

## DISCONTINUITY OF GENERATIONS

next few years will see increasing attention paid to the philosophical base of our work and this is something which we seem to welcome.

3. We believe that the leadership we provide as Jewish communal workers must be strong and directive. It must be seen as *strong* in our willingness to risk ourselves and to give stimulation and inspiration to those with whom we work. It must be seen as *directive* in that the nature of our leadership will be substantive as well as methodological, "that it will help chart a course, not just follow one," and that it will provide the generating power that will motivate people and groups to seek and find solutions to the problems that face them in a changing world.
4. We believe that as a profession we are committed to the perpetuation of Jewish values as well as those values that are related to the democracy in which we live and the social work profession which we practice. But this is not all. Since we recognize that change in our society has all of the characteristics described by Dr. Keniston, we are also committed to do all that we can to make that change a little more planful, a little more conducive to the attainment of our goals while still respecting the rights of people and communities to be different.
5. We believe that there is a need for much more empirical data that will probe and explore the nature of change more fully and provide bet-

ter directions for us. We believe there is a great need for research in depth which will concern itself with the dynamics of what we do. This is, of course, not a new thought, but its reaffirmation bears striking witness to the importance we attach to it.

These then were the five major conclusions about agency structure and practice and the five major conclusions about our profession that emerged from our discussions.

One last and somewhat personal remark: most of us come to these conferences year after year. They provide us with occasions to hear a number of papers, some helpful, and once in a while even brilliant. We meet old friends, eat well, sleep poorly and return home satisfied if not always inspired. As I walked from one discussion group to another and eavesdropped on them, I received a new and different perspective. Here were two hundred of my colleagues in some fifteen to twenty different small groups talking about the implications of social change. They talked with conviction, with dignity, and with wisdom. They talked with a sensitivity to, and a concern about, the people they served, the institutions they represented, and the profession to which they belonged. Suddenly I felt a wholeness and a meaning and a significance to our conference that I have never felt before. Suddenly I felt grateful for the opportunity to have had this experience and proud to be part of our professional group.

## FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE DECISIONS IN COMMUNITY PLANNING \*

by ARNOLD GURIN

Lecturer in Social Work, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

### Growth of Scientific Inquiry Into Community Planning Processes

A PERENNIAL concern in the field of community planning is how to make this process more rational, more controllable, and more predictable. There are recurring attempts, stimulated by both professionals and lay leaders, to clarify the criteria for reaching community decisions and to find some formula that will help to objectify the determination of need and the setting of priorities. The process as it is conducted leaves everyone dissatisfied. It is too idiosyncratic, impressionistic, capricious. Conscientious children of the scientific age cannot easily accept so inexact a procedure, certainly not when large funds are involved. Hence the periodic calls for greater investment in research and for the development of long range rather than *ad hoc* planning.

The problem of achieving greater rational control over decisions in the area of community planning is but one example of the problems involved in the process of "planned change," which refers to deliberate efforts to direct or to steer a process whose ultimate objective is a change in certain patterns of be-

havior.<sup>1</sup> There are two aspects to such problems. There are, to begin with, the underlying *conditions* which account for the patterns of behavior and influence which exist, and, secondly, the actions of the change agents in trying to affect those patterns. In some respects, this is what is implied in diagnosis and treatment. Common to all types of professional intervention (therapy as well as community organization) is the diagnosis of the condition and the use of certain methods and techniques to change it. Research of two types is therefore necessary—research related to an understanding of the conditions, and research directed toward an evaluation of what methods and techniques are effective.

Our first problem, then, in attempting to develop a more rational process of community decision-making, is to understand more clearly the influence patterns out of which such decisions arise. It is encouraging to note that research directed to such issues is becoming more prevalent.

From the perspective of the social sciences, a number of trends has converged to make the community and its

\* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Boston, Mass., May 28, 1961.

