienced unique tensions related to its professional identity and dual purpose of social reform and individualized treatment. Scholars have represented this dual purpose, epitomized by Jane Addams and Mary Richmond, as indicating irreconcilable differences. The purpose of this paper is to investigate the writings and speeches of Mary Richmond and Jane Addams, and, based on this inquiry, to assert that their respective approaches to social work are much more unified than often suggested. Specific themes examined include: acceptance and need for each other's perspectives; compatibility and unity of perspectives; and their collaboration as critical for effecting social change. With this more complex understanding of Richmond and Addams, the authors speculate about how a more holistic approach to social work practice is needed in the 21st century.

Keywords: Charity Organization Society, settlements, social work identity, social work history, philosophy of social work, clinical social work, social reform

Social work has a unique history with persistent tensions related to its professional identity and purpose. These tensions have often centered around conflicting views of social work's purpose as individual treatment (social casework) or social reform; their varying ascendancy reflects the social and historical contexts in which social work developed and also points to social work's ongoing evolution. For example, social workers advocated for reform of child labor laws during the early 1900s and at a time when the United States was beginning to develop compulsory education for children in all 50 states (Chambers, 1963); many social workers embraced popular Freudian psychoanalytic ideas in their social casework and emphasized individual treatment during the 1920s and beyond (Lubove, 1965).

In this article, the authors put forth the thesis that individualized treatment and social reform can be viewed as complementary elements of social work's dual purpose: social work has been a unified profession with a dual purpose from its early beginnings. From loosely based religious-oriented attempts to help vulnerable people (Niebuhr, 1932) to an organized, systematic profession that substituted social sciences for its earlier reliance on theological roots (Greenwood, 1955), there are two persistent internal themes that drove much of social work's early thinking. First, was social work an avocation or an emerging profession? Second, what was the purpose of social work? The first question crystallized when Flexner (1915) presented his critique of social work at the National Conference on Charities and Corrections (NCCC). His response, after admitting he knew little about social work, was that it was not a profession, in part, because social work's purpose appeared to facilitate the work of other professions and therefore was ancillary to more established professions.

The second question about social work's purpose had two responses. One was to focus on using case-by-case techniques emphasizing individual character development as a means to address social ills, as did Mary Richmond. The second group of social workers, such as Jane Addams, believed that people's "individual" problems were generated by the arrangement of social institutions which needed to be reformed. These institutions created an array of barriers that made it difficult for people to escape the toxic conditions that trapped them.

The purpose of this article is to first look at how our profession has handled the debate surrounding the question “What is social work’s purpose—social reform and/or individualized treatment?” We examine writings from scholars, some of whom argue that from the profession’s early beginnings there have been long-standing tensions regarding an understanding of social work’s dual purpose; others describe a more uneven, nuanced and complicated evolution of social work’s purpose as encompassing both social casework and social reform (Chambers, 1963; Germain & Hartman, 1980; Leighninger & Popple, 1990; Lubove, 1965; Pumphrey & Pumphrey, 1961; Trattner, 1974). Finally, some authors acknowledge the complementarity of Richmonds’ and Addams’ perspectives and support a more unified understanding of social work’s dual purpose (Lundblad, 1995; Netting, 2013; Vodde & Gallant, 2002).

Second, we closely examine the writings of Richmond and Addams because their views are often characterized as representing two irreconcilable perspectives of social work’s purpose. Some authors even suggest that Richmond and Addams were both personally and professionally hostile to each other’s perspectives (Franklin 1986; Germain & Hartman, 1980; Murdach, 2007). We purposefully investigate primary source material that suggests their perspectives have much more in common with each other than many social work writers have acknowledged. Richmond and Addams were actively engaged in examining the needs and connections between social reform and individual treatment. By examining their work during various points in their careers, we see the evolution of their thinking. It is our contention that their perspectives were much more clearly aligned than what some scholars suggest.

Third, with this more complex understanding of Richmond and Addams, we speculate about how a more holistic view can be useful to confront these complicated and intense issues in our current historical context, including an appreciation of the need for a “both/and” perspective that allows for a more integrative approach to social work practice in the 21st century.

