an increasingly greater number of problem cases on hand. This, of course, necessitates a change in the method of treatment and in the general child

care program of the community.

Mrs. L. Edward Lashman (New Orleans, La.) stated that the New Orleans institution draws its population from seven southern states besides Louisiana. There is a great pressure from the surrounding states for admitting children to the institution. Very little placement is done. There has been in recent years no material change in either the size or the character of the child care population. Psychiatric service and child care clinics are, however, as necessary for the normal child as for the presumably deteriorated child. This the New Orleans community is now trying to develop.

Mr. Joseph Bonapart (Vista Del Mar, Los Angeles, Cal.) was of the opinion that, taking the situation in other parts of the country, the change in child care methods is possibly due not so much to a change in the character of the child population as to the change in emphasis on the mental

aspects of the work.

Mr. A. Osovsky (Winnipeg, Canada) pointed out that the difference in the character of the institutional child population of New York City and other parts of the country and particularly in Canada is to be sought for in the type of homes the children come from. The Winnipeg institution draws its population from small communities in the western provinces of Canada. Economic conditions in these small towns and villages are better than in the larger cities. The children thus come from homes with a higher standard of living, with a certain family background, with certain traditions and education. This type of children is superior to those coming from the city slums, products of proverty with no educational, religious and national background.

Dr. Lowenstein stressed the need for developing in each community the type of child care program that will enable it to take advantage of every kind of method for the care of children and to adapt the care to the needs of the individual child. This is possible in the larger as well as in the smaller communities. Pressure is brought to bear upon all local institutions. But for a community to limit its child care program to institutional care only is merely to badly handicap itself in its best service to the children.

The need of case workers in child care institutions was next raised by

Miss Cecile Epstein (Chicago).

Mr. Bonapart (Los Angeles) stated that the California State Welfare Department requires that every institution must have a case worker for every hundred children. Those having less than one hundred children must use the services of a part time worker. The Jewish institutions in California have anticipated this by many years, and the number of case workers is much better than one to a hundred.

## GROUP DISCUSSION II

## PROBLEMS OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

Chairman: I. Irving Lipsitch, Los Angeles, California.

The question of the functions of the Federation executive in relation to the problem of community integration was introduced by the Chairman as the topic for group discussion.

The function of the Federation executive, he said, should be not only to marshall available resources toward meeting the community's needs and

problems, but also to endeavor to bring about its integration, to create out of an aggregate of individuals an integrated, conscious whole. This applies particularly to relatively new communities where no community consciousness has been built up. In Los Angeles, for instance, nearly 75 per cent of the local population has come to live there within the last ten years. The integration should further proceed along the lines of getting all elements of the population to take an active interest in coordinated communal efforts and participate in its leadership. Not least among present community organization problems is the training of the younger generation for community leadership.

Mr. S. L. Mosbacher (Oakland, Cal.) stated that while Oakland has been gaining in Jewish population, many of the older leaders have been leaving the town and that the new comers are as yet too engrossed in getting a start to qualify for leadership. Oakland is, however, always in search of new material and has been fairly successful in drawing in some of the

younger men in communal work.

Mr. Harry J. Sapper (Oakland, Cal.) expressed the opinion that the question of community organization must be approached from the angle of the direction which the Federation is to follow. What purpose is there in Jewish community organization, and if there is such a purpose, how is it to be realized? We must determine what, precisely, is the function of a Federation in a community. Should it be the leader in all matters of Jewish import or should it merely limit itself to the task of securing aid from one element of the community for the other element that is in need of it?

Mr. Lipsitch: The business of the Federation is two-fold: One is to be interested in everything that is Jewish, philanthropic, cultural, social, even, in some ways, religious. The other is to be interested in everything that is of social import in the general community. The Federation, in other words, is to act as the representative of the Jewish population in all matters that

affect the general welfare of the community.

Mr. Rabinowitz (San Francisco, Cal.): Jewish life is broader than its merely religious manifestations. It has two aspects, religious and racial. There is a need for two types of leadership, religious and lay. The lay leadership must be broad in scope to include the inter-relation between the various elements in the community and what might be called the intra-Jewish problems, and the relation of the Jewish to the general community. This leadership cannot be found among the general laity. They are too preoccupied with their own affairs and, in most instances, lack breadth of vision to make them acceptable as spokesmen for the entire community. The lay leader must be a man whose whole business, whose whole training fits him for the lay affairs of the Jewish community. Our communities are not integrated, of course. But the process of integration is a long and difficult one. In the absence of complete integration, we may start with the Federation, which represents the bulk of the important elements of the community, and have its leader carry on the work of representation and ultimate integration.

Mr. Ben Sheinman (Los Angeles, Cal.) thought that the key to the situation is integration. Until we get true integration the community would not be ready to accept such a lay leader. The means of integrating the various elements, aside from the Federation, and the integrating of the Federation and organizations outside of it are the problems that should

be given proper consideration.

