

best known to industry and finance, he was refused the aid. In a fury of misguided zeal, he proceeded to wage a widespread publicity campaign against national and international banking interests, singling out the so-called International Jew for his special propaganda and attack. More damage was done and more seeds of anti-Semitism were sown in already fertile soil.

These were of course, the out-croppings of a seething economic discontent which was almost world-wide. American Jewry was greatly alarmed by this series of attacks; and its leaders directed a counter-attack against the propaganda as well as the propagandists. Volumes were published acclaiming the loyalty and patriotism of the American Jew and his numerous and valuable contributions to science and culture; recourse was had to the courts, to establish the miscreancy of the leaders and the gullibility of their following, in these anti-Semitic movements. But alibis and apologies were of little avail, the damage had been done for this generation. The question was what might be done to assure a higher standard of Jewish citizenship for succeeding generations of American Jewry. And out of the deliberations of the Jewish leaders came the decisions for a re-establishment of the Jewish Education movement. Despite its history of more than a decade, the purpose behind the movement still seems much misunderstood though it represents for American Jewry the only really valid instrument for a proper upbuilding spiritually of the Jewish Youth and the Jewish citizenry of tomorrow.

Despite all of these manifestations of a growing anti-Semitism in America, it is doubtful if any action leading to necessary preparedness, would have followed but for the unlooked for rise of Hitler to power in Germany, and the tragic consequences to the Jews of that Country. With the bars of immigration drawn everywhere, assistance for German Jewry took the form of Relief at home, and for some refugees who are in other countries. But the publicity attendant upon the tragedy itself, the measures taken to secure aid, the further plans for economic reprisal, and the insidious propaganda of Hitler's Agents in this country, have thrown the whole Jewish problem out into the open, and history is merely repeating itself for the Jew on a new front.

Thus we find ourselves concerned today, not so much with our localized problems of welfare service (though they too must survive) as with these newer developments for which all of the forces of Jewish life must be marshalled. There can no longer be a Zionist

Group centering its activity solely upon its nationalism or a program for Palestine; there should no longer be any isolation of religious institutions, content only in their own chosen fields of interest; nor for the Jewish Labor Group concentrating its strength entirely in the battle for economic security; in the face of these dangers, there can be no justification for the intense factionalism which has divided Jewish life into the crisis-cross pattern, it now presents. There is today an urgent call upon all elements for a union of their forces and a counselling together for Joint authority, voice and action.

The need for such organization has, as already stated, been developing for a number of years. In many communities, plans have been projected looking to its accomplishment. Usually the Federations have been the Agencies to take the initiative. Perhaps this has been a mistake even though the Federations have appeared to be the only instrumentalities generally acceptable to most of the elements in the community. It is the Agency upon which American Jewry united in the solution of many of its problems heretofore. The Federation has had no individual ax to grind; its interests, whether adequately reflected in the composition of its leadership or not, have been the interests of the whole Community. That the Federation has not always had the complete confidence and support of all elements, may reflect merely certain natural reactions to an organization of this character. An Agency whose major function is to stimulate fund support for communal purposes undoubtedly creates some animosities and prejudices for itself. Its additional function of allocating the funds raised, to widely diverse purposes and institutions, may likewise tend to a lack of confidence of those having special interests and loyalties to serve.

As a means of fostering these plans for the organization of American Jewish life, the National Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds was recently established. It aims to assist local and regional groups to develop adequate leadership out of their own ranks. In the main the Council has had to rely upon the larger local units such as the Federations and Welfare Funds for the necessary assistance in its program, but whether local Federations or other agencies are selected to initiate these movements, is not important. What is of utmost importance is the need for the creation of local machinery whereby the problems which are pressing for consideration and action, can be resolved by joint thinking and planning.

Ten Years of Training Jewish Social Workers

By FELIX M. WARBURG

Chairman, Executive Committee, Graduate School for Jewish Social Work

A LITTLE over ten years ago a committee of the National Conference of Jewish Charities, headed by Dr. Lowenstein, came to see me to discuss plans for a school for Jewish social workers. They had come to the conclusion that the only way to supply Jewish organizations with trained workers was to create a school. Some years had elapsed since the old school went out of existence and it seemed that the time had come for another school. Several attempts to start schools in the interim did not meet the need. This was the first time since the old school discontinued its work that a school was planned on a country-wide basis. This time the undertaking was initiated by the social workers who were in the best position to know the need.

The plan was that the school be located in New York City where it could use the resources of the New York School of Social Work. A national board of directors was to be created and the support was to come from the Federations. During a trial period of three years the New York Foundation and the Nathan Hofheimer Foundation were each to contribute \$15,000 a year.