Historical Context: Tensions and Complementarity in Social Work's Dual Purpose

Social work's history is complex, nuanced, and reflects and uneven development in its dual purpose of both individualized adjustment and social reform. Many social work scholars have argued that from the profession's beginnings in the early 1900s there have been long-standing tensions and divisions regarding the conceptualization of social work's dual purpose. For example, Pumphrey & Pumphrey (1961) described settlement house services as directed toward 'normal' people or everyone who lived in the community, whereas, charity organization societies (COSs) were designed for workers to help people who needed moral guidance due to, e.g., having lost their jobs, or because they had alcohol problems or their children were truant from school. Leighninger & Popple (1990) noted ideological approaches to social work that are very different from each other largely because of their different views of poverty. They remarked that the COSs addressed individual factors in the development of poverty, in contrast with the rise of social settlements, which proposed an approach that addressed the socio-environmental aspects of social problems, such as poverty. Trattner (1974) further stated that the settlement houses were largely a reaction to organized charity and were instead designed to "eliminate sources of distress and to improve urban living and working conditions" (pp. 136–137).

Specht and Courtney (1994) discussed the respective ideologies of the COS and settlement house movement and do not describe these ideologies as complementary. They conclude by saying that "in retrospective...we see the charity organization societies and settlement houses of Jane Addams and Mary Richmond as working with clearly articulated opposing ideologies" (p. 84). Current writings also point to the supposed irreconcilable perspectives of Richmond and Addams (Austin, Coombs, & Barr, 2005; Franklin, 1986; Germain & Hartman, 1980; McLaughlin, 2002; Murdach, 2007). In fact, there seems to be a belief in recent social work writings that these two progenitors of social work were antagonistic toward each other's perspectives, thus prefacing the supposed irreconcilable divides between

individualized treatment and social reform camps that have continued to plague social work into the present day.

Day (1989), Lubove (1965), and others (Chambers, 1963; Leiby, 1978; Waugh, 2005) describe a more nuanced, uneven and complicated evolution of the COS' views of the relationship between individualized treatment and social reform. Day remarked that between the end of the Civil War and the 1890s, the COS, which was rooted in the earlier Association for Improving the Conditions of the Poor, relied on moralism and Social Darwinism, which helped to create their ideology related to the poor as being lazy or morally deficient. They focused on working with the poor to help them develop individual responsibility to address their personal failings. However, by 1904 these moralistic ideas were replaced due to numerous factors, including the translation of science into the larger society and our understanding of social conditions. This led to championing public health efforts and paying attention to carefully collected data by COS workers and others demonstrating that the causes of poverty were societal and environmental (e.g., due to industrialization, urbanization and immigration) rather than personal in nature (Hunter, 1904; Leiby, 1978; Waugh, 2005).

Mary Richmond, who directed the COS at Baltimore, MD, represented one such social worker involved in this transitional period in which understandings of the causes of poverty shifted toward the view of larger social systems and injustices as causes for poverty (Chambers, 1963). By 1909, Richmond had taken a position with the Russell Sage Foundation, which led her to develop more systematic ways to teach others methods and casework as a way to help the poor. By that time, she was using multiple sources to develop her assessments (e.g., client, family, medical records, school and employer), and this work created closer connections between casework and social reform. However, the developments of the 1920s, where casework became closely aligned with "therapy," created a return to a narrow psychological focus. According to Lubove (1965),

the psychiatric influence, however, created two serious long-range problems. The first with that of defining a satisfactory relationship between social work and social reform. The social worker's primary responsibility was service to individuals,

but this did not rule out the interest in social, economic, and cultural conditions typical of the Progressive era. In embracing psychiatry, social workers undoubtedly acquired a more sophisticated awareness of the subtleties and ambiguities of personality, but in the process they undermined their capacity to promote institutional change and deal effectively with problems of mass deprivation in an urban society. (p. 117)

Although social work would be deeply influenced by psychodynamic theory and Freudian ideas which emphasized individual treatment, attention to social reform as an important element of social work's purpose would reemerge due to larger societal occurrences (e.g., the stock market crash of 1929 and the Civil Rights movement in the 1960s). These events created social contexts which provided opportunities for social workers to engage again in broader social reform efforts, such as: advocating for and helping to develop the Social Security Act of 1935 and other social welfare reforms (Genco-Morrison & Hagen, 2005); and the War on Poverty designed to address racism and other forms of oppression (Reardon, 2012; Stuart, 2013).