<sup>1</sup> Ronald Lippitt, Jeanne Watson and Bruce Westley, *The Dynamics of Planned Change*, Harecourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1958.

patterns of influence a growing object of interest. The community is a logical context in which to study variations in organizational behavior and organizational structure. It is the locus for many of the basic functional relationships which exist in our society. It is the meeting place of home and work, and of special interests of all sorts. The ecologists, of course, have been concerned with these matters for many decades, dealing with factors like size and spatial distribution and mobility. But in more recent years, community studies have been undertaken for more varied reasons. Studies of social stratification typically use the community as the area of investigation, and these have moved along from the comprehensive studies of Middletown and Yankee City, to the more delimited work of Hollingshead and Redlich,<sup>2</sup> where class structure is used not so much as the object of analysis but as the independent variable to explain differences in a particular phenomenon, like the incidence and character of mental illness.

The logical descendant of the social stratification community studies are the more recent power structure studies, as initiated by Hunter and pursued either to confirm him or to deny him by many others.<sup>3</sup> Power structure studies come closer than do the older social stratification studies to illuminating community planning problems, since they deal not only with the positions that people occupy in the eyes of others, but with the influence that people occupying different positions have on certain processes in the community. It is this problem of *influence* which is central for planning considerations.

<sup>2</sup> August B. Hollingshead and Frederick C. Redlich, *Social Class and Mental Illness*, John Wiley, New York, 1958.

<sup>3</sup> Floyd A. Hunter, *Community Power Structure*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1952.

It is interesting to note that Hunter's analysis, while centered on the field of community planning, proved of major interest not only to practitioners but to social scientists who had long neglected this particular segment of community institutions. Voluntary organizations and the field of philanthropy are becoming objects of study, increasingly, not only for purposes of examining power structure but to pursue other sociological and socio-psychological problems as well. There is a growing body of research, for example, on the factors which account for the participation of people in organizational activity.<sup>4</sup> Also relevant to this general line of development is the heightened interest in primary groups, and the reappraisal of some of the traditional concepts of urbanization which postulated the complete eclipse of the local neighborhood. Theorists interested in examining the revised forms of primary group structure in today's new urban-suburban complex find the voluntary organizations an important element in their analysis.<sup>5</sup>

What seems to be happening, in short, is that fields of organization and activity which are of professional interests to social workers—namely, the health and welfare and educational organizations that function under voluntary auspices—are becoming a subject of inquiry for social science in the same way that

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, the following articles in Marvin B. Sussman, ed., *Community Structure and Analysis*, Thomas Y. Crowell, New York, 1959: John M. Foskett, "The Influence of Social Participation on Community Programs and Activities," pp. 311-330 and Mhyra S. Minnis, "The Patterns of Women's Organizations: Significance, Types, Social Prestige Ranks and Activities," pp. 269-287.

<sup>5</sup> A significant recent contribution is Eugene Litwak, "Voluntary Associations and Neighborhood Cohesion," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. XXVI, No. 2, (April, 1961), pp. 258-271.

industry and government have already been.

At the same time, new projects are developing, under social work auspices, to dig more deeply into an examination of community planning as such. There have always been any number of community surveys, directed mostly to an estimate of needs and resources. Only rarely have studies focused on the dynamics of community planning. Hunter and his collaborators did a study some years ago in Salem,<sup>6</sup> and similar studies were done by a group of sociologists in Michigan, under the title "Community Involvement."<sup>7</sup> These were detailed case studies of individual community situations. More recently, and currently, there are under way *comparative* studies which give hope of being able to relate elements of process to similarities and differences in community situations. Robert Morris' "Report No. 15" in the CJF&WF's Health Study<sup>8</sup> is an illuminating contribution to the identification of important variables that affect the outcome of coordinating efforts. Particularly noteworthy is the differentiation, in this report, of factors representing *pre-conditions* for planning as against factors designated as *planning tools*. This corresponds to the distinction outlined above. Further studies of the planning process are now under way in local communities under the auspices of Brandeis University and a new project, focusing on the specific processes involved in determining priorities, is be-

<sup>6</sup> Floyd Hunter, Ruth Connor Schaffer and Cecil G. Sheps, *Community Organization: Action and Inaction*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1956.

<sup>7</sup> Christopher Sower, et al, *Community Involvement*, The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1957.

<sup>8</sup> Robert Morris, *Basic Factors in Planning for Coordination of Hospitals and Institutions for Long-Term Care*, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, New York, October, 1960, (mimeographed).

ing organized at Western Reserve University. There are undoubtedly others.