While I was somewhat skeptical whether the federations would support a school adequately, and while I would have preferred to see the school located elsewhere than in New York because of the feeling occasionally expressed but almost always implied that New York controls everything, the plan seemed the best under the circumstances and we decided to go ahead.

With the help of the late Lee K. Frankel and I. Edwin Goldwasser, fellow members on the two foundation boards, we secured promises from them for support. Maurice J. Karpf was brought from Chicago to head the school. We were also successful in getting the late Julius Rosenwald to accept the Presidency of the board. A board was selected and in January of 1925 the school opened its offices, with the intention of starting the first class in July of the same year.

I suppose that none of us close to the enterprise, with the possible exception of the Director, had any very clear idea of the size or the importance of the job we had undertaken. The plan was that the School take only college graduates, and keep them studying

for fifteen months. We had less than six months in which to develop a faculty, a curriculum, a student body, etc. We had only one full-time person, the Director. I confess that I was at first rather skeptical about the program and doubted whether we could go through with it. Others wondered whether there was a real need for a Jewish school and whether it could justify itself. We wondered also about the type of students we would get. All in all it looked as though there would be plenty of difficulties to contend with.

Quite early we ran into difficulties with the State Board of Regents regarding a charter. The law requires an endowment fund of at least \$500,000 before a charter is granted. We had not endowment funds and no prospects of getting any in the near future. We finally secured a temporary charter which was to serve for five years on which the School is still operating. There were other difficulties which required many meetings of the board in those early days.

But despite everything, in July we inducted the first class of twelve students, all college graduates, with good college records and considerable promise for the future. An excellent faculty had been organized, a curriculum was developed and everything went along as per schedule. Fifteen months later this class was graduated and a second class was under way. Contrary to our expectations we had many more applications than we could accept and the students were selected from increasingly large numbers of applicants. The School placed its graduates easily and began to develop a reputation for good and substantial work and high standards.

During the first five years, the School more than justified its existence. Several hundred young men and women took either the full course or special courses in the School. We found, however, that the course of study was too crowded and was more than either the faculty or the students could efficiently carry. It was decided, therefore, in 1930, to expand the course of study to two academic years. Although some of us had doubts about the advisability of expanding the period of training, the new program, which has now been tested for four years, proved much more satisfactory.

The same year also saw a number of other important changes in the School. The temporary charter expired during the year and a new charter had to be obtained. It seemed desirable also for the School to give degrees to its graduates. Since the School took in only college graduates, there seemed no reason why this should not be done. The Regents, after an exhaustive study of the situation, finally granted the School the right to give degrees. They did this because of the high standards of the School. They created the special degrees of Master and Doctor of Social Service. I am told that our School is the first to grant these distinctly professional degrees. They also extended the temporary charter with the recommendation that the name of the School be changed from the Training to the Graduate School for Jewish Social Work. Last year we had the pleasure of conferring for the first time the Master's degree.

With these changes the School entered upon a new phase. Its enrolment more than doubled and new needs of space, faculty, field work and library facilities, made themselves felt. But, because of the depression, needed expansions and developments could not be undertaken. While a very much larger budget was voted by the Trustees in 1930, it was never put into operation and the School spends but little more today than it did in the last year or two of its fifteen month's program.

We believe that in the ten years of its existence the School has made some very important contributions to Jewish social work. It has placed in the field a large number of trained men and women who are doing good work. The School always aimed to serve the entire country. In selecting and placing its students the needs not only of New York City but of the rest of the country are borne in mind. In many other ways the School served very important purposes. But the shortage of funds due to the depression and the need for scrutiny and economy in spending public money, as well as the question raised by some whether a separate Jewish school is still necessary, made it seem desirable to review the program and future of the School.

In order to obtain a completely unbiased study, a special committee of the Board decided to ask Teachers College of Columbia University to make a survey of the need and effectiveness of the School, and whether it should continue on its present or modified program. This study was undertaken about the middle of last year. The activities of the School were carefully examined. Inquiries were made of leading Jewish and non-Jewish social workers and university professors to

determine their views on the need of a Jewish school and the soundness of the present program.

The Committee's report is now being studied. It is a pleasure to be able to say that the work and the standards of the School were endorsed wholeheartedly. In fact some questions were raised as to whether the standards in certain aspects of its work are not too high. A few weaknesses in the present program were indicated but they were already known to some of us. They are due almost entirely to lack of resources and can only be corrected by making available to the School larger funds and facilities. Some suggestions were made regarding changes in the School's set-up with an eye toward economy, but even the survey group was not very enthusiastic about them and suggested them only as a last resort. They maintained that the School must continue because the need today is as urgent as it was at its beginning. They felt also that it has made a contribution not only to Jewish social work but to general social work as well.