Finally, there are authors who directly recognize Addams' and Richmond's acknowledgement of each other's perspectives (Haynes & White, 1999; Lundblad, 1995). Lundblad discusses Addams' speech in 1910 when she was elected president of the NCCC. In this speech, Addams spoke about the COSs and the settlements, recognized their differences, but also saw the need for both so "that these two movements could share a broader perspective" (Lundblad, 1995, p. 667). Lundblad, as well as Leiby (1978), also stated that Richmond believed the division between social reform and social casework to be false. "In Richmond's thinking individual treatment would always be needed, but social reform was also legitimate" (Lundblad, p. 667). Further, Haynes and White (1999) establish this conciliatory history between the two thinkers. They quoted Addams (1910), who stated that social work meant the coming together of "charitable" and "radical" (p. 387). They also quoted from Richmond (1899) when she declared that problems of poverty must be approached from both sides, and that the charity worker and the settlement worker needed each other. The authors concluded that professional unity would be served well if individuals identified themselves first as social workers, only identifying

their particular area of expertise afterward. Their hope is that social workers in the 21st century will not continue bickering about which one is the “real” social work, instead uniting, recognizing the value of each other’s contributions, and taking concerted action to serve those most in need. The observations set forth by these authors give way to the hypothesis of this article that social work has been a unified and dual-focused profession from the beginning, by making a closer examination of Richmond’s and Addams’ writings.

Rethinking the Divide: Unity, Complementarity, and Interdependence

There is an apparent disparity in the literature on Addams and Richmond: many authors surveyed recognize ideological differences between Richmond and Addams, some point to nuanced, uneven progression and acknowledgement of each others’ perspectives, and even fewer make significant reference to sympathetic language from either side (Haynes & White, 1999; Lundblad, 1995). Have these few authors taken an insignificant reference and exaggerated its impact to serve their intentions regarding professional unification in social work? Or perhaps many authors on this topic have simply overlooked the similarities and mutual recognition in these two intellectual founders of social work. The aim of this section is to provide sufficient information to address this issue. The point here, based on a more comprehensive reading of what Richmond and Addams actually said and wrote, is that they did recognize their mutual need. To be sure, they do have different perspectives on how to address issues in social welfare. However, each respectfully recognizes the need for the other perspective. Therefore, the authors stand with Haynes and White (1999) and support professional unity based on the idea that it was clearly present in social work from the outset. An exploration of the peaceable speeches and writings of Addams and Richmond is provided in what follows.

Richmond and Addams: In Their Own Voices

Richmond and Addams each make statements that identify them with a particular perspective of social work as case work or social reform. Richmond stated, "Case work seeks to effect better social relations by dealing with individuals one by one or within the...family" (1922, p. 223). Richmond remarked that "the whole of social work is greater than any of its parts...Case work serves it by effecting better adjustments between individuals and their social environment" (1922, p. 259).

Addams described the settlements as "always fired by a hatred of social injustice" (1913). She depicted the pivotal work of settlements in social reform efforts that involved the development of trade unions to remedy industrial conditions. Addams stated,

I am sure that almost every settlement represented here has had the experience in trying to organize working girls into trade unions...The great value of the trade union among women is—first, the sense it gives girls that they themselves can do something to remedy industrial conditions, that they are not altogether helpless; and secondly, the consciousness it gives them of being a part of a great moral effort. The trade union movement for women [represents a]...social uprising... against conditions which have become intolerable...As a federation of settlements we have spent a year on the study of the young working girl, and we ought to...consider seriously what more can be done to improve her economic conditions, upon which the standard of life rests. (pp. 18–19)

Ideological Compatibility between Addams and Richmond

In order to establish the ideological compatibility and amiability between Richmond and Addams, several relevant statements by Addams, followed by similar statements by Richmond, must be put forth. These statements are grouped into the following themes: (1) acceptance and the need for each other's perspectives; (2) the compatibility and unity of perspectives; and (3) their collaborative work as critical in effecting social change.