This sketchy indication of recent and current work bearing on community planning is designed to call attention to a growing body of data which should eventually prove more and more useful to practice; and, in a more limited sense, to indicate the sources from which we shall try to attack at least a few of the global problems implied in the title of this paper.

It seems to me that many factors involved in community decisions can be grouped into the following categories:

- 1) The *functional needs* that are to be met; i.e., the specific problems with which the decision tries to deal.
- 2) The balance of *power* among the groups involved in the decision.
- 3) The framework of *values* within which the decision is made.

The key words in this formulation are *functional needs*, *power*, and *values*. Each of these calls for considerable explanation, some of which will be suggested in what follows. However, my major point will be that decisions are determined not by any one of these factors but are the outcome of the various ways in which they are interrelated.

As a framework for looking at such interrelationships, it seems useful to make the kind of distinction which is basic to many types of organizational analysis—between the rational and non-rational processes in organizational behavior. This distinction has been made in many settings, and different names have been used for it, such as formal vs. informal structure, manifest vs. latent functions, intrinsic vs. extrinsic goals.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> While there are many sources in sociological literature that deal with concepts such as these, the discussion which follows was influenced primarily by the following: Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1957, Chap. 1, "Manifest and Latent Functions," pp. 19-84; and Alvin W. Gouldner, "Organizational Analysis," in

Common to all these dichotomies is the fundamental notion that there are two sets of phenomena to be looked at in an organizational situation: the surface level, where things are what they seem, where procedures are deliberately directed, instrumentally, toward stated ends; and a somewhat submerged level, where all kinds of other considerations not necessarily germane to the official purposes of the organization are exerting an effect.

This way of looking at organizations has proved very productive in studies of industries, governmental agencies, prisons and mental hospitals, and is being extended, with many ramifications, to more and more organizational areas. Such studies have demonstrated empirically the specific ways in which goals of organizations get redefined through the interaction of forces that are not anticipated and cannot be controlled by the rational, official structure. On the theoretical level, structural-functional analysis is an attempt to explain organizations as spontaneous interdependent systems held together through certain functional requirements, rather than through rational processes. The lesson in these studies is that there are natural limits to what can be legislated on a strictly rational-instrumental basis, and if we want to determine those limits more precisely, we need to understand the kinds of functions that are being served within the organization and the points at which these functions are or are not compatible with the rational goals. The action implications are obvious. Rationally designed programs must take account not only of the ends to be served but of the "natural" elements within the system. If the ends are to be achieved, then provision must be made for meeting the functional re-

quirements of the parts of the system (individuals or groups) in ways that serve rather than undermine these ends.

This type of analysis has not been applied in any extensive way to the relationships between organizations, but the same concepts are applicable and are in fact quite familiar, in somewhat different terminology, to community organization practice. Certainly the notion of latent roles and interests that individuals bring to the community planning process is a basic one in whatever community organization records we have. The limitation in these descriptions has been the lack of adequate definition of the specific connections between the latent and the manifest factors in a way that could lead to generalizations. The current studies on community planning, referred to at the beginning of this paper, should move us further in that direction.

The importance of taking note of both manifest and latent factors is clear in any attempt to delineate the nature of the power structure and its impact upon federation decisions.

#### Power Structure Factors

A federation, like any other organization, can be looked upon as a system made up of functionally interdependent parts. Since it is an interorganizational rather than an organizational system, it is most analogous to a political body. It is a mechanism for the balancing out of interests, needs and functions represented by leadership groups. It may be viewed as a somewhat unstable equilibrium, a temporary adjustment among a variety of forces, some complementary, some conflicting, some quite disparate and independent of one another in their functioning. This equilibrium is of course subject to change in response to pressures from within the system or from the outside environment; but the

amount and pace of change are limited by the requirements of maintaining a viable balance.

One of the differences between the political arena and the pseudo-political framework of voluntary organizational activity is that the nature of the interests involved is much vaguer in the voluntary area. In the political system, it is possible to identify certain vital interests which are inherent in a given class position, or economic stratum, or regional location. Farmers, labor and business groups have clearly identifiable self-serving goals. In local community planning, however, the motivations are much less clear.