One of the by products of the survey is a proposal now being considered by the Board for the creation of a shorter course of fifteen months to parallel the present two year course. It is hoped that the shorter course will provide needed flexibility of program, and that by shifting the emphasis it will enable students who cannot afford two years of graduate study to get a good preparation in a shorter period. We shall undertake it only if we can accomplish it without lowering the present standards of the School.

The friends of the School will of course be encouraged and heartened by the result of the survey. But gratifying as are the findings, the problems which the School faces have by no means been solved by the study. Rather have they been emphasized. It is clearer today than before that the School must eventually have greater resources than it has. We are hoping that the two foundations which supply about half the income will continue their support at least for another five years. The federations have hitherto supplied less than half of the balance. The remainder of the School's budget has been raised through special contributions from three members of the Board, one of whom is unfortunately no longer with us.

The problem therefore arises as to how the School will be able to maintain itself during the coming years. An endowment fund, which it needs and should have, seems out of the question at this time. The only source of increased support therefore must be the federations. Facing the relief problems they do, it may be difficult to get them to take on additional burdens

unless their leaders will recognize clearly the importance of this enterprise. If central fund-raising for national agencies should ever be developed the School will of course have an easier time raising its budget. In the meanwhile the future of the School must become the responsibility of the leaders in Jewish social work since it is they who brought it into existence. Fortunately it has made an admirable and more than satisfactory showing. We who have been working to develop the School feel that we have been amply repaid in its accomplishments and that a satisfactory demonstration has been made. From now on it must be the social agencies who should support it by making available to it the necessary funds through federation appropriations, and by employing its graduates and giving them preference whenever possible.

I understand that at a recent National Conference a committee recommended that the School's graduates be given preference. This is no more than fair. For Jewish men and women going to general schools of social work cannot possibly have the preparation or the interest or the claim upon Jewish agencies that graduates of our School have. Nor are they likely to have the loyalty to the Jewish people and the capacity and preparation for leadership so badly needed in Jewish communities. We believe that because of the high standards of the School in the selection and training of its students our graduates more than measure up to those made available by other schools. By attending the Jewish school they have clearly indicated that they are primarily interested in Jewish social work and are preparing themselves to deal with its problems. For these and other reasons I feel that they should be given preference and encouragement.

Thus far the School has had no difficulty in placing its graduates. With the careful and conservative policy of admission and graduation, I do not expect that we shall have any difficulties in the near future. After ten years of existence, with approximately 50 per cent of the School's graduates going into the agencies of greater New York, the large Jewish agencies connected with the two New York federations still have less than 25 per cent of their staffs graduates of schools of social work. In the smaller communities the percentage of trained people is no doubt much smaller. The School can therefore continue to function for a long time before the field will be adequately staffed with

trained people.

In view of this I am not afraid that the School will be unable to place its graduates. But I am deeply concerned that Jewish agencies and communities should have available the very best people for positions of leadership that we can get and train. If the graduates of our School will be given the deserved recognition the School will attract the best Jewish men and women that the colleges and universities have to offer. Social work and Jewish life stand to gain a great deal from this, and Jewish social workers should be the first to realize it. Events throughout the world are such as to require the best qualities of heart and mind on the part of those who are to lead the Jewish communities and are to represent them before the non-Jewish world. We cannot entrust that leadership to those who are not thoroughly identified with the interests of the Jewish people.

I hope that the School will insist upon undivided allegiance to the Jewish people as a requirement for admission and graduation. I for one believe that it should direct its energies along this line for I would rather have loyalty with less technical perfection than the other way around. Fortunately we do not have to make this choice, for the School's graduates have as good technical training as those in non-Jewish schools since they take their technical training in a non-Jewish school. This assures agencies employing our people, that their staffs will have the best technical equipment, plus interest, devotion, and loyalty to the Jewish people.

I am eager that the School should continue to improve its work to the maximum that its resources will permit. Jewish social workers and lay leaders can want no less. The School is prepared to do its utmost to continue to serve Jewish social work in the best possible manner. We of the Board are prepared to help in every way we can. We feel that the School's past performances have entitled it to our fullest confidence. It is now up to the Jewish organizations who profited from the past work of the School and will profit from its work in the future. It is also up to the Jewish social workers to do their share. It was at their request that the School was organized and it is they who chiefly profit from its existence. They must show by their support that they want it to continue and function efficiently.