Jane Addams: Acceptance and Need for Each Other's Perspectives

In her speech entitled *Social Settlements* (1897), delivered to the NCCC, Jane Addams began on a rueful, yet defiant note with her opening statement.

I feel a little apologetic at being here at all. The settlements are accused of doing their charity work very badly. They pretend not to do it at all; and then they become overwhelmed with the poor, and the needy, and they do it, not as trained people should do it, but as neighbors do it for one another, which is not scientifically. In spite of that, however, settlements are, I believe, valuable to charities. (p. 338)

This opening points already to different ideologies between charities (COSs) and settlement houses. However, even in her indication of the division between charities and settlements, Addams reveals her belief that settlements are valuable to charities. She then deepens the rift by citing a "famous" COS representative who, upon encountering an impoverished man, wished to get him on his feet, have him join a friendly society and trade union, and hopefully never see him again, as there would be no further need. Addams was critical of this orientation to the poor because she hoped to build enduring community between the classes.

It does not take long, however, for Addams to show her respect for charity workers. In a message shared with both charity and settlement workers, she makes it clear that the recipients of charity must be understood from their own viewpoint. Addams remarks,

I do not wish to underestimate the friendly visitor. I often say that the people who constantly visit the poor often know more about them than the people who should be content to live in settlements and should not visit them. It is nonsense to say that one cannot know the poor who does not live with them. You know the poor if you take pains to know them. (Addams, 1897, p. 344)

This point would seem to clear up any question as to whether Addams believed that COS visitors were truly capable of

understanding the contexts and problems facing oppressed and impoverished people. She does not go so far as to offer methodological agreement regarding the actions to be taken on behalf of, or with, the poor, but she does not denigrate the ability of COS workers to know the poor on their own terms, which is prerequisite to any helpful intervention. Additional evidence is provided by the fact that two years previously, Addams had been involved in the establishment of the Chicago Bureau of Charities, which was the COS for the city of Chicago, and signed its charter (Schneiderhan, 2007/2008).

Having conceded that charity workers can know the poor just as well as settlement workers, Addams goes on to say that "...after the settlements have given this attention [to the poor], they would indeed be very stupid to minimize the people who are engaged in charitable and correctional work. *We need them at every possible point*" [emphasis added] (Addams 1897, p. 345). This surprising statement is followed by several examples. For instance, Addams suggests that she would prefer that another group, presumably a COS, provide nursery and probation services so that her own resources could be used otherwise. Hull House apparently provided those and other related services "not because we want to do that, but because we have no children's court and no probation officer. We have no feeling with regard to the charities but one of hearty good fellowship" (Addams, 1897, p. 345). She follows this up with a genuine invitation for "real fellowship" between the COSs and the settlements such that they might work together, albeit with different emphases, to improve the lives of the very poorest people.

Jane Addams: Compatibility and Unity of Perspectives

A powerful example of Addams' call for a unified social work comes from her NCCC presidential address in 1910:

In an attempt to review the recent trend in the development of charity, that which has appeared most strikingly to your president is a gradual coming together of two groups of people, who have too often been given to a suspicion of each other and sometimes to actual vituperation. One group who have been traditionally moved to action by "pity for the poor" we call the Charitable; the other, larger or smaller in

each generation, but always fired by a "hatred of injustice," we designate the radicals. These two groups, as a result of a growing awareness of distress and of a slowly deepening perception of its causes, are at last uniting in an effective demand for juster [sic] social conditions. The charitable have been brought to this combination through the conviction that the poverty and crime with which they deal are often the result of untoward industrial conditions, while the radicals have slowly been forced to the conclusion that if they would make an effective appeal to public opinion they must appeal to carefully collected data as to the conditions of the poor and criminal. It is as if the charitable had been brought, through the care of an individual, to a contemplation of social causes, and as if the radical had been forced to test his social doctrine by a sympathetic observation of actual people. (p. 1)