Labor, for example, has sought a place in local community decision-making, but it does not follow that labor has particular policies or programs which it considers vital to its interests and which it therefore seeks to promote through such participation. From one point of view, one might expect that labor would seek participation as an instrumental means toward the achievement of direct ends, like more service for its members. This is not always the case. Instead, participation itself seems to be instrumental toward some other purpose, like the increase in labor's prestige, or in its community "image," or perhaps the opportunity to control the terms on which the financial participation of its members will take place.

Similarly, there is no sure way of predicting from the vital interests of business what the position of business leaders will be on given community problems or proposals. There may be a general tendency toward keeping the costs down, but this is a vague goal at best, and actual experience indicates that it is not pursued consistently. In regard to programs, it is hard to identify a distinctively "business" interest.

There is no way of showing a clear relationship between a businessman's

problems with absenteeism, let us say, and certain community proposals for health and hospital services. Explanations of this type are sometimes offered as a rationale, as "selling points" for business participation, but it is rather doubtful that this is really what is crucial. The participation of business in community affairs does not seem to be based primarily on instrumental considerations of program need but rather on a more general concern with the public relations position of industry in the community—with the "image" of business, if you will.

Studies of community power structure have found many different patterns of business participation. In some communities, the most dominant companies were found to be indifferent to and aloof from community affairs. In others, they were heavily involved. It is hard to attribute the difference to any objective factors. The difference was in orientation to the value of participation in general. The power was there in all cases. The difference was in the decision on whether to use it.<sup>10</sup>

The conclusion to be derived from these studies, for our purposes, is that community decisions of the type usually involved in the deliberations of voluntary agencies are not necessarily a matter of vital interests to the economic power structure. It is possible for possessors of power not to participate at all, or to participate without feeling it necessary to control the process. It is necessary to look further, then, into the kinds of conditions where interests are affected.

<sup>10</sup> Note especially the distinction between economic dominance and local socio-political dominance reflected in the study by Robert O. Schulze, "The Role of Economic Dominants in Community Power Structure," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. XXIII, No. 1, (Feb. 1958), pp. 3-9.

Robert K. Merton et al, eds., *Sociology Today*, Basic Books, New York, 1959, pp. 400-428.

One of these conditions exists when the voluntary structure becomes symbolic of balance of forces in other systems, where vital interests are actually at stake. Thus, if industrial management defines its basic power problem as one of protecting itself from the economic and political encroachments of labor, then it may be wary of all changes in the balance of power between itself and labor, even when this occurs in areas that are not immediately relevant to this contest. So, for example, an industry that has been indifferent to the local political structure may become activated when it finds that labor is becoming more influential in local government. The same thing may happen in the field of voluntary organizational philanthropic activity.

A fundamental contradiction, however, in much of community planning has been the fact that the community services themselves frequently do not meet any clear, direct, instrumental purposes of the decision-makers. There is thus considerable lack of congruence between the rational-instrumental purposes that the process is designed to serve and the orientations of the groups on whom it depends for support.

From a rational-instrumental point of view, the people most affected by community planning decisions are the clients who use the services of the respective agencies. These people are not usually represented in the decision-making process, at least not in their capacity as clients. This means that the very structure of the decision-making process as set up in the planning organization (as well as in the individual agencies) is based not on direct representation of the interests involved, but rather on representation of those claiming to serve certain groups of clientele. This very structure opens the way for introducing into the criteria for decisions, not only the demonstrable needs, as rationally de-

termined, but the extrinsic interests of the spokesmen—interests that are bound to be based not only on the actual needs they attempt to represent but on the demands of other relationships and social structures in which they are involved.

The importance of this distinction becomes clear when we observe what happens in those relatively rare situations when client groups do find a way of expressing their own needs and make demands upon the community for a greater share of the resources. The impact is almost revolutionary. From the days of Workers Alliances made up of public relief clients in the 1930's, through the politically-oriented organization of aged, to the more recent organizations of parent groups of children with specific physical and mental handicaps, the idea of people demanding welfare programs in their own right is so shockingly different from the prevailing norms that it shakes up the existing pattern.