Mr. Sapper also emphasized the need for community integration before determining the character of its lay leadership. If the Federation is to assume leadership it must be more truly representative of the entire community. As things stand at present it would be a mistake to stamp out those elements that are not in accord with the methods of the Federation, or to stamp out the individuals in those groups that want to do things in their own way. The Federation executive, if he is virile enough, can, however, make himself so felt in those groups that they would consult with the Federation when they want to undertake work that is properly within its

province. This has been worked out satisfactorily in Oakland.

Dr. Herman Lissauer (Los Angeles, Cal.) expressed the view that community organization has to be approached not so much from the viewpoint of a plan of representation as of the basic philosophy underlying Jewish organization. It must be recognized that the Jews throughout the history of their communal life in the Diaspora have always retained a certain degree of autonomy. This autonomy has been responsible for their survival. It must therefore be assumed that a part of the job, at least, of community organization is the encouragement of the building for the survival of the Jewish group. The type of community organization, the Kehillah, varied from generation to generation and from country to country. All of them had, however, a basic philosophy to build on. The Federation happens to be the first original organization formed on American soil, and it just so happened that it was philanthropic in character. But the Federation is not the community. The Kehillah of old incorporated every activity in the entire community and so will the American Kehillah. Our philanthropies will in course of time be taken over by the Community Chests, for in actual philanthropy there is not much difference between Jewish and non-Jewish activities. The type of community organization that will arise on American soil will include the philanthropic, educational, recreational, and social activities of the Jewish group, all of whom will be represented in some sort of council, but it will be a cultural group that will project itself forward consciously and which will give emphasis to such activities as will work for the continued survival of the Jewish people.

Mr. Manuel P. Ostrow (San Francisco, Cal.) was also of the opinion that there are certain cultural traits in the Jewish community which will express themselves not only in the theory but also in the practice of the Jewish community. The basic principle of the Federation, the coordination of various forces in the community, is basically sound. But additional forces are coming into existence and the Federation will have to develop in conformity with these new interests. There is at present a tendency to come back to Judaism, which will enable us to define Jewish culture more clearly

and apply it to life with a new technique.

Dr. Solomon Lowenstein (New York, N. Y.) stated that while there are certain aims and purposes that are common to all organized communities, the form and function of these organizations do vary in accordance with their size, age, history, etc. Integration, too, may perhaps be brought about much sooner in the newer communities than in those older ones where a strong feeling of factionalism and institutionalism has been exerting its influences. The Federation is at present the largest single organization but it does not pretend to express all the forms of Jewish community life.

Dr. Boris D. Bogen (Cincinnati, Ohio) expressed the need for a thoroughgoing study of the aims, purposes, tendencies, desires and aspirations in the Jewish group. It is premature to speak of a comprehensive organization

which is to assume responsibility for the entire community without ascertaining first what the community wants to express and what it wants to control. The time is not yet ripe for delegating the entire Jewish expression to one group, and especially to a democratic group. Study must precede it, and to this end we must bend all our efforts.

## GROUP DISCUSSION III

PROBLEMS OF TRAINING PERSONNEL, PROFESSIONAL AND VOLUNTEER. IN SOCIAL SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

Chairman: Mr. Samuel A. Goldsmith, New York City, N. Y.

Chairman Goldsmith, in introducing the subject, said that while in the training of professional social workers in universities and specialized social service training schools care is taken to give the students the required scientific background and technique as well as the clinical experience that would enable them to make a practical application of the theoretical knowledge gained, the training of volunteers is lagging greatly behind.

Many and varied attempts have been made by various communities in this direction. The most fruitless and ineffective type of training is the one that merely gives the trainees an occasional course of lectures. Such lectures are, as a rule, irregularly attended. No practical field work accompanies the theoretical exposition. In most instances no machinery is provided for keeping the volunteer interested in her work, to place her where she would be of greatest service and to help her make the proper adjustment to her work. Yet, the proper training of volunteers is an urgent need, for there is a very definite place for them in the social service scheme. Aside from assisting the professional worker in the performance of certain office and field routine tasks and in doing actual technical work, which, of course, requires technical training, the volunteer is of greatest service to the social agency by interpreting the agency's work to the community.

Mrs. S. M. Blumauer (Portland, Oregon) pointed out that the smaller communities are handicapped in the work of training volunteers. They have no special schools or even professionally trained workers to undertake the training. The volunteer comes in with no grasp of the problem and gets her experience afterwards, in the course of the work. Both the work and

the volunteer pay sometimes very dearly for this experience.

Mrs. Geballe (San Francisco, Cal.) related the experience of the San Francisco agencies in training volunteers during the last two years. Training is done by means of lecture courses. The first course of lectures had a registration of over 100 and a regular attendance of over 90. These courses are being followed up with more intensive training. For the group interested in Big Sister work, arrangements are being made for more specialized work in psychiatry and mental hygiene, so that they will be professionally trained for their work. The volunteer, it is true, brings into the work a certain amount of emotionalism. Still, the volunteer is of decided value, for she brings also with her an experience arising of her own home problems, an important contribution to the understanding and control of social problems. The value of the volunteer would be still more enhanced through greater cooperation between her and the professional worker.

Miss Emma J. Loewy (San Francisco, Cal.) raised the question of the use and training of volunteers in community centers. Volunteers, even if