Addams continues by commending the charities for becoming, over time, less dogmatic, more democratic, and more flexible. This is a rather bold statement of Addams' peaceable stance toward the COSs and the charity workers. To be sure, she does not mention Mary Richmond specifically in this speech, but the connection between Richmond and the charity movement is well documented, as discussed in the previous section. Addams' statement is also addressed to the NCCC, which meant that it was to be heard by all sides in the developing field of social work. Her vision for social work is holistic and non-dualistic, where the ideology of one group must be integral to the other: the charity ideology, in its individualistic focus, cannot help but develop an understanding that social and industrial conditions play a significant role in shaping the plight of each woman, man, child, or family. On the other hand, the settlement philosophy, aimed at ameliorating unjust social and industrial conditions, cannot elide individuals or individual families and their particular circumstances when advocating policy decisions for entire populations. Addams apparently envisions a future for social work that includes social work interventions at both the individual and broader societal levels. This would necessarily involve social workers in various systems such as child welfare and criminal justice, but also would require workers in positions of administration, social organizing, and legislative advocacy.

*Jane Addams: Collaborative Work
as Critical in Effecting Social Change*

In the 1920s and within the broader influences of psychiatry and Freudian ideas on social case work, Addams called for the COS and settlements to acknowledge their common, unified vision of social work and their need to work together to effect social change. Addams (1920) stated this explicitly in her speech to the NCCC as she reflected on her recent visit to social work sites in Europe:

What is the spirit of social work? It was founded upon genuine human pity, upon the desire to relieve suffering, to give food to the hungry and shelter to the homeless; unless we can get back to that, underlying as it does, all the subdivisions and subtleties into which we have developed our activities, and take hold of this great world-situation, we will fail in an essential obligation, in a sense we will be traitors to our original purpose. (Addams, 1920, pp. 41–42)

Her speech proceeds to tell of wretched conditions that children faced in various European cities, her point being that social work must wholeheartedly take action as a diverse profession with many “subdivisions and subtleties,” otherwise we are not “worth our salt” (Addams, 1920, p. 42). The “spirit” of social work then is one that does not forget its original mission: its calling to relieve suffering, feed the hungry, and shelter the homeless. This spirit is for an inclusive, unified understanding that social work has strength in its internal diversity. If each subdivision of social work will remember its mission and take action, then real social transformation may be possible.

These excerpts should suffice to introduce a more holistic view of Jane Addams. Though her specific social work tasks differ and overlap from those of the COS, she clearly promotes only a unified vision for social work. But what about Richmond? What sort of vision did she have for social work as an emerging profession?

*Mary Richmond: Acceptance and
Need for Each Other's Perspectives*

Richmond's perspective can be discerned from her speech at the NCCC in 1911. This speech, which followed Addams' speech, was entitled, "The Art of Beginning in Social Work." Richmond stated,

There is an art of beginning, whether we are considering our first steps in trying to find out what to do for an orphaned and destitute little child, or our method of procedure in the larger but related undertaking of trying to reduce the number of destitute orphans in the United States. Both of these social tasks demand a social investigation, though the investigation that is peculiarly my theme is that one which precedes from some form of social treatment not for a large group but for an individual. (1911, p. 373)

Richmond takes ownership of her own individually-centered role and function within social work, but does so without any hint of displeasure that others will do related but different tasks. In her speech she defines her own purview as "clinical," or focused on the person, but also describes the need for a contrasting, alternative focus of the larger social elements of a problem. Referring to the distinctions between different aspects of social work, Richmond (1911) said,

But the methods of the workshop [settlement] and the bedside [COS] are always shading into one another, and the pendulum is always swinging now toward one, now toward the other; in social work it seems to be swinging almost violently of late. I make no attempt to settle the question of which one of these two methods of social service has contributed or will contribute more to human welfare. I do not know and probably no one knows. Probably both supply indispensable data...few forms of social betterment have always and under all circumstances been able to utilize only one of these two methods. (p. 373)

The speech continues with Richmond elaborating on the similarities and differences between what she terms the *personal or retail* and *wholesale* methods of social work (1911). The latter setting policies for groups based on a broad understanding of their needs, and the former attending to the need for individual tailoring of various policies and procedures. Similar to Addams' understanding of the "spirit" of social work, Richmond is not interested in quibbling over which social work is the one authentic or true social work, but instead recognizes the need to address problems using a plurality of investigations and interventions at different levels.