It is from this perspective that the frequently observed trend, especially in the Jewish community, for the line between clients and agencies to become blurred takes on such significance. Direct involvement of sponsors of a program with the service goals presumably increases their vital interest in the decision-making process. It makes them stronger and more persistent advocates of the program. There is a good deal of evidence for this, not only in common sense, but in everyday practice experience and in the few studies that have been made. Sills' study of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, for example, demonstrated not only that the core leadership became involved because of personal experience with polio, but that its identification with the organization was reinforced powerfully by its functional responsibility to admin-

ister assistance programs on the local level.<sup>11</sup>

When the power of wealth or status is joined with direct involvement in the instrumental purposes of the program, we should expect a maximum influence of such a powerful individual or group over the decision-making process. When there is no such clear-cut relationship, the issue is much more uncertain. We do know from experience that the pressure of power blocs can be very strong and decisive even when the nature of the interest is not directly instrumental but where participation and control are serving vital extrinsic purposes of the decision-makers.

In the polio foundation study, for example, Sills documented another fact well known in community organizations practice, that, while the core group was personally involved in the program itself, the mass of workers were recruited on the basis of their social relationships and they joined because of the people involved rather than the cause. Along the same lines, Morris found that one of the pre-conditions for successful implementation of a community plan for coordination was a pattern of *informal social interaction* among the leadership of the agencies being coordinated.

On the rational side, it is the core leaders, lay and professional, who define the issues for decision and formulate a point of view. Their orientation is primarily an instrumental one, but it too is determined by the value and role commitments that they have to their reference groups and to the wider publics they are attempting either to influence or to satisfy. In the case of the professional, this includes the broader professional groups of which he is a member. These extend beyond the particular organization he is serving.

<sup>11</sup> David L. Sills, *The Volunteers, The Free Press*, Glencoe, Ill., 1957.

Where the resources are adequate to carry out the decisions and where no conflicts of interest are involved, rational-instrumental types of proposals advanced by core groups having this type of orientation can be effective. Decisions of some moment, however, do not meet these conditions. They tend to require additional resources and they may very well involve some change in existing relationships which arouses resistance. It is at this point that all the secondary, extrinsic goal relationships come into play in the interaction of groups with varying degrees of power.

It is perfectly obvious that an individual large contributor or a group of contributors strongly identified with a particular agency or program will have a powerful influence over community decisions affecting that agency. This is inherent in the voluntary nature of financial contributions and participation.

The potential of secession is an ever-present factor in the calculus of interdependence on which the community structure is based, and the right to secession is prescribed by the terms of the voluntary system. Any agency powerful enough to have the potential of secession is inevitably powerful enough to exert a very strong if not always decisive influence on decisions—and certainly on decisions affecting its own welfare. While these stone walls exist in every community, they tend to distort, it seems to me, the true picture of power structure. The truer picture is that power is usually not so attached and committed, that there are pockets of countervailing power which balance each other off, and that there are large areas for the operation of rational decision-making. There are, in addition, certain restraints which come from the value system that pervades everyone's participation. For example, all participants feel some com-

mitment to the value of rational process itself.

The real problem continues to be the extremely low level of involvement of wider publics in the decision-making process, or in meaningful participation in general. The channels for expression of community wishes are very ambiguous. The larger publics are most often quiescent, and it is only in rather rare instances that decisions reached by leadership groups will touch some latent interest that will arouse an expression of mass reaction. As in the case of client self-organization, such popular reactions tend to be effective, even spurious ones which do not really represent broad mass reactions but the interests of the vocal minority groups.

#### Needs as a Factor in Decisions

Turning from the power structure to an examination of needs, we find similar complications. Just as it is difficult to define the nature of the interest which is involved in the participation of various leadership groups in the community structure, it is difficult to determine what are the needs to be served, and much more difficult to measure their relative urgency. There has been some work in this field, all of which tends to bog down on the problem of how to separate the need as such, if there is such a thing, from the evaluation which people place on need.<sup>12</sup> Some attempts have gone in the direction of constructing indices, based on rates of social pathology, like delinquency and divorce. Others try to apply some general population standard, like a certain number of hospital beds or a certain number of mental health workers per capita. In

<sup>12</sup> For an excellent review of this subject, see Genevieve W. Carter, "Measurement of Need," in Norman A. Polansky, ed., *Social Work Research*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1960, pp. 201-221.

one way or another all such attempts get back to the judgments which people make of the need. The basic measure thus becomes consensus. This is not a satisfactory answer, and there continues to be a striving for a more objective basis for measurement.