Mary Richmond: Compatibility and Unity of Perspectives

Richmond's various writings acknowledge the compatibility and unity of individual case work and social reform perspectives. For example, Richmond (1906) described the advice that an experienced COS leader gave to a newly appointed leader,

"Stick to the individual case," said a wise charity organization leader to one about to assume leadership. "Let nothing drive you away from it, for, rightly handled, there's the whole of social reform in it." The whole of social reform is in the retail [case work] method, when we follow faithfully wherever its careful working out may lead. (p. 179)

Further, evidence of Richmond's favorable opinion of Addams and the settlements can be found in her well-known book *Social Diagnosis* (1917). The book describes formal social case work as an alternative, not to settlements, but to merely "doing good" without any sense of standards or accountability (Richmond, 1917, p. 25). The newly emerging profession of "social service" or "social work" is only worthwhile to the extent that "society is really served" (p. 25). To this end, social workers engage in case work for the betterment of individuals and families. Other social workers are distinguished by their focus on the betterment of individuals and families "in the mass" (p. 25). "Mass betterment and individual betterment are *interdependent* [emphasis added], however, social reform and social case work of necessity progressing together. This fundamental truth will appear repeatedly as the present discussion of social diagnosis advances" (p. 25). Richmond's conception of social work as comprised of both

individual and mass intervention is a rather strong statement of the compatibility and unity of these perspectives. The fact that she calls it a "fundamental truth" should leave no doubt about her positive opinion regarding social reform efforts. It would seem that a bolder statement on the matter would be difficult to make.

*Mary Richmond: Collaborative Work
as Critical in Effecting Social Change*

Richmond (1917) revisits the topic of internal diversity in social work in chapter nineteen of *Social Diagnosis*. She reiterates that "...social reform and social case work must of necessity progress together" (p. 365). Richmond, like Addams, describes a holistic, non-dualistic orientation which requires both the collaborative work of social reforms and social diagnosis and treatment.

When, for example, the restriction of child labor was made possible, several new kinds of case work became necessary, one of them involving greater skill in sifting the various evidences of age, one involving the development of other family plans to take the place of children's earnings, etc." (Richmond, 1917, p. 365)

Through her description of the slow progress toward the reform of Child Labor laws which were informed by the individual work and scientific data collection done by case workers, Richmond (1922) depicts an intimate portrait of collaboration between reformers and case workers,

I know from personal experience in a certain state where there was, at the time, greater industrial demand for the labor of children than in any other, how easily the new child labor law might have been a dead letter save for the devoted service of the case work agencies [who, for example, collected data about child injuries due to child labor]. After this experience I learned to watch for relation between case work and any given social reform. It has happened again and again, though not always, that case work has preceded and led up to the mass movement by supplying pertinent observations and recorded data. Then later it has followed after the mass movement, and has *applied* the new standard in individual

cases at a stage when the application was still difficult. There is a still later stage, as in child labor law enforcement, when social research must...study special phases of the subject, the street trades, for example, or the labor of children in the beet fields. This study must often be undertaken by an agency which continues its work long after the first strongholds of prejudice and inertia have been overcome. (pp. 234–235)

Richmond demonstrated the interrelationship of social case work and social reform with this example: new policy, in this case child welfare policy, resulted in the need for new forms of case work in order to implement and evaluate the policy change. Alternatively, information from case work with individuals may provide essential information for social reformers, who may then advocate for relevant legislation. This relationship involves the need for policies to be modified and adapted to accommodate individuals. "...[R]esemblances have made mass betterment possible, while individuality has made adaptation a necessity" (Richmond, 1917, p. 367).