Once consensus becomes the determinant, then all kinds of questions arise: about how consensus is achieved, whose judgment dominates, who influences whom, etc. In other words, the issues around need become intermingled with the issues around power, and we are back again to an examination of who is speaking for an alleged need, rather than the need itself. Once this happens, the problem becomes whether it is the need that is being projected, or the intrinsic goals.

It is therefore important to try to keep some separation between the factors related to need and the factors related to power. In fact, such a separation is quite essential unless we are ready to say that needs and functions are completely irrelevant and that it is simply the power relations of the participants which determine the decision-making process. I think there would be general agreement that this is in fact not the case. If it is not, then it is important to try to differentiate between these two aspects of the process and to show how they are related.

I would like to suggest that needs and power relations can be looked upon as limiting conditions on each other; that they are both always involved in the decision-making process, that neither is completely independent of the other, and that the particular interaction between these two elements varies on the basis of certain attributes of each.

Even if we were to assume that consensus is the only valid basis for determining need, there are discernible differences in the degree of consensus,

more agreement in regard to certain "needs" than others. Some of the factors which make a given need striking to large numbers of people are their relevance to vital functions of life, to safety, to health. Another criterion is the numbers involved. Group survival, as in times of war or disaster, is of this nature.

A need that is likely to have the greatest impact on decisions is one where there is a condition affecting substantial numbers of people, recognized widely as a need which must and can be met, where there is a consensus not only as to the need but as to its urgency, and where appropriate means are available for dealing with it. Deviations from this extreme occur as the result of ambiguity as to the condition, lack of awareness or sense of responsibility for meeting the need, or uncertainty as to the best means of dealing with it.

When either goals or means are ambiguous, then the basis for rational decision-making is impaired. In this kind of situation, there are greater opportunities for issues to be decided on the basis of extrinsic factors—in this case, confidence in the quality of the leadership of an agency rather than conviction as to the merits of its program. Some of the difficulty in the field of community relations stems from the fact that there is a general sense that the work to be done is important but no agreement as to criteria for competence and effectiveness. In this situation the status and power position of agency sponsors become even more determining than they might otherwise be.

#### Interaction of Needs and Leadership in Jewish Community

Let me try now to bring these much too diffuse and fragmented observations into a preliminary attempt to identify the elements that are most central to the

relations between the Jewish federation and its component agencies in the decision-making process.

Approaching this from the point of view that decisions are a product of the interaction between functional needs and the relative influence of decision-makers, let us look first at functions and needs.

Viewed in historical perspective, the needs of the Jewish population, its characteristics and status, have of course changed drastically in the past half century. These demographic and economic changes are the source of various pressures on the federation as a system, either directly, or through its agencies. The direction of these forces, it seems clear, has been toward an emphasis on group identity and cohesion in contrast to the older emphasis on individual adjustment. This has placed pressure on all the agencies to develop a rationale for sectarian service, stressing Jewish group values in one manner or other.

As functions have shifted in this direction, new leadership has arisen to act as spokesmen for new needs. It is one of those futile questions to ask which comes first—the new needs or the new leadership. The same historical forces are involved in both. What is important, however, is to recognize that not only do new leadership groups arise and seek a place in the sun because of their emerging economic and social power, but such emerging groups tend to identify themselves with programs that respond in some way to changing conditions. Sometimes, to be sure, there is simply a change of leadership, without a change of program. This happens when the successful businessman from the wrong side of town is coopted onto the board of a prestigious organization dominated by members of old families. The long-range changes, however, are of a more far-reaching character.

One of the difficulties in defining trends is that the pace of change in community programs is very slow. Agency structures and leadership patterns are quite persistent. If any evidence were needed, Morris' study demonstrates once again how important the German vs. East European cleavage continues to be in some communities, many decades after anyone came off the boat.