Conclusion and Implications

If successful, this paper has provided a more robust understanding of Richmond and Addams and their views on social work. These examples are a far cry from claims in the literature that posit only hostility between these two early leaders in the field. Statements that Richmond and Addams "abhorred" or "deplored" each other's work and perspectives (Germain & Hartman, 1980), or that they were "fundamentally opposed" to each other (McLaughlin, 2002), exaggerate differences between them and fail to recognize their positive recognition of one another's perspectives. The idea that Richmond and Addams despised each other's approach to social work seems more indicative of an unfortunate trend in some current social work circles where hostility between clinical and social reform approaches has led to a breakdown in attitudes and relationships among people in this field. As we've demonstrated using Richmond's and Adams' own words, their perspectives reflect substantial overlap and compatibility.

Addams' and Richmond's work suggests the need to incorporate both an individual and environmental focus in order to

accurately look at the interactional nature and purpose of social work. What makes social work's purpose realized is the dual focus acknowledging connections between clinical and reform efforts. Clinicians who solely emphasize intra- and interpersonal aspects of clients' challenges without connecting those issues to unjust social structures that contribute to them, ignore the comprehensive social work perspective put forward by Addams and Richmond. By the same token, social workers who only focus on structural changes without connecting those changes to consequences for individuals are equally culpable for abdicating their responsibilities to examine how larger changes directly affect individual well-being. Both Richmond and Addams call us to a standard of practice that transcends the "either/or" focus that appears in our literature, and replaces it with a demand to include both clinical practice and reform efforts. As Porter Lee (1929) said in his address to the National Conference on Social Work, "cause and function" are necessary to improve the lot of those people for whom social work has historically and currently provided its broad array of professional activities.

What are the implications for social work today if indeed Richmond and Addams presented an interdependent and unified approach to professional social work at the outset of its existence in the United States? It is our primary hope that as a profession whose mission is to help improve the lives and life conditions of the ill, poor, marginalized, and exploited in modern society, that recognizing connections between Addams' and Richmond's perspectives will lead to decreased anxiety, increased awareness of a comprehensive professional social work identity, and improved cooperation among social workers—whether in the academy or among practitioners—to better serve people in need. This involves reframing our social work discourse and how we often understand each other as engaged in suspicion about who among us is an "authentic" social worker.

We do not intend to diminish the diversity of responses to human need that social work offers. On the contrary, one of the great strengths of social work as a profession is our pragmatic approach to problem solving which permits us to use various theoretical perspectives, research methodologies and practice methods in order to effect change at multiple levels. Thus, reframing the clinical versus social reform divide is not about diminishing

any aspect of social work, or about taking one side or the other, it is about embracing the unified identity of this still nascent profession, which, from the beginning, has included these two broad approaches to doing the “work” of social work (Thompson, 2012). Reframing means letting go of hostility and instead understanding this difference as a healthy tension which, when properly construed, leads to increased cooperation, dialogue and more effective implementation of theory, research and practices, as Richmond suggested approximately 100 years ago.

In effect, since collaboration between social reformers and clinical workers will certainly benefit those we aim to serve, we have an ethical duty to work together toward this end. Our purposes cannot be realized by defining social work practice based on our entry point (i.e., micro, mezzo and macro). Our purposes require that we must understand and integrate multiple factors, both cause and function, in every interaction in our practice. We also have a duty to educate our students about the accuracy of our intellectual history which reflects an inclusive and vibrant profession that, in turn, can enable our students to develop and deepen their professional identity.

The current NASW Code of Ethics states that “[s]ocial workers promote social justice” and that we do so by using multiple methods, including direct practices such as counseling and case management, as well as macro/policy practices such as community organizing and political advocacy (2017, p. 1). “A historic and defining feature of social work is the profession’s focus on individual well-being in a social context and the well-being of society” (NASW, p. 1). By representing both “sides” of social work, the Code of Ethics supports these ideas put forth by Addams and Richmond with the hope that we move forward together to accomplish our mission with unity, though not necessarily uniformity, so all perspectives and practices that promote human well-being are valued.

Acknowledgements: Mark Leveling, MSW student at St. Ambrose University, assisted with summarizing and editing this manuscript.