The prestige that is associated with inherited wealth and family position tends to be a particularly potent status symbol in this society, as the Yankee City studies proved. The identification of old-line families with certain community institutions may continue to give them a high status position and therefore a strong influence on community decisions for a considerable period of time. On the other hand, if such institutions and their leadership do not fall away completely from Jewish identification (as some of them do), they tend to go through a series of modifications, both in leadership and in program, which meet functional requirements and thus reinforce prestige.

Closely related to changing functions is the way that leadership defines its role and its claim to legitimacy. In the older philanthropic pattern, the leader was defined largely by the non-Jewish world, and his relationships within the Jewish community tended to be influenced largely by his interests as an individual representative to the wider community. As the group composition of the Jewish population became more heterogeneous, there were challenges to such a basis for leadership, and many forms of self-expression on the part of groups that saw themselves not as clients but as full participants in Jewish group life. The periodic reorganizations of federations in many cities have been designed, in the main, to provide broader representation to these diverse elements.

While Jewish-non-Jewish relations continue to be an important determinant of Jewish policy and program decisions, leadership today tends to participate in community relations as spokesmen of articulate constituencies which define its positions.

It seems inevitable, in this historical perspective, that the decision-making process should be more strongly influenced, in the long run, by groups representing programs that can substantiate a claim for advancing group identification and cohesion. By its very nature, this is a function whose advocates will tend to be personally involved and affected by the programs and therefore will tend to be most effective in advancing their claims.

From this point of view, it would seem reasonable to expect that participation in overseas programs and identification with the large aims of the Israeli community should continue to be central to the functions of the Jewish community for as far ahead as we can see. What seems especially predictable is that the ebb and flow in the fortunes of Israel will continue to exercise a powerful effect upon the Jewish community program in this country. The Jewish community has found its greatest centripetal force in periods of overseas emergency when the needs are obvious and dramatic.

Among domestic agencies, it is consistent with this trend that there should be growing emphasis on the expansion of group and educational services, where the relationship to central sectarian functions is easier to define than it has proven to be in some of the individualized services.

There is, however, a trend of a different order whose influence is not yet fully apparent. The agencies which provide services to individuals—hospitals, homes for the aged, casework services, voca-

tional services—are caught up in *general* community changes which are giving greater priority to certain of their functions. As a result, there are constantly growing resources from outside the Jewish community for hospital construction, medical and social research, rehabilitation, mental health programs. Inevitably, the existence of such funds influences the program priorities of the agencies and also affects the degree of their dependence upon the federation. In the short run, this growing independence can serve to strengthen the position of some agencies in the federation complex.

The very popularity of certain programs, like care of the aged, mental health, and hospitals, makes it desirable for the federation to retain its participation in these programs, so that the interest groups identified with them can be welded into the total community effort. The present situation is very mixed, with agencies participating both in sectarian and in more general financing. The trend is toward larger funds from external sources. Over the long run, this can lead to ever greater independence of the Jewish community. Such a prospect has its dangers. It would involve losses both for the agencies and for the total Jewish community. Here is a problem area where rational and value elements may be reconcilable with power considerations. The direction would be toward recognizing and utilizing the factors making for both greater resources and greater independence, but trying to

determine through rational criteria what functional and financial relationships continue to be necessary within a Jewish community framework.

In summary, the suggestion offered here is that the underlying social, economic and cultural conditions of Jewish group life in America are tending to influence Jewish communal programs toward a major concern with problems of group identification and cohesion; that this is reflected as the manifest level in the need to justify Jewish sectarian programs in such terms, and at the latent level in the growing influence of groups representing such functions. In the slow processes of community change, leadership groups are not replaced quickly. The federation attempts to maintain a workable equilibrium, modifying leadership patterns and programs sufficiently to develop maximum contributions of newer groups without losing the support of older ones.

The balance at any given moment is uncertain. The federation tends to be the testing ground for its determination. In most instances, projects of any substantial dimensions require some degree of collaboration between older and newer leadership elements. It is here that values become determining. If there is a history in the federation of a commitment to meeting community needs and to defining them through some kind of representative process, then the basis exists for decisions that involve compromises designed to permit and to facilitate cooperative action.