References

- Addams, J. (1897). Social settlements. *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections*, 338–346.
- Addams, J. (1910). Charity and social justice: The President's address. *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections*, 1–18.
- Addams, J. (1913). Struggle for life above the poverty line. *National Federation of Settlement Conference III*, 16–19.
- Addams, J. (1920). The Spirit of Social Service. *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections*, 41–43.
- Austin, M. J., Coombs, M., & Barr, B. (2005). Community-centered clinical practice: Is the integration of micro and macro social work possible? *Journal of Community Practice*, 13(4), 9–30.
- Chambers, C. (1963). *Seedtime of reform: American social service and social action, 1918–1933*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Day, P. (1989). *A new history of social welfare* (5th ed.). New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Flexner, A. (1915). Is social work a profession? *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections*, 576–590.
- Franklin, D. (1986). Mary Richmond and Jane Addams: From moral certainty to rational inquiry in social work practice. *Social Service Review*, 60, 504–525.
- Genco-Morrison, B., & Hagen, J. L. (2005). Frances Perkins (1882–1965). In J. M. Herrick & P. H. Stuart (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of social welfare history in North America* (pp. 266–267). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Germain, C. B., & Hartman, A. (1980). People and ideas in the history of social work practice. *Social Casework*, 61, 323–331.
- Greenwood, E. (1955). Social science and social work: A theory of their relationship. *Social Service Review*, 29, 20–33.
- Haynes, D., & White, B. (1999). Will the "real" social work please stand up? A call to stand for professional unity. *Social Work*, 44, 385–390.
- Hunter, R. (1904). *Poverty*. London, England: McMillan & Co.
- Lee, P. (1929). Social work as cause and function (Presidential Address). *National Conference of Social Work*, 3–24.
- Leiby, J. (1978). *A history of social welfare and social work in the United States*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Leighninger, L. H., & Popple, P. R. (1990). *Social work, social welfare, and American society*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lubove, R. (1965). *Professional altruist: The emergence of social work as a career 1880–1830*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lundblad, K. (1995). Jane Addams and social reform: A role model for the 1990s. *Social Work*, 40, 661–669.

- McLaughlin, A. M. (2002). Social work's legacy: Irreconcilable differences? *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 30, 187–198.
- Murdach, A. (2007). Situational approaches to direct practice: Origin, decline, and re-emergence. *Social Work*, 52(3), 56–65.
- National Association of Social Workers (NASW). (2017). *Code of ethics*. Washington, DC: NASW.
- Netting, F. E. (2013). Macro social work practice. *Encyclopedia of Social Work*. New York, NY: National Association of Social Workers and Oxford University Press.
- Niebuhr, R. (1932). *The contribution of religion to social work*. NY: Columbia University Press.
- Pumphrey, R. E., & Pumphrey, M. W. (1961). *The heritage of American Social Work*. New York & London: Columbia University Press.
- Rearson, C. (2012). "Case" and "cause" in social work education—A balancing act. *Social Work Today*, 12, 20–24.
- Richmond, M. E. (1899). *Friendly visiting among the poor: A handbook for charity workers*. New York: Macmillan.
- Richmond, M. E. (1906). The retail method of reform. *International Journal of Ethics*, 16(2), 171–179.
- Richmond, M. (1911). The art in beginning social work. *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections*, 372–379.
- Richmond, M. (1917). *Social diagnosis*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Richmond, M. (1922). *What is social casework?* Philadelphia: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Schneiderhan, E. (2007/2008). Jane Addams and charity organization in Chicago. *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, 100(4), 299–327.
- Specht, H., & Courtney, M. E. (1994). *Unfaithful angels*. New York: Free Press.
- Stuart, P. H. (2013). Social work profession: History. *Encyclopedia of Social Work*. New York, NY: National Association of Social Workers and Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, J. B. (2012). Rethinking the clinical vs. social reform debate: A dialectical approach to defining social work in the 21st Century. *ProQuest Dissertations Publishing*, 3522069.
- Trattner, W. I. (1974). *From poor law to welfare state: A history of social welfare in America*. New York: Free Press.
- Vodde, R., & Gallant, J. P. (2002). Bridging the gap between micro and macro practice: Large scale change and a unified model of narrative-deconstructive practice. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 38, 439–458.
- Waugh, J. (2005). Charity organization societies (United States). In J. M. Herrick & P. H. Stuart (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Social Welfare History in North America* (pp. 49–51). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.